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**Interrogating the importance and awareness of NSS improvement initiatives:**

**A case study of final year undergraduate students**

**Abstract**

This paper reports the results of a case study investigating the importance and awareness of national student survey (NSS) improvement initiatives in one department at a university in the South-West of England. The paper is motivated by the observation that despite many initiatives that the Department put in place since 2011 in response to poor NSS results, the overall students' satisfaction remained below the national average for the period 2011-2015. This situation raises two questions. First, are the initiatives put in place really important for students’ satisfaction when it comes to responding to the NSS questionnaire? Second, are the students even aware of these initiatives? To answer these questions, 67 initiatives that the Department put in place from 2011 to 2015 were documented using the minutes of various education committees. Through a questionnaire survey, the final year students in the Department were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale the importance and their awareness of the initiatives. Descriptive, correlation analysis and t-tests were used to determine the importance and awareness of the initiatives. The data analysis was followed by two focus groups with selected students to gain further insights into the findings. The main results of the study are that many of the 67 initiatives are considered important but the students are not aware of a majority of the initiatives. These results have important implications for UK university departments trying to improve their NSS results.
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**1. Introduction**

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the importance and awareness of the National Students Survey (NSS) improvement initiatives that were put in place by one business school department at a university in the South-West of England. The initiatives were deemed necessary from 2011, following a 53-point fall in the overall NSS satisfaction rates from 93% in 2010 to 40% in 2011. The NSS questionnaire consists of twenty-two questions which are divided into seven sections. The first twenty-one questions fall under one of six subheadings on: the teaching on my course, assessment and feedback, academic support, organisation and management, learning resources and personal development. The last question is about the overall quality of the course. For each of the twenty-two questions, students are asked to tick a box to indicate their preference from definitely disagree to definitely agree.

The NSS results for the Department under study were excellent up until 2011. The significant fall in student satisfaction during the academic year 2010/11 may have largely been attributed to a restructuring within the Department with regard to teaching staff. The Department responded immediately to the significant decline in NSS results in 2011 with the introduction of numerous initiatives aimed at improving responses to specific questions in the

NSS questionnaire. For example, to increase satisfaction under the ‘teaching on your course’ section, the Department introduced a policy of two to four guest lectures at every level, encouraged staff to pursue recognised teaching qualifications and use technology to enhance learning. To improve results to the NSS questions under ‘assessment and feedback’, the Department introduced a standardised feedback form, conducted internal audits of feedback to ensure good quality and encouraged electronic marking among other initiatives. To elicit more positive responses to questions under the ‘academic support’ section of the NSS questionnaire, staff were encouraged and expected to respond to student emails within two days, a student charter was published and each student was assigned an academic advisor.

It must be acknowledged that the NSS results for the Department bounced back by 43 points in 2012 (40% in 2011 to 88% in 2012), which may indicate cohort-bias. However, despite the bounce and the continual introduction of numerous initiatives aimed at improving positive responses to the NSS questionnaire, the NSS satisfaction rates of the Department have remained below the national average. This raises the question of why these initiatives have not delivered the desired results. Kovacs, Grant, and Hyland (2010), for example, noted that departments acted on areas of concern in a wide range of ways dependent on resources available, personal approach and areas identified which is exactly what this department did without success. Kovacs et al. (2010) therefore called for further research to identify the effectiveness of various strategies pursued by different university departments.

This case study therefore partly responds to such calls by investigating the importance of the initiatives and also extends previous studies by examining the awareness of such initiatives in improving NSS results. Specifically, this case study seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) How important are the initiatives to the students when it comes to responding to the NSS? (2) To what extent are the students aware of the initiatives aimed at improving the NSS results? Given that much has been written on student experience, their perceptions on the quality of teaching and a range of university services aimed at fostering their satisfaction (Race, 2010; Brown, 2011; Ginns et. al. 2007 and Kane et al. 2008), this paper brings to the fore a different dimension. By unveiling the interconnection between strategies aimed at improving student satisfaction, the awareness of such strategies and their bearing on the student experience, interventions designed to serve students can be well received and maximised for utmost outcomes.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: The next section is the literature review on how universities have sought to improve their NSS questionnaire results and to what extend such efforts have been successful. In Section 3, the research methodology is discussed. This is followed in Section 4 by a discussion of the results. The final section is a summary and conclusion.

**2. Literature review**

The NSS survey is an annual and on-going practice in UK universities, commissioned by the HEFCE (Lenton, 2015; Ginns, Prosser and Barrie; Kane, Williams and Cappucccini, 2008; Race, 2010). It informs university ranking and enrolment choice amongst prospective students as they seek the best value for investment in higher education. However, there is relatively very little published research on what different universities are doing to improve their NSS results given its importance. This is not surprising given that whatever initiative each university comes up with is a source of competitive advantage and therefore remains confidential. For example, Flint, Oxley, Helm and Bradley (2009) describe the quality enhancement focused response to NSS by Sheffield Hallam University in the UK. Specifically, the research explains what transpired on a day that was dedicated to improving the NSS by bringing together a number of stakeholders including students, staff and senior management. Flint et al. (2009) point out that one of the tangible outputs from the one day meeting was the leaflet entitled ‘*You Said, We Did*…’ which was so successful that updated versions were developed and circulated. In addition, Flint et al. (2009) also point out a number of initiatives such as electronic feedback on assessment, building connections between student personal development planning and continuing professional development.

Kovacs, Grant and Hyland (2010) reported that the universities they surveyed responded to the NSS results through various initiatives. For example, in response to dissatisfaction with assessment and feedback, the tutors were asked to embark on electronic marking and the departments started working closely with the Student Union to clarify marking practices and course information in student and module handbooks. Other initiatives also included giving verbal and detailed feedback to students via voice recording; organising group feedback sessions to provide general and specific guidance; introducing a policy to return assignments within 20 days and organising an assessment and feedback conference. Further, in response to learning resources, some university departments introduced laptop loan scheme and offered an ongoing programme of support for staff and students to make best use of technology.

