KING'S College LONDON

Module Evaluation Policy

Policy Category:	Academic and Student
Subject:	Module Evaluation
Approving Authority:	Academic Board
Responsible Officer:	Vice-President (Education & Student Success)
Responsible Office:	Academic Regulations, Quality and Standards (ARQS)
Related Procedures:	N/A
Related University Policies:	N/A
Effective Date:	1 September 2025
Supersedes:	25 May 2022 - Module & Teaching Evaluation Policy
Next Review:	1 September 2028

I. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this policy is to set out the guiding principles, key requirements, and responsibilities for undertaking module evaluation at King's. It details the baselines standards to which all Faculties must comply for a three-stage methodology for student feedback and evaluation: Early Check In, Mid Module Reviews and End of Module Evaluation.[1] The principle underpinning this policy is that module evaluation should drive the enhancement of teaching quality and students' learning experience.

The policy is based on sector recognised principles and good practices and supports the University in meeting its ongoing *Conditions of Registration* with the Office for Students (OfS) as follows:

B Conditions: Quality, reliable standards and positive outcomes for all students:

- *B1a. each higher education course is up to date*
- *B1 b. each higher education course provides educational challenge*
- *B1 c. each higher education course is coherent*
- *B1 d. each higher education course is effectively delivered*
- *B2 bi. effective engagement with each cohort of students which is sufficient for the purpose of ensuring a high quality academic experience for those students*

The policy is applicable to:

- All taught modules (whether delivered in-class or online)
- Dissertations/major project modules
- Lab-based modules
- Placements/modules which include a period in industry (See [4] for accepted flexibility regarding this type of module)

The policy is **not** applicable to:

- Short courses
- Study abroad modules
- Module(/s) delivered by partners and/or external organisations

[1] During the 25/26 academic year, interim arrangements are in place. Further detail can be found on the Module Evaluation SharePoint.

II. Definitions & Descriptions

Module	A module is an individual element of a programme of study which is taught and assessed under the approved regulations for that programme. For the purposes of this policy, each module must include opportunities for evaluation by students enrolled on the module each year. Where programmes do not consist of discrete credit-rated modules, module evaluation baseline requirements can be applied to any coherent block of learning that exists within the programme.
Early Check In	An informal opportunity to 'temperature check' a module. This allows Module Leads to establish dialogue, determine a baseline for how students understand module aims and requirements, and identify and address early questions and/or issues.
Mid Module Review	A semi-formalised point which builds trust in the feedback process. It embeds student voice in curriculum delivery and allows students to shape their learning experience in real time. Mid Module Reviews provide Module Leads with an opportunity to react quickly and make (minor) changes which benefit the current cohort(s). It predominantly aims to resolve practical and operational issues.
End of Module Evaluation	The formalised point at which modules are evaluated once students have completed the module. It channels student voice, evaluates the whole teaching and learning experience, supports staff performance processes, and facilitates quality assurance. It helps to track trends and support enhancement of future iterations of the module.
Closing the Feedback Loop	Closing the Feedback loop is the term used for responding to student feedback. It is a critical part of the feedback and evaluation process which demonstrates that student feedback is listened to, valued, and acted upon where possible.

III. Policy

1	**Aims**
1.1	The key aims of Module Evaluation are: • To provide the Module Leads with timely feedback on the quality of the teaching, supervision, and assessment on the module(s) for which they are responsible. • To provide Module Leads with information to support immediate and responsive improvements. • To enable good practice to be identified, so that it can be shared with others. • To embed student voice in curriculum design and provide a systematic and transparent means through which students can work in partnership with staff and contribute to the development and enhancement of modules. • To provide lead indicators of teaching quality and student satisfaction that are subject to less lag time, relative to end-of-study surveys like the National Student Survey (NSS) and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES). • To enable the quality of individual modules at Department, Faculty, and University level to be reviewed on a consistent basis. • To enable those in leadership positions to address areas of sustained low performance.

