

 <b>BOND UNIVERSITY</b>	<b>EVALUATION of LEARNING and TEACHING POLICY</b>
Policy Owner	Provost
Contact Officer	Chair, Academic Senate
Endorsement Authority	Academic Senate
Date of Next Review	February 2028

## 1. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

This Policy outlines the holistic approach to evaluation of learning and teaching at Bond University based on the Evaluation Framework outlined in [Appendix A](#). It represents the intent of the University to transition from the previous Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy with its focus on student surveys (eTEVALs), to the more holistic evaluation approach outlined in the Framework. Supported by continuous professional development for Educators, the Framework is an important element of Bond's commitment to a culture of reflective practice and learning and teaching excellence. It also informs a number of mandated quality assurance processes, including the Program and Subject Review and Assurance of Learning (AoL) processes and the [Faculty Review](#) process.

The Framework is based on the over-arching principles that a holistic approach to learning and teaching evaluation recognises:

- the diversity of approaches and activities that contribute to effective learning and teaching
- there are multiple stakeholders who each contribute unique and important perspectives
- the relative contribution of each component of the framework will vary dependent on
  - nature of the subject and its context within the program(s),
  - Educator career stage and experience.

Major sources of evidence of an Educator's effectiveness include:

- Students
- Peers
- Relevant data
- Scholarly activity
- Critical self-reflection
- Review outcomes (reviews may be internal and/or external e.g. subject, program, Faculty, accreditation).

The inclusion of multiple sources of evidence in the Framework encourages Educators to use student feedback within a holistic, integrated approach to ongoing development of their learning and teaching practice. This approach forms the basis for Educators to provide evidence of their effectiveness and contributions to learning and teaching.

## 2. AUDIENCE AND APPLICATION

All staff and students involved with coursework programs.

## 3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Responsibility
Academic staff with teaching responsibilities in Coursework programs (Educators)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider the sources of evidence they will utilise to evaluate their teaching and subjects and for discussion at the annual PDR meeting</li> <li>▪ Conduct appropriate evaluative activities, reflect on findings and implement changes as appropriate</li> </ul>
Office of Learning and Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide support and opportunities for professional development</li> </ul>
Executive Dean of Faculty or Head of University Academic Unit ( <a href="#">UAU</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommend appropriate professional development for an Educator when required</li> </ul>

## 4. POLICY STATEMENT

**4.1** Holistic evaluation of learning and teaching recognises the value of diverse perspectives and is structured to capture the multi-faceted nature of teaching and learning practices, processes and outputs directly and indirectly related to quality instructional delivery.

**4.1.1** Educators should evaluate subject(s) and teaching in subjects for which they are Lead Educator and/or responsible for the delivery of educational experience(s) in which significant instruction is undertaken. Evaluation strategies would normally include:

**4.1.1.** feedback obtained through **peer** evaluation inclusive of peer observation and peer review of teaching; at least one peer observation of teaching is required annually.

**4.1.2.** feedback from **students** (including data from Student Satisfaction and Feedback Surveys (SSAFSs)) as outlined in the Management of Student Satisfaction and Feedback Survey Procedure.

**4.2.** Educators are encouraged to utilise multiple sources of evidence to support ongoing development of their learning and teaching practice. The Evaluation Framework in [Appendix A](#) provides a range of evidence sources as examples.

**4.2.1.** The evidence sources used by an Educator may vary according to circumstance and should be selected to suit the:

- context of the subject
- Educator's experience/career stage and goals
- nature of the Educator's contribution to the subject
- areas of particular focus e.g. innovations being trialed, responses to previous feedback or review outcomes
- purpose for which evaluation will be used – purely self-development (formative) or contributing to evidence of effectiveness for PDR, promotion, research/scholarship
- contribution each makes to form a holistic representation of teaching effectiveness and impact e.g.
  - peer review can provide professional, experienced comment on effectiveness of teaching delivery and engagement strategies; constructive alignment; resource design and effectiveness; assessment quality through assessment moderation and marking review
  - student feedback can provide information about their experience during a subject including e.g., engagement; delivery/presentation skills; learning resources provided; assessment feedback; interactions between the Educator and student(s) etc.
  - data analysis can provide important insights into e.g. student attainment of learning outcomes; student progress; student engagement with resources provided on iLearn sites
  - scholarly activity – utilisation of relevant scholarly work and or communities of practice may provide inspiration and evidence for developing new initiatives or refining current educational practices; contributions to scholarship are important indicators of quality.

**4.2.2.** Evaluative strategies should be structured to provide both immediate and longitudinal evidence to document demonstrable self-reflection over time. Strategic interventions should be designed with a view to continuous improvement as warranted, and/or sustained effectiveness.

**4.2.3.** Analysis and interpretation of evaluation should be triangulated where possible to recognise the varying perspectives and information provided by each type of evidence. Results from any source should not be used in isolation.