Race (2010) and Brown (2011) also describe a number of actions that were taken in some institutions to improve the results of the NSS. These actions include among others: zero tolerance on cancellation of classes, mutual expectations document, recruitment of the right staff for teaching; training for new academic staff; peer observation of teaching; feedback on assessed work; changing culture; helping students to take strong ownership of their learning needs and giving students more opportunities to learn by doing. In addition, Flint et al. (2009) also addresses an institution’s aspiration and student focused response to the NSS by implementing an innovative approach to dealing with the issues raised by the NSS and this involves capturing and maximising student voice and involving a broader range of colleagues in tackling the issues raised by the NSS amongst others. Brown (2011) reports a significant improvement to the 2010 NSS results following the various actions taken which suggest that the initiatives had a favourable influence; it is however not clear which of the various initiatives had the most influence on the outcome and also to what extent the students were aware of the initiatives.

**3. Research Methodology**

3.1 Sample

The population of our study was the 105 Accounting and Finance Framework students who are in their final year of their degree programmes. A questionnaire survey (see below) was distributed to these students in hard copy. A total of 57 questionnaires were completed, forming the basis of the results discussed in this article. Three final-year students on the framework were recruited to participate in the framing and administration of the questionnaires to their peers, guide discussions, transcribe recordings and participate in the analytical processes. It was assumed that the students’ involvement in the project as co-researchers would elicit honest participation and responses from their peers.

3.2 Identifying the Initiatives

To identify the initiatives undertaken since 2011, the minutes of various education committees such as framework meetings and student experience forums were considered. The initiatives were summarised each year in a document entitled the Education and Student Experience Plan (ESEP). These documents were analysed noting new initiatives, their original sources, their rationale and their effective dates of implementation. All the initiatives were then grouped under one of the six categories included in the NSS questionnaire (that is, the teaching on my course, assessment and feedback, academic support, organisation and management, learning resources, personal development and overall satisfaction).

3.3 Questionnaire

The anonymous survey questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section A asked for information about the background of the respondent such as gender, predicted degree classification based on second year results, whether the student intended to complete the NSS survey online and their degree of satisfaction for each of their three or four years at university (which may have included a placement year). Section B consisted of a list of the initiatives the Department had introduced since 2011 in response to the NSS results. The initiatives were grouped under the first six headings of the NSS questionnaire: the teaching on my course (13 initiatives), assessment and feedback (12), academic support (14), organisation and management (10), learning resources (2) and personal development (6). The students were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale the importance and awareness of the initiatives, 1=not important (not aware) at all to 5= very important (very aware). Section C consisted of six open-ended, section-specific questions which were meant for students to volunteer any initiative that they had not been asked about in Section B.

3.4 Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to summarise the results of the background information in Section A and also to calculate the mean for the importance and awareness of the various initiatives in Section B. The initiatives under the six NSS questionnaire categories were then ranked according to the mean. A one-sample t-test was conducted for both the importance and awareness of the initiatives comparing the mean to a mean value of 3 on the 5-point Likert scale. This was meant to establish if each initiative was statistically significant or whether students were significantly aware. Correlation analysis was conducted between the importance and awareness of only those initiatives that were found to be significantly important. The importance and awareness of the NSS improvement initiatives results from the questionnaire was further explored through two focus groups discussions.

3.5 Focus Group

Given the need to generate more data by probing into the survey results, two focus groups were held. The groups were made up of seven participants of mixed gender who had taken part in the survey and were willing to be part of a discussion. Focus groups are typically different from one-to-one interviews where the researcher simply asks the interviewee a series of questions. In this case, instead of asking each participant in the focus groups to respond to a question, the researcher encourages participants to contribute ideas to a discussion theme. This method is particularly useful in generating ideas by exploring participants’ knowledge and experience (Kitzinger, 1995; Morgan, 1996). The focus groups occasioned opportunities to obtain richer and more detailed data. The discussions were recorded and later transcribed. Transcriptions were checked for consistency and analysed thematically (Aronson, 1995; Boyatzis, 1998). The discussion that follows captures the views of some of the participants.

**4. Results and discussion**

4.1 Nature of the respondents

The background information about the respondents to the questionnaire is summarised in Table 1. The results indicate that females constitute about 59.60% of the sample compared to 40.40% males. The results also show that the majority of the respondents are working towards a 2.1 degree classification (70.18%) and only 5% think that they will be able to achieve a first class degree. As expected, a very high percentage of the students (94.74%) are aware of the NSS. However, 75% of the respondents stated that they would or had already completed the NSS survey and the remaining 25% (14 students) did not intend to complete the survey. Ten of the fourteen students (over 70%) that said they did not want to complete the NSS were male which may suggest that this category is less likely to complete the questionnaire compared to the female category.

**[Table 1 ABOUT HERE]**

The examination of the reasons proffered by the fourteen students suggest that seven students believed that their completion of the questionnaire would not make a difference, while four stated that there was no incentive for them to do so and another three students said that the questionnaire was too long. In terms of levels of satisfaction, the results show that the students were more satisfied during their placement year with a mean rating of 4.27, followed by the first year (3.7358), final year (3.7222) and finally the second year (3.6296). The satisfaction during the placement year could be due to the students’ abilities to apply their learned skills and knowledge in the work place and receive remuneration.

4.2 Importance and awareness of the initiatives

*4.2.1 Teaching on your course*

The initiatives that were taken to improve results to Section A ‘teaching on your course’ of the NSS questionnaire are in Table 2A. Ranking on the basis of the mean, the results indicate that the top three most important initiatives are: ensure staff have teaching qualification (4.50), use of technology to enhance learning (4.13) and staff mentoring aimed at developing professional excellence (4.00).