2	**General Principles**
2.1	The following general principles apply to Module Evaluation at King's: • The responsibility for the application of the majority of this policy is devolved to Faculties. • Module Leads are accountable for the educational experience of students on their module(s). • To aid familiarity and consistency of student experience, unless otherwise noted within this policy, Mid Module and End of Module surveys must be undertaken online using the approved question banks via Evasys.[2] • Surveys are run confidentially. Module Leads/Faculties will not be able to link students to their answers. Superusers within ARQS/IT will only be asked and able to identify students in exceptional circumstances such as a severe breach of the Community Charter or in student welfare cases where identifying the student is deemed to be in the best interest of the student and/or the University community. • Whilst evaluations are not a formal performance indicator for staff, Module Leads are expected to consider results of Module Evaluation as part of their Personal Development Review (PDR). They should help to inform discussions about staff achievement and any training/development needs. Where staff contribute to group-taught modules, they are also expected to reflect on the student module evaluations for the modules they teach on as part of their PDR. Staff also have the option to use the results to support applications for promotion, fellowships, and award applications.
3	**Module Evaluation Set Up and Delivery** (See appendix 2 for a summary of responsibilities)
3.1	The responsibility for the overall configuration of Evasys and Evasys+ sits with ARQS and IT colleagues. ARQS work together with IT to maintain all 'global' question banks, email templates, and system settings. They also provide central support to Faculties for questions and concerns, and work with Evasys to roll-out new features. IT are responsible for providing specific technical support, maintaining back-end systems, and ensuring new features are tested before they are launched to Faculty colleagues.
3.2	To reduce Faculty administration and workload (for Mid Module and End of Module), 'default dates' can be set within the data which is imported into Evasys. This speeds up the survey creation process for Faculties as these do not then need to be set manually. To facilitate this, Faculties are also responsible for providing ARQS with the defaults and notifying of any changes required to default dates by the end of July each year. If the deadline is missed, Faculties will be required to change the dates manually within Evasys until IT are able to update the data feed.
3.3	Data should be checked carefully by Faculties before creating and launching surveys as, once launched, surveys cannot be amended. When checking, if Faculties notice that any module information is incorrect within Evasys, this will usually be because the underlying data within the Curriculum Management System/SITS is incorrect. In these instances, it is a requirement for Faculties to first correct the issue at source before creating and launching a survey. Once corrected, this is updated automatically overnight into Evasys, ready for Faculties to create and launch surveys. If source data is amended after a survey has been created/launched, this will not update the survey and it will continue to run as initially set up (with any errors in place).

[2] During the 25/26 academic year, interim arrangements are in place. Further detail can be found on the Module Evaluation SharePoint.

4	**Survey Creation[3]**

4.1	**Early Check In**
	• A range of methods can be used for the Early Check In. It is at the Module Lead's discretion to choose which method and to conduct the check in. This could involve:
	  ○ Verbal feedback gathered informally during a lecture
	  ○ Use of an online survey tool (e.g. KEATS, Mentimeter, MS Forms)
	• It is best practice that an Early Check In takes place within the first two weeks, but it is at the Module Lead's discretion to ensure the timing is appropriate.

4.2	**Mid Module Review** • The creation of surveys is the responsibility of Faculty Subunit Administrators and their teams. • Mid Module evaluation must be carried out via Evasys.[4][5] Faculty Subunit Administrators (or their teams) are responsible for setting up and launching surveys. This involves ensuring the survey dates and question bank are correct. • Mid Module surveys must use the approved question bank relevant to the module type (see Appendix 1). • Mid Module surveys should be run at the mid-point of the module as determined by the Module Lead. Faculties will have local cut-offs for revising any Faculty default launch dates which have been set. Module Leads must ensure they adhere to these. • It is best practice that Module Leads devote 5-10 minutes within a teaching session for completion of the survey.
4.3	**End of Module Evaluation** • The creation of surveys is the responsibility of Faculty Subunit Administrators and their teams. • Module evaluation must be carried out via Evasys.[4] Faculty Subunit Administrators (or their teams) are responsible for setting up and launching surveys. This involves ensuring the survey dates and question bank are correct. • All End of Module Evaluation surveys must use the approved question bank relevant to the module type (see Appendix 1). • Typically, End of Module Evaluation surveys should be run in the final 2 weeks of the module, after assessment has been set/taken by students (in some instances, this may be before marking is complete). Faculties will have local cut-offs for revising any Faculty default launch dates which have been set. Module Leads must ensure they adhere to these. • It is best practice that Module Leads devote 5-10 minutes within the final teaching session for completion of the survey.
5	**Closing the Feedback Loop**
5.1	To build student confidence in the process and demonstrate that the University listens and responds to feedback, Module Leads must ensure that timely action is taken in response to feedback. They must also communicate and share outcomes with all students on the module(s) for which they are responsible. There will often be valid reasons why student feedback cannot be acted upon and sharing reasons why issues are unable to be addressed is equally as important as communicating what action/s will be taken.

