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**Response to Student Feedback from Central Services:**

**Academic Year 2009-10**

The processing of Module Feedback forms to students for the academic year 2009-10 was again undertaken by the Teaching Centre.

Upon receipt, forms were logged and processed within a maximum of 10 working days, with the majority of forms being processed within 5 working days. This ensured prompt availability of quantitative data to Schools/Departments via LUSI. Additionally, Schools/Departments were advised that forms could be collected from the Teaching Centre to enable qualitative feedback to be evaluated.

Following the electronic pilots that took place in 2008-09, it had been agreed at Programme Quality Team (PQT) that a third phase of the pilot be run during the following year during Semester One. A total of 76 modules were run electronically across four departments. It was reported that response rates continued to be disappointingly low compared with paper-based feedback. PQT therefore decided in March 2010 that electronic questionnaires would not be routinely used to collect module feedback.

A total of 543 modules were processed in Semester One of academic year 2009-10 (including 76 electronically) and 644 modules in Semester Two, totalling 1,187 modules for the year compared with a total of 1,210 the previous year. The Teaching Centre only ran a total of 36 batches of module feedback forms for the Business School and it is assumed that the majority of their feedback has been collected within the department as for the previous academic year.

The revised questions from last academic year remained the same, namely Q10: *‘The library resources and services are good enough for my needs’,* Q11: *‘I have been able to access general IT resources when I needed to’* and Q12: *‘The teaching rooms for this module were fit for purpose’*.

Although it had been agreed at PQT on 14 July 2008 that Programme feedback would not be collected and processed this academic year, as stocks of printed forms were still available and it was a transition period, the Teaching Centre did run feedback for 35 batches of Programmes at the request of a small number of departments. This will not be repeated in the current academic year.

Review of the Projects, Placements and Dissertations (PPD) feedback form is on-going and 50 batches of PPD forms were processed for 2009-10.

Reports are appended for the following three service providers:

1. University Library (Ruth Stubbings)
2. Facilities Management (Caroline Pepper)
3. IT Services (Carys Thomas)

Heads of Support Services noted above were alerted to outcomes of student feedback where mean scores were <3 and asked to provide a written response. The reports appended herein address concerns raised via student feedback and provide an account of action taken by the respective service providers.

The percentage of modules referred was 4%, a 2% reduction from the previous academic year.

The majority of issues raised were relatively straight-forward and have been addressed by the relevant Service provider.

Updates from issues previously reported

Some students have completed a question/questions on the Module feedback form when this does not apply to them. Following findings last academic year, a memo was sent out to all Departmental/School OMR Co-ordinators requesting them to liaise closely with individual lecturers so that any irrelevant questions can actually be crossed through, thereby eliminating any uncertainty on the students’ behalf. Reminders will be sent at the start of each Semester and hopefully this can be improved upon further, thereby ensuring more meaningful data.

Library staff continue to work closely with Schools/Departments re reading lists and encouraging lecturers to add reading lists to the on-line reading list system.

As only 36 Modules were run for the Business School, it is assumed that student feedback is mainly collected within the School. However, I am unaware of any questions relating to Central Services.

Future Methodology for University Student Feedback Collection

The Optical Mark Reader (OMR) remains to be utilised for processing. With the move of the Teaching Centre later this year to an open-plan office, I believe we need to look at replacing the OMR with a scanner for processing, which will be considerably quieter and less obtrusive in this environment. The support of IT Services would be needed for the set-up and for the redesign of the forms.

Jo Wilkins January 2011

Teaching Centre Administrator



**University Library**

# Library-related module feedback from students, 2009-2010

## **Overview**

The main module feedback question relating to the Library was Q10: ‘*The library resources and services are good enough for my needs*’. Six modules sought feedback on the training provided by the Library (Question 12).

The number of modules attracting a mean score of less than 3.00 for questions relating to the Library decreased. The total (33) was 15% lower than in 2008-2009. The continued decrease may be due to the close working relationship the Library Faculty Teams successfully maintain with the Academic Departments. Of those modules with low scores for the Library questions, 66% were delivered in Semester two and 84% were aimed at undergraduates. Of the undergraduate modules 73% were final year modules.