**[Table 2A ABOUT HERE]**

In terms of awareness of the thirteen initiatives in Table 2A, the results show that the students are mostly aware of (1) the provision of guest lectures, (2) use of microphones and (3) the use of technology to enhance learning, respectively. Speaking about the positive impact of a class she attended and making allusion to guest lectures, a focus group participant asserts: ‘*The lecturer made the course interesting, it wasn’t just “this is theory, this is what it is’, he gave real life examples and experiences and brought in a couple of guest lecturers. It wasn’t an overboard of 5 different lectures, there was a variety of different techniques he used to get his points across’.*

The results also show that the students are least aware of (1) staff development through voice coaching, (2) student experience budget and (3) student union -TEL initiatives which were ranked 13, 12 and 11, respectively.

In order to determine which of the initiatives are statistically important, we ran one sample t-test for all the thirteen initiatives comparing their mean rating with the neutral point rating of ‘3’. The results indicate that eight out of the thirteen initiatives are significantly important according to the t-test results. In addition to the three described as important in terms of the mean ranking above, the use of microphones, sharing good practice through peer review, AACSB accreditation, staff sharing experiences through an education enhancement forum and in-house teacher training were found to be significantly important. Using the same t-tests, the results show that statistically, students are only significantly aware of provision of guest lectures, use of microphones and the use of technology to enhance learning initiatives.

Since there is evidence to suggest students’ satisfaction improves if the students are aware of the initiatives (Nasser et al. 2007), we ran a correlation co-efficient test between the mean rating of the importance and awareness only for those initiatives that were found to be significantly important in terms of the t-test.

**[TABLE 2 B ABOUT HERE]**

The results which are presented in Table 2B indicate that out of the eight initiatives found to be significantly important, there are only three instances where there are significant positive correlations between importance and awareness (i.e. sharing good practice through peer review, sharing good practice through an education enhancement forum and in-house teacher training). The fact that there is no significant positive correlation between the importance and awareness of five out of the eight important initiatives means that the Department needs to do better in publicising its initiatives aimed at increasing satisfaction when students respond to NSS questions on ‘teaching on your course’.

*4.2.2 Assessment & feedback*

Feedback is the area of greatest discontent among students surveyed regarding their course. The following transcript from one focus group supports this assertion:

*Researcher: The questionnaire result showed that timely and quality feedback is the most important initiative, is it true, is that how you rated it?*

*Student A: Yeah, especially when you get late feedback or late marks.*

*Student D: I think one of the things that annoyed people I know is when lecturers have gone past the deadline for coursework and you get it back and it just says ‘60- 65’ or ‘good’ and you are like ok, what did I do wrong. They give you no indication on how you failed or how you didn’t get 70+ etc. or for example if you got 45, it just says you missed out on this point.*

*Researcher: Are you saying you want detailed feedback?*

*Student D: Yeah, so normally it’s a sentence or a few words they do instead of like a paragraph, it’s generally not very helpful.*

*Student C: I completely agree the quality of feedback is the most important thing in this section, and it’s the one thing that needs to be improved.*

According to the results in Table 3A, it is therefore not surprising that the initiatives aimed at improving student satisfaction to NSS questions on assessment and feedback are regarded as very important. Table 3A shows that all twelve initiatives that the Department implemented are significantly important from the neutral point of ‘3’ on the Likert scale. The most important initiative is the timely and good quality feedback, followed by the three-week turnaround for marking assignments and the electronic marking and feedback was ranked third.

**[TABLE 3A ABOUT HERE]**

Despite the fact that all initiatives are perceived to be important by the students, an examination of student awareness paints a different picture. For example, the mean rating of the awareness of the 12 initiatives indicate that only five out of the 12 initiatives have a mean rating of above 3. Further, in terms of significant awareness, the results suggest that students are significantly aware of only four such initiatives: electronic marking and feedback, three-week turn around for marking coursework, marking criteria and standardised feedback forms and timely and good quality feedback.

To examine the association between the importance and awareness of the initiatives on assessment and feedback, we ran correlation analysis between importance and awareness of the twelve significantly important initiatives. The results which are presented in Table 3B shows that in nine out of the twelve initiatives, there are significant correlations between the importance and awareness of the initiatives consistent with Naser et al. (2007) who suggest a positive correlation between the two. These results suggest that the Department is doing a reasonable job in terms of its effort to make students aware of what it is doing to improve satisfaction with assessment and feedback.

**[TABLE 3B ABOUT HERE]**

*4.2.3 Academic support*

The students also regard initiatives pertaining to academic support introduced by the Department as important. The results of descriptive statistics in Table 4A show that the most important initiative is the maximum two day response to student emails, followed by staff guidance on final year options and thirdly, making sure that student complaints are treated seriously and dealt with appropriately. In terms of statistical significance, the one sample t-test results show that thirteen out of the fourteen initiatives are significantly important. The only initiative not statistically significant is the ‘promotion of student engagement through the GROW programme’. In terms of awareness, the results show that the students are, on average, mostly not aware of most of these initiatives.

For example, only four out of the fourteen initiatives, received a mean rating of over the neutral rating of 3 and above. When the subject of awareness under this category was discussed at the focus group, a participant asserts: ‘*I think most people are not aware of this [2-day response to emails]. A number of lecturers do not stick to the time constraint. I had to wait for a month before the exams and the lecturer replied on the day of the exams. Most people are not aware as most don’t stick to it’*.

This tends to confirm the results of a questionnaire survey in Table 4A which show that the students are statistically and significantly aware of just three of the fourteen initiatives.

**[TABLE 4A ABOUT HERE]**

The correlation test results to determine whether there is a relationship between importance and awareness of the significantly important initiatives are presented in Table 4B. The results show that there is a significant positive relationship between importance and awareness in only six out of the fourteen initiatives.

**[TABLE 4B ABOUT HERE]**

This suggests that despite the fact that the students perceive the various initiatives as significantly important, they are not aware of most of the initiatives. This again suggests the need for the Department to improve its communications regarding initiatives taken to improve academic support for the students.