[3] During the 25/26 academic year, interim arrangements are in place. Further detail can be found on the Module Evaluation SharePoint.

[4] For placements/year in industry modules only - Due to specific external/Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirements, Evasys is not always a pragmatic option. In these cases, Faculties are permitted to use an alternative survey method. If Faculties do wish to use Evasys, they must use the agreed Placement question bank which is maintained by ARQS.

[5] Dissertation modules are not required to run a Mid Module Review, but this can be run if the Module Lead wishes.

	Results of any of the below evaluations can also be discussed as part of Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs), as well as other Faculty-led student voice forums.
5.2	**Early Check In** • Where possible, the feedback loop should be closed immediately within class, or at least at the next session. There is no prescribed method for doing so, but best practice can be found on the Module Evaluation SharePoint.
5.3	**Mid Module Review** • It is best practice to close the loop to feedback provided in person at the next available session. • Formally, the feedback loop <u>must</u> be closed within 10 days of the survey closing using Evasys+. • This involves assigned Module Leads adding a reflection to the survey results using the Instructor Portal within Evasys+. Where modules are co-taught, it is expected that the teaching team liaise with each other and that a collective response is added by the assigned Module Lead. Module Leads must mark their reflections as 'Reflections ready to be published to students' by the cut-off set by their Faculty Subunit Administrator (or their team). • Faculty Subunit Administrators (and their teams) will then release the 'Student Report' to students which includes a summary of the quantitative data, along with the Module Lead's reflections to students via the Admin Portal within Evasys+. It should be noted that the Student Report distributed does not include the free text comments left by other students. • Module Leads must ensure that they feed forward the feedback and their reflections to any staff commencing teaching in latter stages of a module.
5.4	**End of Module Evaluation** • The feedback loop <u>must</u> be closed within 4 weeks of the survey closing using Evasys+. • This involves assigned Module Leads adding a reflection to the survey results using the Instructor Portal within Evasys+. Where modules are co-taught, it is expected that the teaching team liaise with each other and that a collective response is added by the assigned Module Lead. Module Leads must mark their reflections as 'Reflections ready to be published to students' by the cut-off set by their Faculty Subunit Administrator (or their team). • Faculty Subunit Administrators (and their teams) will then release the 'Student Report' to students which includes a summary of the quantitative data along with the Module Lead's reflections to students via the Admin Portal within Evasys+. It should be noted that the Student Report distributed does not include the free text comments left by other students. • Where possible, Module Leads should work with Programme Teams and use results to inform/feed-forward to the Module Leads for remaining modules students take within an academic year, so they are aware of feedback, where relevant. In addition, it is best practice that Module Leads share results/reflections with subsequent cohorts during an appropriate teaching session at the beginning of the next academic year/iteration of the module. This has multiple benefits: • Increases the transparency about how modules have changed in response to student feedback from previous cohorts. • Demonstrates how staff value students' views and opinions. • Prompts ongoing student/staff dialogue. • Helps contextualise persistent issues and helps students to understand the reason/s a Faculty may be unable to act.

