

<b>Title:</b>	Supporting Staff to Make Sense of Student Module Evaluation
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Jacque Jahn, Caroline Breslin & Katy Savage, University of Strathclyde
<p>In this session, the University of Strathclyde team reflect on the opportunities provided for staff support and development throughout their journey to implement an institution-wide approach to module evaluation. The successes and challenges encountered will be considered along with the participant's perspective. The team will highlight the resources developed to guide staff through the process and their integration with the STEP (Strathclyde Teaching Excellence Programme), to help staff leverage the insights from module evaluation to enhance learning, teaching and assessment practice. A vital component for engagement, the role of the closing the feedback loop will also be explored.</p>	
<b>Title:</b>	Bluenotes Community Collaboration to Develop Guidelines for Instructors in Interpreting and Reporting Evaluations Results
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	John Jordi, University of Florida
<p>Over the past few years, Bluenotes Community members have identified the need for consistent recommendations and guidelines to help instructors interpret evaluation/assessment data to effectively inform teaching and course planning. Bluenotes Community members around the world have been collaborating to build a document of guidelines which centers around a common framework of language associated with reporting of evaluation data - the "Guidelines for Instructors in Interpreting and Reporting Results" document. In this interactive session, attendees continue to collaborate, review, and further enhance this document. The final result will be shared at the Bluenotes GLOBAL 2022 conference in Chicago (July 30 - August 3).</p>	
<b>Title:</b>	For Your Eyes Only
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Joris de Vries, University of St Gallen
<p>The University of St Gallen uses data integrations to automate course evaluation report distribution to individual instructors. This session examines the strategic implications of using this data beyond just report delivery. It presents opportunities to integrate into your university's quality assurance or management processes through enabling the feeding back of data to business intelligence solutions.</p>	
<b>Title:</b>	The Pros and Cons of Using Secondary Subject Selection
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Julie Mulvey, Durham University
<p>At Durham University it is mandatory to rate all members of Staff who have a teaching component as part of their contract. We also allow Departments to list Postgraduate Researchers who also teach the option to be rated. We also rate all Supervisors who are responsible for supervising students completing dissertations at both Undergraduate and Postgraduate levels. Following on from a presentation by Chapel Hill University – Durham University implemented this process and allowed DIG to determine the roles that staff have. On top of that we allowed a single member of staff to have multiple roles that they wish to be rated on. At Durham we would wish to rate a Lecturer for their delivery of the module, however that individual Lecturer may lead a seminar group of a subset of students and we need to tell the system what questions they need to view. This presentation will discuss how this was done and give our findings of the process outlining what worked and what did not work – and hopefully make some suggestions on streamlining this process.</p>	