*4.2.4 Organisation and management*

Table 5A shows the results of the importance and awareness of the ten initiatives that the Department introduced to reverse the decline in students’ responses to the NSS questions on organisation and management. The results show that the students regard ‘no charge to see exam scripts’ as the most important initiative, followed by staff not being allowed leave or conference attendance while teaching or marking is required and the standardised assignment briefs were rated as the third most important. The ranking of ‘no charge to see exam scripts’ as the most important initiative is no surprise given that previously the students had to pay a £10 fee to see their marked examination script.

**[TABLE 5A ABOUT HERE]**

In terms of the significance of the importance of the items, the results in Table 5A show that eight out of the ten items are significantly important. The only two items not significantly important are ‘the availability of framework leaders and programme coordinators photographs’ and ‘loop-closing’ through ‘you said, this happened’. Regarding the awareness of the ten initiatives, the results show that the students are not significantly aware of any of the initiatives. It is clear from the mean rating of the awareness of the initiatives that only three such initiatives have a mean rating above the neutral rating of 3. These initiatives are standardised assignment briefs, unit guide explicit on course integration, and clear communication of any changes in management structure.

The results of the correlation between the importance and awareness of the eight significantly important initiatives are presented in Table 5B. The results show that there are significant correlations on only two out of the eight initiatives. These are ‘availability of learning technologists’ and ‘clear communication of any changes in management structure’.

**[TABLE 5B ABOUT HERE]**

The lack of significant correlations between the importance and awareness of the other initiatives suggest that the Department clearly missed the opportunity to explain to students the initiatives aimed at improving the NSS questionnaire responses. This was clearly evident during the focus group discussions when one student remarked: *‘I did not know that staff were not supposed to take annual leave or attend a conference when teaching and marking was required. How am I supposed to know?*’

Clearly staff not being allowed to take annual leave or attend a conference is a managerial issue. However, in this case the results are suggesting that student satisfaction could be enhanced had they been aware of the initiative.

*4.2.5 Learning resources*

The results of the ratings of importance and awareness of the two initiatives associated with the learning and resources questions on the NSS questionnaire are presented in Table 6A. The results show that accessibility of core textbooks by promoting the use of e-books initiative is regarded as more important and the availability of IT resources and other facilities is second. The t-tests show that the two initiatives are both significantly important. In terms awareness, the results indicate that the students are slightly more aware of the availability of IT resources and other facilities than accessibility of core texts by promoting the use of ebooks in terms of the mean ranking. The results of the t-tests also show that students are significantly aware of both initiatives.

**[TABLE 6A ABOUT HERE]**

The results of correlation analysis test show that although there is a significant correlation between the importance and awareness of the availability of IT resources and other facilities(E2I-E2A), there is no significant relationship between the importance and awareness of the accessibility of core texts by the promotion of ebooks (E1I-E1A).

**[TABLE 6B ABOUT HERE]**

*4.2.6 Personal development*

The results in respect of personal development initiatives are presented in Table 7A. These results show that out of the six initiatives, the enhancement of numeracy skills is regarded as most important, followed by the encouragement of engagement between students and employers through provisions of post placement/industry mentors. In terms of the significance of the importance of the initiatives, the results show that only three out of the six initiatives are significantly important. Regarding the awareness of the initiatives, the results show that only three such initiatives have mean ratings of above the neutral rating of 3. The t-test results, however, revealed that students are not significantly aware of any of the six initiatives.

**[TABLE 7A ABOUT HERE]**

The correlation between the significantly important personal development initiatives and the student awareness is presented in Table 7B. The results show that there is no significant relationship between the importance and awareness of the initiatives. This again suggests that the Department needs to do more in terms of making sure that students are aware of the important initiatives in order to improve the student satisfaction in terms of responding to the NSS questionnaire.

**[TABLE 7B ABOUT HERE]**

*4.2.7 Other initiatives suggested by the students*

Section C of the questionnaire administered to the students asked the students to list any other initiatives they regard as important. Under the teaching section, four points were raised by the students. Firstly, they stated that the lecturer must bequalified. The students felt that it is essential that lecturers on final year units have previous experience and appropriate qualifications. Secondly, the students also made the point that the lecturers must be understandable, noting that in some cases lecturers’ accents impede the delivery of already challenging material. Thirdly, the students also wanted the lectures recorded so that they could listen when revising for exams as well as throughout the course. Fourthly, students prefer to havethe same lecturer throughout a module rather than experience a change in lecturer mid-semester. The following assertions from participants stress the need for qualified teachers:

*Student B – Maybe the university should appoint those who are less qualified to teach level C [first year] and not level H [final year]. We don’t want a PHD candidate who has no clue what she is talking about in a level H unit when this year is really important for 70% of our overall mark. If she was shifted down a bit or not at all it would be better.*

*Student C – I think it is important that they are actually prepared for the lecture and they know what’s exactly on the slides, they know what they are going to say, they know the subject, so if a question comes up, they can then answer it. Most lecturers are good but some you can tell they haven’t prepared and their slides show that.*

*Student E – Hire those lecturers who are really approachable and the ones who want to be here at university and they want to help out students, rather than those who are here just to answer a few questions and then go home. It’s a 2-way thing, we are going to be in debt and they are getting paid, so they should help us as one day we may be lecturers and helping their kids.*

In terms of assessment and feedback, the students stated that they wanted exam results released early. This point was made by ten students. Most of the students stated that it had been six weeks since they had sat the exams but had not received the results. The students also stated that they wanted more feedback in terms of positive as well as negative comments and how the candidate could improve in future. Further, they also stated that they wanted the marked assignment returned in 3 weeks. They were aware that there was a policy in place but felt that this was not being adhered to in some cases. Some students also felt that the feedback should be personalised, for example, face to face.