6	**Access to Data**
6.1	IT are responsible for ensuring colleagues have access to Evasys+ as needed/as requested by Faculties. Faculties are responsible for ensuring that ARQS have correct Faculty Subunit Administrator (or team members) information by 30th September each year. These are listed on the Module Evaluation SharePoint. This allows proactive access set-up, without late requests having to be made. After this date, Faculties remain responsible for notifying ARQS of any changes to roles. Where there are access issues, colleagues should contact their Faculty Subunit Administrator in the first instance, who will liaise with ARQS/IT as needed.
6.2	For surveys run through Evasys, assigned Module Leads will automatically be sent results upon survey closure. They also have access to their survey results using the Instructor Portal within Evasys+. This allows them to 'self-serve' to download and share the report(s) as needed. Faculty Subunit Administrators (and team members) are also able to use the Admin Portal of Evasys+ to download data in bulk.
6.3	All staff have access to quantitative data via PowerBI. Results can be shared from this as needed, provided these are part of Faculty strategies for improving quality and student experience. Qualitative comments are not open access and are only available to Module Leads via Evasys. Faculty senior leadership can, however, request access to comments and further distribution of qualitative data, should they see the need. Responsibility for doing so resides within the Faculty.
6.4	Data can also be made available in full to External Examiners (including both quantitative and student qualitative responses to open-ended questions). Where relevant, results should be used as part of Continuous Enhancement Reviews (CERs) and Periodic Programme Reviews (PPR).
6.5	The Module Evaluation Power BI Report is the responsibility of the University's Analytics team to maintain.
7	**Additional Guidance**
7.1	User guides, key contacts and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) are maintained on the Module Evaluation SharePoint: Module Evaluation
8	**Data Retention**
8.1	In line with the Data Retention Policy, seven academic years' worth of data will be retained within ARQS. Five of the seven years will remain available through Evasys. As each new academic year begins, the oldest year will be deleted from ARQS Files/Evasys by ARQS. The value of using older data for change can be limited and the main purpose of retaining older data is to track trends and themes over time.
9	**Policy Review**
9.1	This policy will be reviewed at least every three years. Revision may be carried out sooner where necessary, or if there is a change in applicable sector best practice, guidance, or legislation.
10	**Reporting**
10.1	**Early Check In** There is no formal requirement to report on the Early Check In. It is recognised that this could create administrative burden and that the value of an Early Check In is enacting change quickly and resolving any early 'quick win' or 'housekeeping' issues.

10.2	**Mid Module Review** Faculties are responsible for local level reporting and monitoring of review results and monitoring of response rates/Closing the Feedback Loop rates. Faculty Subunit Administrators can use the Dashboards within Evasys+ to assist with this. Results/ actions planned/outcomes of surveys should also be discussed at SSLCs and other Faculty student voice mechanisms as appropriate (e.g. Department Education Committees (DEC) or Faculty Education Committees (FEC)). Results should also be considered within wider Quality Assurance processes, such as CERs and PPRs.
10.3	**End of Module Evaluation** Faculties are responsible for local level reporting of survey results and monitoring of response rates/Closing the Feedback Loop rates. Faculty Subunit Administrators can use the Dashboards within Evasys+ to assist with this. Results/actions planned/outcomes of surveys should also be discussed at SSLCs and other Faculty student voice mechanisms as appropriate (e.g. DECs and FECs). Results should also be considered within wider Quality Assurance processes, such as CERs and PPRs. Annually, ARQS will produce a report which summarises key metrics for End of Module Evaluation (including response rates and Closing the Feedback Loop rates). This will usually be reported to the final Student Experience Sub-Committee (SESC) of the year, which in turn reports to College Education Committee (CEC).
10.4	The Vice-President (Education & Student Success) is responsible for the communication of matters in relation to Module Evaluation at CEC and Academic Board.

Appendix 1 - Question Banks

Taught Modules (Campus, Lab, Online)

Early Check In
The following questions are standard but can be customised by the Module Lead/team, as per their chosen delivery method:

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Understanding of the Module	The module learning aims and outcomes are clear.	Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree and Does not apply to me
Assessment & Feedback	I understand how I will be assessed.	
Assessment & Feedback	The marking criteria for the module are clear.	
Resources & Accessibility	I can access the resources needed for the module e.g. timetable, KEATS, lecture capture, reading list, equipment, software?	
Resources & Accessibility	I know who to contact for support.	
Preparedness	I feel prepared to start this module.	
Open Question	Is there anything that could help you feel more prepared?	
Open Question	What in the module are you most looking forward to?	
Open Question	Do you have any other questions at this time?	

Mid Module Review[6]
The following questions are mandatory:

To support and enhance your learning: ○ What should we continue doing? ○ What should we start doing? ○ What should we stop doing?
Are there any topics covered so far that you have found particularly difficult and why?

End of Module Evaluation
The following questions are mandatory:

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Student Engagement	How often did you attend lectures, seminars, or tutorials for this module?	Always, Most of the time, Sometimes, Rarely, Never
Teaching	The module was well taught.	Strong Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree,
Teaching	The content on this module was explained in a clear and accessible way.	
Academic Support	I felt supported in my learning.	