As in previous years, the reasons for modules receiving the low scores were investigated in detail by the staff of the Library Faculty Teams. This is seen as part of their continuous liaison between academic departments and the Library. Library staff:

* ascertained whether there was an online reading list for the module
* studied the module reading list (if there is one) and checked the availability and demand of the library material listed
* contacted the academic staff teaching the module to discuss the feedback and in addition, were required the Learning & Teaching Co-ordinators and / or Heads of Department were copied into emails discussing the module feedback scores.

As in previous years, there were a few low-scoring modules for which Library support is considered neither necessary nor appropriate: in such cases students should be instructed to tick the ‘does not apply to me’ box. (It may be that they were so instructed but still answered the questions.)

Dissertation / project modules continue to receive low scores, as reading lists are generally not provided. On discussions with the internal examiners it became clear that they wish students to explore the subject and find information relevant to their own topic. In addition information literacy refresher workshops are often not scheduled into the teaching timetable, as the lecturers believe the students should already have the skills to find and manage information. For these types of modules, consideration should be given to providing reading lists relating to research methods and information literacy lectures / clinics delivered to help those students who are struggling to find good quality information on their topics.

Where problems were identified, steps have been taken to improve matters. These include encouraging lecturers to add new material to reading lists; encouraging lecturers to add reading lists to the online reading list system; purchasing additional copies of books; purchase of electronic copies of texts; moving copies of texts from long to high demand and *vice versa*; correcting broken links on modules and suggesting the arrangement of information literacy courses.

General points are:

* close liaison between teaching staff and Library staff is crucial
* electronic resources are not always recognised as Library resources, so that where modules rely heavily on e-journals, for example, students may not realise they are using a resource provided by the Library
* student expectations of Library support can be unrealistic
* students are often expected to buy key texts: failure to do so makes low scores for Q10 - inevitable – especially for modules with large numbers of students
* lecturers teaching dissertation / project modules often provide no reading list – which inevitably can cause student frustration
* information literacy teaching by Library staff can be very beneficial, and is an opportunity that should be more widely taken up by departments

Detail of Faculty Team investigations follows at the end of this report.

Ruth Stubbings

Head of Academic Services, University Library

22nd December 2010

###  Module Feedback Report for the Library Engineering Faculty Team

A summary of the Engineering Faculty modules with responses lower than 3.0 to the question relating to the Library are given below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dept** | **Module** | **Semester** | **Score** | **Response?** |
| CV | B065 | 2 | 2.41 | Yes |
| CV | P262 | 2 | 2.00 | Yes |
| MM | B301 | 1 | 2.94 | No |
| MM | B505 | 1 | 2.80 | Yes |
| MM | D300 | 1 | 2.86 | Yes |
| MM | B300 | 2 | 2.79 | No |
| MM | B504 | 2 | 2.91 | Yes |
| TT | C001 | 1 | 2.75 | Yes |
| TT | D008 | 1 | 2.56 | Yes |
| TT | D018 | 1 | 2.57 | No |
| EL | P011 | 1 | 2.52 | No |
| EL | B006 | 2 | 2.19 | No |
| EL | P067 | 2 | 2.80 | No |
| **TOTAL 2009/10** | **13 Modules** |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL 2008/9** | **13 Modules** |  |  |  |

**General comments**

A total of 13 module groups gave the Library below average feedback, the same number as last year. The distribution amongst departments shifted slightly with Electronic & Electrical Engineering seeing a reduction in the number of modules providing below average feedback, Civil and Building Engineering remaining the same and the other two departments seeing a slight increase. For the second year running Chemical Engineering had no modules giving poor feedback. This was also the case for the Department of Materials which has moved from Science to the Engineering Faculty this year.

One satisfactory result was that no module that received poor feedback this year was also listed last year.

**Action taken**

We checked each module which had scored below the mean of 3. We then examined reading lists attached to the module and any indicative reading list and noted any mismatches or gaps. We then contacted all lecturers to discuss potential solutions. These emails were copied into Learning & Teaching Co-ordinators for the Departments. Where there was no reading list, we would suggest one. Where there were few titles, we suggested additional titles. Where there were few copies, we suggested additional copies. Where it was thought training would help, it was offered. If there were problems with broken links we would fix them automatically.

