

Towards a Course-Level approach to teaching evaluation at Sheffield Hallam University [abstract only]

DONNELLY, Alan <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4000-0139>>, PARSONS, Rachael, WARD, Louise, TELLING, Richard <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7148-0759>>, SMART, Caroline and THICKETT-COLE, Laura <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2538-6291>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/37954/>

This document is the Published Version [VoR]

Citation:

DONNELLY, Alan, PARSONS, Rachael, WARD, Louise, TELLING, Richard, SMART, Caroline and THICKETT-COLE, Laura (2026). Towards a Course-Level approach to teaching evaluation at Sheffield Hallam University [abstract only]. SoTL@SHU Learning and Teaching Conference 2026 Book of Abstracts, 1 (1). [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



Towards a Course-Level Approach to Teaching Evaluation at Sheffield Hallam University

Alan Donnelly, Rachael Parsons, Louise Ward, Richard Telling, Caroline L. Smart, and
Laura Thickett-Cole
Sheffield Hallam University

Abstract

Response rates of 30-40% are quite typical for digital surveys that evaluate university students' learning experience (Chaudhury and Jenkins, 2021). At Sheffield Hallam University, a module-level approach has been the tradition through Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQ). However, the average response rate across the university in 2024-25 was 19%. This brings into question the trustworthiness of such data in terms of it yielding actionable intelligence for course delivery teams. In academic year 2025-26, Sheffield Hallam University piloted a Course-Level Evaluation Questionnaire (CLEQ) across three of its nine schools and institutes with the aim of achieving a more meaningful response rate. The new course-level approach offered two main advantages. First, it mitigated the issue of survey fatigue among students (see Porter *et al.*, 2004) since a survey was distributed once per trimester rather than on completion of each module. Second, the survey was administered through a new platform which no longer hinged upon module leaders to launch the survey and drive completions. The CLEQ was piloted among 8,287 students in trimester one and achieved a response rate of 11%. This presentation focuses on challenges encountered to date and the shared learning acquired from piloting the survey across the three different schools and institutes. The CLEQ was repeated in trimester two and we plan to share the outcomes, which we anticipate being both positive and significant, at the SHU Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 2026 conference. The presentation will include reflections from an advisory group of student representatives who were recruited and paid to support the review of the CLEQ.

Keywords

Students, digital surveys, teaching evaluation, survey fatigue, response rate

References

Chaudhury, P. & Jenkins, C. (2021). *How to raise response rates for teaching evaluations – An experiment*. Centre for Teaching and Learning Economics (CTaLE), Department of Economics, University College London. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/sites/teaching_learning/files/evaluation_paper_jeesubmission_2018.pdf

Citation:

Donnelly, A., Parsons, R., Ward, L., Telling, R., Smart, C.L., and Thickett-Cole, L. (2026). Towards a course-level approach to teaching evaluation at Sheffield Hallam University. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Enquiry*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.7190/jostle.v1i1.579>

Porter, S.R., Whitcomb, M.E. & Weitzer, W.H. (2004). Multiple surveys of students and survey fatigue. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2004(121), 63-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.101>