[6] 10-week teaching period mode only (New Category B, Category C and Category D). Pre-existing programmes which are shorter in length (Category A, old Category B) can run a Mid Module Review should they wish. In these cases, it is recommended that quicker to administer, customisable approaches are used e.g. KEATS questionnaire, MS Forms.

Assessment & Feedback	The feedback I received for improving my work was helpful.	Strongly Disagree, Does not apply to me
Resources & Accessibility	The subject-specific resources (e.g., readings, equipment, facilities, software) were easy to access when I needed them.	
Organisation & Management	The module was organised well.	
Learning Community	I felt included and encouraged to participate in this module.	
Satisfaction	Overall, I am satisfied with this module.	
Open Question	What have you enjoyed about the module?	
Open Question	If you could recommend any improvements, what would they be?	

Dissertation / Major Project

Early Check In

The following questions are standard but can be customised by the Module Lead/team as per their chosen method:

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Understanding of the Module	I understand the dissertation/project selection and/or allocation process.	Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree and Does not apply to me
Understanding of the Module	I understand the supervisor selection and/or allocation process.	
Understanding of the Module	I understand the role and responsibilities of the supervisor.	
Understanding of the Module	I understand my role and responsibilities as the supervisee.	
Assessment & Feedback	The marking criteria for my dissertation are clear.	
Assessment & Feedback	I understand how much feedback I am entitled to.	
Resources & Accessibility	I know how to access the resources needed for my dissertation e.g. guidance, readings, equipment, software.	
Resources & Accessibility	I know what to do should I require ethical approval, risk assessments or off-campus study requirements.	
Academic Support	I know how to contact my supervisor (once allocated).	
Academic Support	I know the timeline for meetings with my supervisor (once allocated), including any meeting cut-off points.	
Academic Support	I know who to contact should I encounter issues with my supervisor.	
Preparedness	I feel prepared to start my dissertation.	
Open Question	Is there anything that could help you feel more prepared?	
Open Question	Do you have any other questions at this time?	

Mid Module Review

Mid Module Review for dissertation/major project modules is not considered necessary given the nature of the supervision relationship. However, if Faculties wish to run this, it can be facilitated through Evasys using the same Mid Module Review questions as the Taught Modules (Campus, Lab, Online) section.

End of Module Evaluation

The following questions are mandatory:

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Academic Support	I received sufficient guidance in selecting and planning my dissertation/project.	Strong Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Does not apply to me
Academic Support	I received sufficient support from my supervisor/advisor.	
Assessment & Feedback	I received helpful feedback on my progress during my dissertation/project.	
Resources & Accessibility	I was able to access subject-specific resources (e.g., readings, equipment, facilities, software) when I needed them.	
Skills	My dissertation/project allowed me to consolidate my knowledge and skills from other modules into a research output.	
Satisfaction	Overall, I am satisfied with my dissertation experience.	
Open Question	What have you enjoyed about the dissertation/project?	
Open Question	If you could recommend any improvements, what would they be?	

Placements

Early Check In

The questions are defined as 'standard'. It is expected these questions would be used unless there is a suitable justification to use alternatives (such as the specialist needs of clinical placements):

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Logistics (Open Question or Drop Downs)	Placement details: location, dates, supervisor name, etc. as determined by Faculty or Department.	
Organisation & Management	The placement was prepared for my arrival.	Strong Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Does not apply to me
Organisation & Management	I have received the information necessary to start this placement e.g. onboarding information, timetables/schedules/rotas.	
Organisation & Management	I know when the key contact points are scheduled e.g. mid-point reviews, visits, sign-off.	
Understanding of placement	I understand how this placement will help me to achieve my programme learning aims and outcomes.	
Assessment & Feedback	I understand how I will be assessed on this placement.	
Assessment & Feedback	The marking criteria for the assessments are clear.	
Resources & Accessibility	I can access the resources needed whilst on this placement e.g. readings, equipment, software, facilities.	
Support	I know who to contact for support whilst on this placement.	
Preparedness	I feel prepared to start this placement.	
Open Question	Is there anything that could help you feel more prepared?	
Open Question	What are you most looking forward to in the placement?	
Open Question	Do you have any other questions at this time?	