**Outcomes**

Responses were received from 7 of the 13 module leaders contacted – a slightly lower response rate than last year. Outcomes achieved as a result of contact with each of the departments is summarised below.

# Aeronautical/Automotive Engineering

E-mails were sent to the two module leaders offering to purchase additional material and provide training to the students. Replies were received from both module leaders. One resulted in the purchase of additional copies of the recommended texts from the reading list and the other advised us that the module in question would be merged with another as of next year.

# Civil and Building

Only two modules were listed for Civil and Building this year and prompt responses were received to e-mails sent to both module leaders. The second year module already had a reading list but a lack of sufficient multiple copies was identified. This resulted in orders for additional copies of several items on the reading list. The other module was a WEDC distance learning module which did have a reading list. An e-mail was sent to the module leader offering information on services to part-time and distance learners and the electronic reserve. He felt that the “reading list was not relevant to distance learning modules as they are completely unnecessary as the students are working remotely and we aim to provide them with all the material they need”. Fortuitously a goal on the Engineering team operational plan had already been set to review and enhance provision for distance learners and a meeting arranged with Tricia Jackson, Head of the WEDC Resource Centre to discuss provision of tailored material on Library services to support WEDC distance learners.

# Electronic and Electrical

Three modules were listed for Electronic and Electrical this year. One of the modules had no reading list and an e-mail was sent to the module leader highlighting this. The other two module leaders were contacted with offers to purchase additional material and/or provide training to students. Unfortunately no responses have been received for any of these modules.

**Wolfson School**

Of the five modules receiving below average feedback, responses were received for three of them. Two of these were group project modules and the problem was identified as students’ lack of knowledge in searching for relevant information. This has been addressed by providing additional material on Learn on finding information for their projects. For the third module additional copies of texts have been identified.

Ginny Franklin, Lizzie Gadd. Becky Laing, Steph McKeating, Tracy Marshall

Dec 2010

### Module Feedback Report for the Library Science Faculty Team

This document details an investigation into the library provision for Science faculty modules which attracted low scores relating to the question on library resources and services.

## Analysis of Science modules affected with last years’ scores for comparison.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Low scores****2009/10** | **Low Scores** **2008/09** |
| Chemistry | **0** | 0 |
| Computer Science | **4** | 2 |
| Mathematical Sciences | **1** | 1 |
| Physics | **1** | 1 |
| Information Science | **2** | 1 |
| **Total** | **8** | **7** |

 |

This years’ total of 8 low scores for the Science Faculty is, unfortunately, slightly up on last year’s record low of 7. However it is still low bearing in mind the large number of Science modules. Chemistry once again had no low-scoring modules for the library question.

Reading lists, the catalogue of modules and provision of texts against numbers on each module were analysed and reading lists created where these were lacking (2 cases). Additional copies of texts were purchased where this was appropriate. Frank Parry contacted the module leaders of all low scoring modules to invite them to identify any other possible causes of low satisfaction. Summaries of responses from academic staff and remedial actions taken are provided by department as below.

**COC131 (Data Mining)**

No response received from the module leader despite several chaser emails.

## **COC251 (Computer Science Project) and COC253 (IT Project)**

It was surmised that training in finding information could be the remedy for the low score in these two project modules. The lecturer responded that training in finding information at the start of the project would be welcome, but students had not attended previous sessions formerly offered. He stated that:

*”my feeling is that frequently information/data does not exist and it is up to the student to provide data in the form of surveys carried out by the student. This is hard work. It is easy to give lack of training in finding information, as the reason for lack of information in a project”.*

**COF180 (Introduction to Programming 1)**

The module leader suggested some new texts and asked his students in his current module for their ideas. Whilst books are included in this module, the lecturer stated that notes provided are pretty comprehensive so students shouldn't really need a book. He hoped students were not giving the library low marks just because they don't need books. He also requested data from the Library about reading list book use and this was supplied.

**ISC312 (The Magazine Business)**

The new module leader examined individual forms and suggested that students had not commented specifically on library materials though some of the students felt that the lecture material was simplistic - perhaps they felt they therefore needed more help from library materials.

The module leader agreed that there are generally enough copies for the recommended reading. Handouts provided with lectures which might help the situation. In addition a new book has been added to the reading list and copies ordered.