Under the academic support, the students listed two additional points. They would like one-to-one support for coursework and also more contact with the academic advisors. One student commented that academic advisors should send emails to students so that they know their academic advisor. Two main points were also made under the organisation and management. The student stated that the Department should inform students what is going on, and went on to say that*: ‘I had not heard about most of these initiatives’*.

The other point made was that the Department should make the timetable more convenient. For example, two students stated that they had a lecture at 9am followed by lectures at 3pm and 6pm. Many students noted that the timetabling was bad as lectures could be spread from 9 am to7pm with only 4 hours of lectures. In terms of learning resources, the students wanted more recommended textbooks in the library. Two students stated that they spent £50.00 each term on books and that was very expensive for them. Regarding personal development, the students added that they would like to have final year meetings to discuss future plans and also some help aimed at those who may want to undertake a graduate scheme.

**5. Summary and conclusion**

The NSS questionnaire results for individual courses are important for both the department that runs the course and the university. This is because such results determine the ranking of the course delivered by the department and ultimately the university’s league table position. As a result, many departments put resources in the form of various initiatives to improve their subject area and university NSS results. However, there is sparse literature on whether such initiatives are viewed as important by the students and also if the students are aware of such initiatives.

We therefore documented 67 initiatives that were put in place by one department at a university in the South of England over a five year period and then surveyed final year students on an accounting and finance degree course. Specifically we asked them to indicate the importance and awareness of the initiatives. Our results indicate that while the students regard many of the initiatives as important, they are not aware of the undertaking of many of the initiatives. Correlation analysis between the initiatives found to be significantly important to students for their satisfaction and their awareness of the undertakings reveal that in most cases the association is not significant. This means that the Department is failing to improve students’ satisfaction because the students are simply not aware of the many initiatives implemented.

Overall this research makes three main contributions to existing literature. First, it brings to the fore a comprehensive list of initiatives aimed at improving NSS results. Second, although other studies have documented some initiatives that were put in place to improve NSS results, there is currently no documented evidence of how important those initiatives are in terms of improving the NSS questionnaire results. Finally, the paper extends the existing literature by reflecting on the association between initiatives deemed to be important and students’ awareness of their undertakings. It was found that in many cases students are not aware of important initiatives that could improve their satisfaction. This paper therefore advances that the Department needs to make sure that the important initiatives they have in place to improve student satisfaction and NSS questionnaire results are known by the students. In so doing, their intended purpose can be maximised. Whilst the findings from this study can inform practices aimed at improving student satisfaction in similar contexts within Higher Education, a further study with a larger sample size and involving more institutions would enhance the basis for generalisation across the sector.

**References**

Aronson, J., 1995. A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The qualitative report*, *2*(1), pp.1-3.

Boyatzis, E. R. (1998) *Thematic Analysis and Code Development.* London: Sage Publications

Brown, S., 2011. Bringing about positive change in the higher education student experience: a case study. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *19*(3), pp.195-207.

Chen, F. C., Ku, E., Shyr, Y. H., Chen, F. H., & Chou, S. S. (2009). Job demand, emotional

awareness, and job satisfaction in internships: The moderating effect of social

support. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *37*(10), 1429-

1440.

Dow, Fleur, Jackie Heslin, and Elaine Mealey. "Assessment practice for functional

employability skills." *Investigations in university teaching and learning* 9 (2014): 70-

74.

Fjermestad, J. (2004). An analysis of communication mode in group support systems

research. *Decision Support Systems*, *37*(2), 239-263.

Flint, A., Oxley, A., Helm, P., and Bradley, S. (2009). Preparing for success:

one institution’s aspirational and student focussed response to the

National Student Survey. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (6), 607-

618.

Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students’ perceptions of teaching quality in

higher education: The perspective of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher*

*Education*, *32*(5), 603-615.

Gruber, T., FuB, S., Voss, R., and Glaser-Zikudu, M. (2010). Examining

student satisfaction with higher education services using a new

measurement tool. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*,

23 (2), 105-123.

Kane, D., Williams, J., & Cappuccini‐Ansfield, G. (2008). Student satisfaction surveys: The

value in taking an historical perspective. *Quality in Higher Education*, *14*(2), 135-

155.

Kitzinger, J., 1995. Qualitative research. Introducing focus groups. *BMJ: British medical journal*, *311*(7000), p.299.

Kovacs, S., Grant, L., and Hyland, F. (2010). *A study of the use of National Student Survey to*

*enhance student experience in education departments*. The Higher Education

Academy.

Lenton, P. (2015). Determining student satisfaction: An economic analysis of the National

Student Survey. *Economics of Education Review*, 47, 118-127.

Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja-Iglesias, M., and Rivera-Torres, M.P. (2005).

Measuring customer satisfaction in summer courses. *Quality*

*Assurance in Education*, 13 (1), 53-65.

McCollough, M.A. and Gremler, D.D. (1999). Guaranteeing student

satisfaction: An exercise in treating students as customers. *Journal of*

*Marketing Education*, 21 (2), 118-130.

Morgan, D.L., 1996. Focus groups. *Annual review of sociology*, pp.129-152.

Nasser, R. N., Khoury, B., & Abouchedid, K. (2008). University students' knowledge of services and programs in relation to satisfaction: a case study of a private university in Lebanon. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *16*(1), 80-97.

Ocker, R. J., & Yaverbaum, G. J. (1999). Asynchronous computer-mediated communication versus face-to-face collaboration: Results on student learning, quality and satisfaction. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, *8*(5), 427-440.

Petruzzellis, L., D’Uggento, A., and Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student

satisfaction and quality of service in Italian universities. *Managing*

*Service Quality*, 16 (4), 349-364.

Pham, M. T., Goukens, C., Lehmann, D. R., & Stuart, J. A. (2010). Shaping customer satisfaction through self-awareness cues. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *47*(5), 920-932.