Mid Module Review

The following questions are recommended but can be customised by module leader and/or placement provider as necessary:

What do you like about the placement so far?
If there was anything you could change about the placement, what would it be?
Is there an area where you need more guidance or support to achieve your learning objectives?
Overall, how satisfied are you with the placement so far?

End of Module Evaluation

If Faculties wish to use Evasys for End of Module Evaluation, and provided the modules are correctly categorised in SITS, the questions below must be used. If using another survey method, other questions can be used.

Theme	Question	Response Scale
Logistics	Please type where and when your placement took place.	Manual data entry
Organisation & Management	I received sufficient preparatory information prior to my placement.	Strong Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Does not apply to
Organisation & Management	I was allocated a placement suitable for my programme.	
Organisation & Management	Once underway, the placement was well organised.	
Support	I received appropriate supervision/support on placement.	
Support	My placement/practice supervisor(s) understood how my placement related to the broader requirements of my programme.	
Resources	The quality of the facilities on the placement(s) met my needs.	
Teaching	I was given opportunities to meet my required learning outcomes/competences.	
Assessment & Feedback	I received helpful feedback on my progress during my placement.	
Learning Community	My contribution during my placement was valued.	
Satisfaction	Overall, I am satisfied with my placement experience.	
Open Question	What have you enjoyed about the placement?	
Open Question	If you could recommend any improvements, what would they be?	

Questions approved by CEC 4th May 2025

Appendix 2 - Summary Table

	Early Check In	Mid Module Review	End of Module Evaluation
Who is responsible for carrying out activity?	**Creation and promotion** - Module Lead*.	**Creation** - Faculty Subunit Administrator (or their team). **Promotion of review** - Module Lead*.	**Creation** - Faculty Subunit Administrator (or their team). **Promotion of survey** - Module Lead*.
How will activity be undertaken?	Variety of methods available. Chosen by Module Lead*.	Evasys.	Evasys.
When will activity take place?	Typically, week 2 of a module's delivery.	Suitable midpoint of the module, as agreed by the Faculty.	Final two weeks of the module, as determined by Module Lead* / Faculty. (After assessment has been set/taken by students. In some instances, this may be before marking is complete)
How frequently will it take place?	Once for each module delivery.	Once for each module delivery. (Unless the module delivery is too short to fit in a Mid Module evaluation).	Once for each module delivery.
How / by who / where will data be analysed?	There is no requirement to formally analyse the Early Check In. It is recognised that this could create administrative burden and that the value of an Early Check In is establishing dialogue, enacting change quickly and resolving any early 'quick win' or 'housekeeping' issues.	Results / Outcomes should be discussed as part of Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) and other Faculty-led student voice forums as appropriate (e.g. Department Education Committees (DEC) or Faculty Education Committees (FEC)). Faculties are responsible for local level analysis of data and trends.	Results / Outcomes should be discussed as part of SSLCs and other Faculty-led student voice forums as appropriate (e.g. DECs/FECs). Faculties are responsible for local level analysis of data and trends.
How / by who / where will data be reported?	For local use by the staff member delivering the module. Can be shared with administrative teams as necessary.	Faculties are responsible for local level reporting of data and monitoring of response rates / Closing the Feedback Loop (CfL) rates through the year. Faculty Subunit Administrators can use the Dashboards within Evasys+ and Admin Portal to assist with this.	Faculties are responsible for local level reporting of data and monitoring of response rates / CfL rates through the year. Annually, ARQS produce a report which summarises key metrics for End of Module evaluation (including response rates and CfL rates). This will usually be reported to the final Student Experience Sub-Committee (SESC) of the year, which reports to College Education Committee (CEC).
How will the feedback loop be closed?	At next session.	Module Leads* must ensure timely action is taken in response to Mid Module evaluation and communicate and share the outcomes with all students enrolled on the module. It is best practice to close the feedback loop in-person at the next available session following the survey. Module Leads'* reflections must also be submitted on Evasys+ within 10 days of survey closure.	Module Leads* reflections must be submitted on Evasys+ within 4 weeks of survey closure. Reflections and results of the quantitative questions will be emailed directly to students via Evasys by the Faculty Subunit Administrator (or their teams). Reflections (not the results of the quantitative questions) should be made available for future cohorts at the beginning of the next teaching session for the module.

*or member of staff delivering the module.