**ISP310 (Leadership and Change Management).**

The module leader agreed to recommend additional, newer, textbooks and will promote the use of databases such as Business Source Complete and Emerald.

**MAB265 (Scientific Programming)**

At the request of the module leader a new reading list has been set up by the Library and an extra 5 copies of the Bronson (2006) book and another 6 of the Dawson (2001) have been ordered.

**PHC108 (Modern Optics)**

The reading list for this module was “unpublished”. This error has been corrected and in agreement with the module leader an additional copy of the key textbook ordered.

Peter Lund and Frank Parry

16th December 2010

### Module Feedback Report for the Library SSH Faculty Team

There has continued to be a reduction in SSH modules scoring below three from the Library oriented questions "The Library has the books and resources I need for this module" and “I received training to find relevant information” on the module feedback forms.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2009/2010** | **2008/2009** | **2007/2008** | **2006/2007** |
| No. of modules | 11 | 15 | 29 | 38 |
| Modules to ignore | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
| **TOTAL** | **11** | **15** | **22** | **31** |

# This year 11 SS&H modules received scores below 3 compared to 15 last year. Nine were undergraduate modules (all Part C), the majority (ten) were from semester 2. Only one module received a low score the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **UG** | **PGT** | **Semester 1** | **Semester 2** |
| School of Arts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Business School | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Design & Technology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Economics | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| English & Drama | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Geography | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PHIR | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SSEHS | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Social Sciences | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **9** | **2** | **1** | **10** |

# No modules from the School of Arts, Design & Technology or Social Sciences received a score below three for the Library questions

# Investigations

Library staff:

1. Checked whether reading lists were being made available to students via the University’s reading list system
2. Examined online reading lists to ensure there were an adequate number of current titles, appropriate number of copies and loan statuses, and whether links were correct etc.
3. Checked the loan history of key texts to ascertain how popular items were
4. Undertook fruitful discussions with individual academics regarding the low scores received by the Library questions.

# Issues

Low scores were due to:

1. Students having little need of library resources due to the way the module was constructed. Either because they were very practical based or project modules. Staff tend to ask the students to say the questions are not applicable, but this does not always happen.
2. Reading lists were available, but there were only a few items and / or not enough copies leading to the students competing to borrow them.
3. The Library being unaware of what resources were being recommended as there were no online reading lists.
4. Insufficient copies or inappropriate loan statuses of items
5. Broken hyper links on the Online Reading list system and Learn may have caused frustration for the students.
6. Students not transferring their information seeking behaviour from one module to another.

# Actions taken:

The following actions were taken:

1. Where there was no reading list on the University’s reading list system copies were sought either via investigating material on Learn or asking the lecturer for a copy. This was then added to the Reading list system by Library staff and the Academic notified.
2. Where there were broken links on the online reading list, Library staff automatically fixed them
3. If there were only a few items on the reading list, Library staff suggested possible additional titles.
4. Where there were few copies of a title, Library staff suggested additional copies and or purchase of an electronic version of the item.
5. Where items were in heavy demand, Library staff suggested either additional copies and / or change in loan status.
6. Discussions took place with lecturers requesting they create reading lists and / or develop the students information literacy skills.

**BSC016 – Financial risk management** **[Feedback score: 2.97]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

The module has an online reading list and there are multiple copies of the recommended text. However, some of the links to electronic resources were not set up properly and may have caused problems. The lecturer is broadly very satisfied with the teaching resources provided by the library, but thinks the multiple copies of the latest version of the core text may have been late and contributed to the feedback.

**BSC100 – Advanced interpersonal skills** **[Feedback score: 2.50]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

The module has a comprehensive online reading list and multiple copies of ‘recommended’ text and links to e-journal articles. There were some broken links to electronic resources that have now been sorted. The Library provides no information literacy teaching for this module. Students are set course work relating to their own personal goals. They therefore have to find information pertinent to the topic they have selected. Because of this the Library may not always have information on the topics they have selected. The Academic Librarian has suggested that the students receive a refresher session on finding and managing information.

**EAC022 - Ulysses skills** **[Feedback score: 2.50]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

There is a short, four item reading list for this module. The student dissatisfaction probably stems from the lack of multiple copies and the current loan status of stock items. There is only one copy of each book, all of which have a long loan status. If the course runs again, an additional copy of each item should be purchased as appropriate. The module did not run in 2010/2011.