Race, P. (2010) (Ed). Increasing Students’ Satisfaction. *11th Issue of Reflections*. Queen’s University Belfast.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Background information of the respondents** | | | | | |
|  | |  |  | No | Percentage |
| **1.Gender** | |  | Female | 34 | 59.60 |
|  | |  | Male | 23 | 40.40 |
|  | |  |  | 57 | 100.00 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| **2.Expected degree classification** | |  | 1st | 14 | 24.56 |
|  | |  | 2.1 | 40 | 70.18 |
|  | |  | 2.2 | 3 | 5.26 |
|  | |  | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  | |  |  | 57 | 100.00 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| **3.Awareness of NSS** | |  | Aware | 54 | 94.74 |
|  | |  | Not Aware | 3 | 5.26 |
|  | |  |  | 57 | 100.00 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| **4. Completed or intent to complete NSS survey** | |  | Yes | 43 | 75.44 |
|  | |  | No | 14\* | 24.56 |
|  | |  |  | 57 | 100.00 |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| **5. Level of satisfaction over course duration\*** | | N | Mean | Min | Max |
| Year 1 (Level C) | | 53 | 3.7358 | 1 | 5 |
| Year 2 (Level I) | | 54 | 3.6296 | 1 | 5 |
| Year 3 (Level P) | | 37 | 4.2703 | 1 | 5 |
| Year 4 (Level H) | | 54 | 3.7222 | 1 | 5 |
|  | \*Level of satisfaction at each level of study on a 5 point Likert scale (5=very satisfied; 1 =very dissatisfied; 0=not applicable). | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2A: Teaching on your course initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. The provision of guests lectures | 3.25\* | 1.01 | 1 | 5 | 9 |  | 3.75\*\* | 0.93 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 2. The use of microphones | 3.53\*\* | .97 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3.71\*\* | 1.29 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 3. The use of technology to enhance  learning | 4.13\* | .74 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.53\*\* | 1.22 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 4. Shared good practice through Peer  Review | 3.61\*\* | .86 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2.82 | 1.14 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 5. Staff mentoring aimed at  developing professional  excellence | 4.00\*\* | .77 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2.54 | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 6. Staff development through voice coaching | 3.17 | 1.2 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 1.44 | 1.02 | 1 | 5 | 13 |
| 7. Ensure staff have a teaching qualification | 4.50\*\* | .89 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2.80 | 1.27 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. AACSB accreditation for international recognition in excellence | 3.61\*\* | .99 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2.94 | 1.48 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 9. Staff sharing best practice through an Education Enhancement Forum | 3.47\* | 1.02 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 1.94 | 1.16 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| 10.In-house teacher training | 3.41\* | .96 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 2.14 | 1.14 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| 11. Student union -TEL initiatives | 2.59 | 1.17 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 1.69 | 1.02 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| 12. Student Service Excellence | 3.00 | 1.19 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 1.87 | 1.06 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 13.Student Experience Budget | 3.10 | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 1.68 | 1.08 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | co-efficient | Significant |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| A2I-A2A | .244 | .073 |
| A3I-A3A | .539 | .085 |
| A4I-A4A | .334 | .016\*\* |
| A5I-A5A | .184 | .191 |
| A7I-A7A | .134 | .323 |
| A8I-A8A | .262 | .056 |
| A9I-A9A | .280 | .047\* |
| A10I-A10A | .401 | .002\*\* |
| A2I-A2A = correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 2 relating to Part A (Teaching on your course) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level. | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3A: Assessment & Feedback Initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. Marking Criteria and Standardised Feedback Form | 4.25\*\* | .77 | 2 | 5 | 4 |  | 3.58\*\* | 1.05 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 1. Three-week turnaround for marking coursework | 4.62\*\* | .582 | 3 | 5 | 2 |  | 3.73\*\* | 1.26 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1. Timely and good quality feedback | 4.67\*\* | .63 | 2 | 5 | 1 |  | 3.56\*\* | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 1. Electronic marking / feedback | 4.35\*\* | .93 | 2 | 5 | 3 |  | 3.74\*\* | 1.16 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1. Internal audit of feedback to ensure good quality | 4.18\*\* | .86 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 2.86 | 1.18 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 1. Feedback 'master classes' to share best practice | 3.81\*\* | 1.03 | 1 | 5 | 6 |  | 1.74 | 1.06 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 1. The provision of generic cohort feedback | 3.48\*\* | 1.05 | 1 | 5 | 12 |  | 2.50 | 1.27 | 1 | 5 | 11 |
| 1. Guidance on use of Self and Peer Assessment (SPA) | 3.51\*\* | 1.06 | 1 | 5 | 11 |  | 2.64 | 1.15 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| 1. Review use of Turnitin | 3.75\*\* | 1.01 | 1 | 5 | 8 |  | 2.98 | 1.30 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Paper Boards to ensure good quality and varied assessments and staggered hand-in dates for coursework | 3.77\*\* | .97 | 1 | 5 | 7 |  | 2.57 | 1.26 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 1. Formative self and peer assessment of student work | 3.60\*\* | 1.02 | 1 | 5 | 9 |  | 2.75 | 1.22 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| 1. The use of time-constrained papers as alternative assessment | 3.53\*\* | 1.45 | 1 | 5 | 10 |  | 3.41\* | 1.22 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | co-efficient | Significant |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| B1I-B1A | .333 | .013\* |
| B2I-B2A | .213 | .116 |
| B3I-B3A | .419 | .001\*\* |
| B4I-B4A | .310 | .020\* |
| B5I-B5A | .222 | .103 |
| B6I-B6A | .310 | .024\* |
| B7I-B7A | .319 | .019 |
| B8I-B8A | .399 | .003\*\* |
| B9I-B9A | .379 | .004\*\* |
| B10I-B10A | .340 | .013\* |
| B11I-B11A | .460 | .000\*\* |
| B12I-B12A | .401 | .002\*\* |