### **4.3. Feedback from students and peers**

In addition to other sources of evaluative evidence (refer to 4.2 and 4.3), feedback from students and peers are useful elements of an educators' reflections on their teaching and learning practice.

#### **4.3.1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

**4.3.1.1.** Peer evaluation of teaching provides an important perspective on teaching providing a comprehensive approach to evaluating and improving teaching effectiveness across different settings and methods. Insights gained from experienced colleagues observing teaching practice and/or educational resources provide useful information that can inform continued development of good teaching and learning practice and assure the quality of that practice.

**4.3.1.2.** There are two elements to peer evaluation:

- a) collaborative peer observation of teaching – through collegial discussion and observation of teaching by a peer, provides feedback for an Educator that may be used to identify areas for further development; normally focusses on classroom delivery
- b) peer review– through structured feedback by an appropriately experienced peer provides evidence of teaching quality; includes classroom delivery but may also incorporate review of educational resources e.g. iLearn sites, assessment materials

**4.3.1.3.** Management of peer evaluation of teaching, inclusive of provision of support is outlined in the Management of Peer Evaluation of Teaching Procedure

#### **4.3.2. Student Satisfaction and Feedback**

**4.3.2.1.** Students provide insights into Subject or Educator effectiveness by providing feedback on their experience and satisfaction. Feedback from students can be obtained through a variety of formal or informal strategies selected by an Educator to suit the context of their teaching and/or subject.

Examples include formal SSAFSs, informal testimonials received from students/alumni, awards received from students and feedback received through the Class Representative system.

- 4.3.2.2. SSAFSs are an element of formal feedback that can
  - a) ensure student views are considered in learning and teaching evaluation and
  - b) provide aggregated data to inform institutional strategies designed to improve student experience.
- 4.3.2.3. To ensure students' efforts in providing feedback are recognised, continuous improvement actions taken as a result of the analysis of quantitative and qualitative feedback from SSAFS data must be provided to students via the Closing-the-Loop process.
- 4.3.2.4. SSAFSs, inclusive of the Closing-the-Loop process, will be conducted and managed as outlined in the Management of SSAFS Procedure.

#### 4.4. Support for Educators

- 4.4.1. The University recognises that developing an effective holistic evaluation strategy requires support for Educators and that those who review the outcomes (e.g. through formal peer evaluation, PDR and/or promotion) also require professional development in order to recognise, interpret and evaluate the value of different evidence sources.
- 4.4.2. Support is provided through the Office of Learning and Teaching which provides a range of services, opportunities and resources for targeted professional development. The OLT also offers individual consultations and support/PD planning to assist academic teaching staff to effectively respond to feedback received through multiple evidence sources.
- 4.4.3. Educators are also encouraged to participate in informal and semi-formal discussions with peers e.g., sessions organised by their Faculty or UAU, through communities of practice and/or professional/discipline networks/associations.
- 4.4.4. Professional development may also be recommended by the Executive Dean or equivalent as an ameliorative measure in response to evaluation results that may include SSAFS feedback.

### 5. DEFINITIONS, TERMS, ACRONYMS

<b>Assurance of Learning (AoL)</b>	AoL is the process of collecting and mapping educational data such as learning outcomes, graduate attributes and assessment to give universities specific information about how to strengthen contribution to student learning
<b>BOE</b>	Board of Examiners
<b>Faculty</b>	Bond Business School, Faculty of Health Sciences & Medicine, Faculty of Law, and Faculty of Society & Design (each of which is headed by an Executive Dean)
<b>FLTC</b>	Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee
<b>Peer evaluation of teaching</b>	Overall term used to describe "A purposeful process of collaboration between academics which provides constructive feedback on the effectiveness of interventions to promote student learning" (see also <a href="#">Peer review of teaching A rapid appraisal</a> )
<b>Peer observation of teaching</b>	Direct observation of formal teaching in a classroom, laboratory, workplace or fieldwork setting (see <a href="#">Peer review of teaching A rapid appraisal</a> )
<b>Peer review of teaching</b>	Term applied more widely than peer observation of teaching to encompass all approaches used to support student learning (see <a href="#">Peer review of teaching A rapid appraisal</a> )
<b>SSAFS</b>	Student Satisfaction And Feedback Survey
<b>University Academic Unit (UAU)</b>	Bond University College (headed by the Director) and Transformation CoLab (headed by the Deputy Provost - Education)

### 6. AFFILIATED PROCEDURES AND SCHEDULES

[Appendix A: Evaluation Framework](#)  
[Management of Student Satisfaction and Feedback Surveys Procedure](#) (NEW)

### 7. RELATED DOCUMENTS

[Curriculum Management Policy \(TL 3.4.2\)](#)  
[Student Code of Conduct Policy \(SS 5.2.1\)](#)

**8. MODIFICATION HISTORY**

Date	Sections	Source	Details
16 February 2025		Endorsed by Senate Executive and UMC Policy Subcommittee	Date First Approved

**APPROVAL AUTHORITY:** Vice Chancellor

# EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