**EAC027 - An unexpected light: writing Afghanistan [Feedback score: 2.71]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

There is a six item reading list for this module. Student dissatisfaction is at least partly attributable to the lack of multiple copies. Also, each book has a Long loan status. Should the course run again, it would be sensible to purchase at least one additional copy of each item and to place a copy of each in High Demand. The lecturer encouraged students to source secondary material from other subject areas in the Library, such a History Geography, Human Geography and Politics, but students were reluctant to do so. The module is not running in this current academic year.

**EAC507 - El Teatro Campesino [Feedback score: 2.50]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

There is an online reading list for this module with a sufficient number of multiple copies. There were a few broken links to electronic resources that needed to be reinstated. The lecturer received feedback regarding the loan status of items and has recommended that more of the stock be made One week loan. The lecturer noted the lack of English subtitled videos available generally (all are Mexican Spanish only) and feels that there may be a lack of visual resources. The lecturer is going to recommend additional material for purchase.

**ECC016 – Energy and the Environment [Feedback score: 2.00]**

**Question:** Library resources and services

There was no online reading list for this module, however all support material for ECC016 is kept on Learn and stored under ECB030 – [which has extensive support material and a comprehensive reading list – and scored over 3.00.]  Students were having to navigate from one module to another to discover the appropriate resources. The Library has copied the EC030 reading list to ECC016, thus allowing the students instant access.

**09EUC657 - The Civil Rights Movement in the US [Feedback score: 2.56]**

**Question:**  Library resources and services:

There is a online reading list for this module. However, student dissatisfaction may be due to both an insufficient number of multiple copies of key texts and the inappropriate loan status of stock items. The lecturer has identified the key texts requiring additional copies which will be purchased and given appropriate status, placing one copy of each in High Demand. The lecturer also noted that there is insufficient stock relating to the civil rights movement and has provided a list of additional texts to be purchased

**GYP400** – **Dissertation module [Feedback score: 2.80]**

**Question:** Training to find relevant information

There is no reading list for this module. Teaching material relating to information literacy was supplied to the lecturer by the Academic Librarian.  [The companion modules GYP600 and GYP500 also received the same training material and scored over 3.00.]

**GYC110 - GIS and Flood Management [Feedback score: 2.81]**

**Question:** Library resources and services

The module is based in a computer lab, and students undertake individual and group project based work.   There was a small reading list on Learn not the Reading List system, which may account for some students having difficulties.

**HUC204 – Infectious diseases** **[Feedback score: 2.38]**

**Question:**  Library resources & services

The module has a comprehensive online reading list and multiple copies of ‘key / recommended’ text and links to e-journal articles. The lecturer noted that at the very beginning of the module students struggled to gain access to a key text, but the Library responded quickly and purchased more copies of the title.

**PEC005 – Project (Physiology)** **[Feedback score: 2.96]**

**Question:** Training to find relevant info – Library

This module received a low score the previous year relating to the questions regarding right resources and help received from Library staff. As this is a project module the tutor does not provide a reading list. In addition the tutor feels the students should have the information literacy skills to find the information to support their project, therefore there is no information literacy teaching provided by the Library. The Academic Librarian has suggested to the lecturer that a reading list on research methods and dissertation writing be provided and that the students receive a refresher session on finding and managing information.

**PEP404** – **Project in Sports Biomechanics** **[Feedback score: 2.33]**

**Question:** Training to find relevant info – Library

As this is a project module the tutor does not provide a reading list. In addition the tutor feels the students should have the information literacy skills to find the information to support their project, therefore there is no information literacy teaching provided by the Library. The Academic Librarian has suggested to the lecturer that a reading list on research methods and dissertation writing be provided and that the students receive a refresher session on finding and managing information.

Ruth Stubbings

17th December 2010

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

# Subject: Student Feedback Relating to Teaching Rooms

**Origin: Caroline Pepper, Facilities Management**

**Learning Space and Administration Manager**

The numbers of responses below a score of 3 for 2009/10 relating to fit for purpose teaching rooms were as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of responses forall teaching space | Number of responsesallocated to pool teaching space | Allocated pool rooms |
| Semester 1  | 3 | 3 | A201, A203, KG109, RTO40, SMB017, RTO40 |
| Semester 2 | 5 | 4 | G004, KG112, W004, J104, B111, U012, UO13, JB021 |
| **Total** | **8** | **7** | **8** |

The total of 8 negative responses is an improvement on last year where there were 16 responses below 3. However, 7 specifically relate to allocate pool space in comparison to the previous year of 5.