| B1I-B1A= correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 1 relating to Part B (Assessment and feedback ) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level. | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4A: Academic support initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. Publication of surgery times | 4.28\*\* | .80 | 1 | 5 | 3 |  | 4.09\*\* | .90 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 2. Maximum 2-day response to  student email | 4.54\*\* | 57 | 3 | 5 | 1 |  | 3.39\* | 1.26 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 3. Target Level H lower quartile  and boundary students (+2% on 1st  or 2:1 grade bands). Advise on  engagement and University  regulations | 4.19\*\* | .86 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 2.80 | 1.45 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 4.Identify students most at risk  (Level H) and offer support | 4.09\*\* | .91 | 2 | 5 | 6 |  | 2.28 | 1.14 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 5. Appoint staff to support  international students | 3.61\*\* | 1.07 | 1 | 5 | 11 |  | 2.14 | 1.17 | 1 | 5 | 14 |
| 6. Promotion of student engagement  through GROW | 3.16 | 1.11 | 1 | 5 | 14 |  | 2.21 | 1.34 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 7. Ensure student complaints are  treated seriously and dealt with  appropriately | 4.27\*\* | .99 | 1 | 5 | 3 |  | 2.93 | 1.17 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Staff guidance on Level H options | 4.33\*\* | .88 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 3.07 | 1.32 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 9. Support for students with  Additional Learning Needs (ALN) | 4.05\*\* | 1.07 | 1 | 5 | 7 |  | 3.37\* | 1.24 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 10. Student Expectations - Student  Charter | 3.41\* | 1.11 | 1 | 5 | 13 |  | 2.21 | 1.28 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 11. Provision of academic advice by Programme Coordinators | 3.81\*\* | .92 | 1 | 5 | 9 |  | 2.65 | 1.12 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| 12. Provision of individual  Academic Advisors | 3.57\*\* | 1.05 | 1 | 5 | 12 |  | 2.72 | 1.23 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| 13. Mathematic and Statistics Help  Centre | 3.83\*\* | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 8 |  | 2.25 | 1.32 | 1 | 5 | 11 |
| 14. Study skills support | 3.73\*\* | 1.11 | 1 | 5 | 10 |  | 2.98 | 1.26 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | Co-efficient | Significant |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| C1I-C1A | .395 | .003\*\* |
| C2I-C2A | .032 | .818 |
| C3I-C3A | .322 | .020\* |
| C4I-C4A | .016 | .906 |
| C5I-C5A | .245 | .074 |
| C7I-C7A | .273 | .044\* |
| C8I-C8A | .390 | .003\*\* |
| C9I-C9A | .122 | .375 |
| C10I-C10A | .412 | .003\*\* |
| C11I-C11A | .258 | .065 |
| C12I-C12A | .223 | .109 |
| C13I-C13A | .168 | .225 |
| C14I-C14A | .480 | .000\*\* |
| C1I-C1A= correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 1 relating to Part C (Academic support) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5A: Organisation and management initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. Time-table changes with Head of Department approval | 3.70\*\* | .98 | 1 | 5 | 6 |  | 2.62 | 1.33 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 1. No staff leave or conference attendance while Teaching and/or marking is required | 4.18\*\* | 1.01 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 2.38 | 1.28 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| 1. Standarised Assignment briefs | 4.12\*\* | .87 | 2 | 5 | 3 |  | 3.14 | 1.20 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1. Unit guide explicit on course integration | 4.09\*\* | .90 | 1 | 5 | 4 |  | 3.24 | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1. No charge to see exam scripts | 4.46\*\* | .77 | 3 | 5 | 1 |  | 2.63 | 1.63 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 1. Ensure effective 'crisis management' | 3.75\*\* | 1.17 | 1 | 5 | 5 |  | 2.58 | 1.37 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Availability of Framework Leaders and Programme Coordinators photographs | 2.90 | 1.36 | 1 | 5 | 10 |  | 2.58 | 1.36 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. ‘Loop-closing' through "You said, This Happened" | 3.32\* | 1.22 | 1 | 5 | 9 |  | 2.05 | 1.14 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 1. Availability of Learning Technologists | 3.38\* | 1.26 | 1 | 5 | 8 |  | 2.23 | 1.33 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| 1. Clear communication of any changes in Management Structure | 3.40\* | 1.23 | 1 | 5 | 7 |  | 3.07 | 1.21 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| **D. Initiatives** | **Co-efficient** | **Significant** |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| D1I-D1A | .240 | .080 |
| D2I-D2A | -.027 | .845 |
| D3I-D3A | .226 | .094 |
| D4I-D4A | .190 | .173 |
| D5I-D5A | .133 | .336 |
| D6I-D6A | .439 | .001\*\* |
| D9I-D9A | .522 | .000\*\* |
| D10I-D10A | .385 | .006\*\* |
| D1I-D1A= correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 1 relating to Part D (Organisation and management) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6A: Learning Resources initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. Accessibility of Core texts by promoting the use of eBooks | 4.46\*\* | .83 | 1 | 5 | 1 |  | 3.93\*\* | 1.03 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1. Availability of IT resources and other facilities | 4.43\*\* | .87 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 3.94\*\* | .91 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| 1. Initiatives | Co-efficient | Significant |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| E1I-E1A | .165 | .224 |
| E2I-E2A | .301 | .024\* |
| E1I-E1A= correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 1 relating to Part E (Learning resources) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7A: Personal Development Initiatives** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Initiatives** | **Importance** | | | | |  | **Awareness** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |  | Mean | Std Dev | Min | Max | Rank |
| 1. Encourage engagement between students and employers through the provision of post-placement/industry mentors | 4.16\*\* | .98 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 3.07 | 1.30 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1. Extend and embed 'Mahara' | 2.18 | 1.13 | 1 | 5 | 6 |  | 3.18 | 1.20 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1. Continue to promote 'Student Development Award' | 3.18 | 1.19 | 1 | 5 | 4 |  | 3.02 | 1.10 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 1. Promotion of Academic Societies | 3.17 | 1.06 | 1 | 5 | 5 |  | 2.64 | 1.08 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 1. Provision of an Outduction and Level H support | 3.54\*\* | .98 | 1 | 5 | 3 |  | 2.04 | 1.17 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Enhancement of numeracy skills and excel training | 4.34\*\* | .82 | 2 | 5 | 1 |  | 2.91 | 1.25 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level for both importance and awareness | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7B – Correlations between important initiatives and their awareness** | | |
| Initiatives | Co-efficient | Significant |
| Importance (I) /awareness (A) |  |  |
| F1I-F1A | .253 | .062 |
| F5I-F5A | .066 | .634 |
| F6I-F6A | .199 | .146 |
| F1I-F1A= correlation between the importance (I) and awareness (A) of initiative number 1 relating to Part F (Personal development) of the NSS questionnaire and so on. \*\*significant at 1% level; \*significant at 5% level | | |