1 response relates to departmental teaching space where there is currently no central data available on this space, although it will be collated as part on the central timetabling project and will be available for analysis next academic semester.

Pool Space

* Module code ISC331 had the lowest mean average of 1.75 and had been allocated to G004 and KG112. KG112 is a postgraduate facility refurbished to a high specification, however by contrast G004 has a lower standard of AV. The cohort size was 18 which matched the room capacity. The module had been allocated for 2 hours and therefore not a comfortable environment with only natural air circulation. The central timetabling project would in future look to allocate just below capacity in these rooms.
* Module code CVP010 had been allocated to J104 (capacity 100). This room is scheduled for renovation Summer 2011 to upgrade the capacity to a 400 seater tiered lecture theatre and upgrade the AV to a high specification.
* Module code BSA070 had been allocated to a number of teaching rooms on central park and JB021 (capacity 100) on East Park, however there were 106 feedback forms submitted. This suggests that the cohort was larger than stated in the original submissions and therefore not enough seating provision.
* Module code PHD204 was allocated to W004. The AV in all of the rooms in Sir David Davis teaching block has been scheduled for upgraded Summer 2011. There is also a discussion to replace the chalkboards in these rooms with whiteboards to reduce the dust levels, although approval is required from the Math department.

Facilities Management has encouraged departments making room bookings to identify styles of rooms which best suit their teaching and learning requirements. More departments are making use of this and a better match is perhaps being made and resulting in an improved experience. This is reflected in the feedback statistics. The central timetabling project will enable a better understanding of teaching requirements as there is a direct interface for CMIS (Central Management Information System) and LUSI which will allow for accurate student data rather than a reliance of a manual prediction of student numbers from academic departments. It will also allow for detailed global analysis of all teaching space (both pool and department).

## Student Feedback Scores – IT Resources – Semester 1, 2009-10

Modules where “IT resources” scored less than 3 out of 5.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Department | Module | No of forms | Score for “IT Resources” | Notes |
| GY | B213 | 14 | 2.79 | In the current module approach, IT facilities have not been emphasized. The module leader is retiring this year and the HoD has undertaken to discuss this issue specifically with the new module leader to ensure that full consideration is given to it.  |
| MM | D802 | 24 | 2.68 | No specific comments on IT resources, however this module relies a lot on computer simulations for its 100% coursework and students having access to computers with relevant software to run these is a usual issue raised from students, therefore it is suspected this is the cause of the lower score here. Availability of facilities will be reviewed. |
| CV | A042 | 18 | 2.94 | There is no IT content related to this module, therefore students were presumably making a general comment. |
| MM | D403 | 36 | 2.78 | Most respondents ticked “does not apply” on the IT question, which is about right as all they need is a computer to write their coursework assignment.  Since the question was “access” to IT services, the feedback session was just after we restricted evening access to last year’s group and picking up on a few comments (part D module), I would suggest that it was this they were kicking at. |
| MM | D105 | 16 | 2.15 | Comments refer to Wolfson not having enough PC’s available for number of students, also the module relying too much on MATLAB and SAM software. Availability of facilities will be reviewed. |

## Student Feedback Scores – IT Resources – Semester 2, 2009-10

Modules where “IT Resources” scored less than 3 out of 5.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Department | Module | No of forms | Score for “IT resources” | Notes |
| EA | C507 | 23 | 2.94 | The module is based on Mexican 'poor theatre' where students can only use the most rudimentary of props etc. (paper, wood), so there would never be any need to access technology. The only provision I can think of would be for IT support when writing up reflective reports but I assume that most students have their own computers.. |
| MM | B620 | 10 | 2.50 | This is a second page of MMB600 therefore shouldn’t have been completed by students, does state DO NOT complete but they still do!  |
| MM | F111 | 45 | 2.95 | This is the second page of MMF110 therefore shouldn’t have been completed by students, does state DO NOT complete but they still do! |