**Appendix 1- Questionnaire**

If you would like to be entered in the prize draw for participating in this research, please provide us with your student number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Winners will be notified by 11/03/16.*

**SECTION A**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

In this section, please respond by ticking one box for each question and where appropriate, fill in the blank spaces.

1. What is your gender **1** Female☐**0** Male☐
2. What degree classification are you expecting based on your results to date?

**1**  First class☐ **2** Upper second class (2.1) ☐  **3** Lower second (2.2) ☐ **4** Third class ☐

1. Are you aware of the National Student Survey?  **1**  Yes ☐**0**No☐
2. Have or are you going to respond to the request to complete the NSS? **1** Yes☐**0**No☐

If you have answered no, what is the main reason?

1. Don’t have time to complete the questionnaire **1** ☐
2. My responses will not make a difference **2**  ☐
3. No incentive for me to complete the questionnaire **3** ☐
4. The questionnaire is too long **4** ☐
5. Not very happy with the course but did not want to give negative responses **5** ☐
6. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
7. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with your course at the end of each of the following years (levels):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Satisfied** | **Somewhat Satisfied** | **Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied** | **Somewhat Dissatisfied** | **Very Dissatisfied** | **Not Applicable** |
| Year 1 (Level C) | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| Year 2 (Level I) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 3 (Level P) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 4 (Level H) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION B**

**AWARENESS AND IMPORTANCE OF INITIATIVES**

In this section, please indicate the extent of your awareness and the importance that you attach to each of the following initiatives aimed at improving NSS results. Please tick one box under ‘Awareness of Initiatives’ and one box under ‘Importance of Initiatives’ for each of the initiatives.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Awareness of Initiatives** | | | | |  | **Importance of Initiatives** | | | | |
| **Extremely Aware** | **Moderately Aware** | **Somewhat Aware** | **Slightly Aware** | **Not Aware at all** | **Absolutely Essential Essentialportant at all** | **Very Important** | **Of average Importance** | **Of little Importance** | **Not Important at all** |
| **A. TEACHING ON YOUR COURSE** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. The provision of guests lectures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The use of microphones |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The use of technology to enhance learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Shared good practice through Peer Review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff mentoring aimed at developing professional excellence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff development through voice coaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ensure staff have a teaching qualification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. AACSB accreditation for international recognition in excellence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff sharing best practice through an Education Enhancement Forum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. In-house teacher training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Student Union-TEL initiatives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Student Service Excellence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Student Experience Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B. ASSESSMENT & FEEDBACK** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Marking Criteria and Standardised Feedback Form |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Three-week turnaround for marking coursework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Timely and good quality feedback |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Electronic marking / feedback |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Internal audit of feedback to ensure good quality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Feedback 'master classes' to share best practice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The provision of generic cohort feedback |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Guidance on use of Self and Peer Assessment (SPA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Review use of Turnitin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Paper Boards to ensure good quality and varied assessments and staggered hand-in dates for coursework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Formative self and peer assessment of student work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The use of time-constrained papers as alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C. ACADEMIC SUPPORT** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Publication of surgery times |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Maximum 2-day response to student email |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.Target Level H lower quartile and boundary students (+2% on 1st or 2:1 grade bands). Advise on engagement and University regulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify students most at risk (Level H) and   offer support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Appoint staff to support international students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Promotion of student engagement through GROW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ensure student complaints are treated seriously and dealt with appropriately |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff guidance on Level H options |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Support for students with Additional Learning Needs (ALN) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Student Expectations - Student Charter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provision of academic advice by Programme Coordinators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provision of individual Academic Advisors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Mathematic and Statistics Help Centre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Study skills support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D. ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **3** | **1** |  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Time-table changes with Head of Department approval |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No staff leave or conference attendance while Teaching and/or marking is required |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Standarised Assignment briefs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Unit guide explicit on course integration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No charge to see exam scripts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ensure effective 'crisis management' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Availability of Framework Leaders and Programme Coordinators photographs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ‘Loop-closing' through "You said, This Happened" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Availability of Learning Technologists |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Clear communication of any changes in Management Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E. LEARNING RESOURCES** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Accessibility of Core texts by promoting the use of eBooks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Availability of IT resources and other facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Encourage engagement between students and employers through the provision of post-placement/industry mentors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Extend and embed 'Mahara' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Continue to promote 'Student Development Award' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Promotion of Academic Societies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provision of an Outduction and Level H support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Enhancement of numeracy skills and excel training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION C (Type all comments under appropriate category i.e. teaching, assessment and feedback, academic support, organisation and management, learning resources and personal development) – Please make sure you identify the comments to a particular individual)**

Apart from those initiatives that you have been asked about above, are there any other initiatives that you think the University can introduce to improve your satisfaction for NSS purposes? Please list such initiatives under the following headings:

1. Teaching \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. Assessment and feedback

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Academic support

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Organisation and management

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Learning resources

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Personal development

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you very much for taking time to respond to this questionnaire. The results will help the department to improve student satisfaction for future students.