This CAPTURE report was produced and collated by the CES Analysis Group. It is an instrument intended to further your understanding of your CES results, and provide a focus for you to implement change or pinpoint areas for improvement. It is designed to be used in conjunction with the discipline Factor Structure (available through our website), the CES report from your course, and knowledge of your own experiences throughout the semester. Please visit the CES website for further information on this document.

Listed below are some trends to look out for in your course summary. Some comments may not apply to all graphs but they will assist you when interpreting your data.

- Larger Confidence Intervals, defined by longer vertical error bars, indicate a smaller sample size. Where no error bar exists there was often a sample size of one, or all responses were the same.
- Do items 5 and 20 rate consistently low? This is a common observation.
- Look at the variation between items for one year. Which items lie above/below the College mean?
- Look at how each item changes over the years. What has been done differently to encourage this change?
- Are there items that behave in a similar manner?
- Is there an item that receives consistently a high/low mean response over the years?
- Compare the three graphs for a year. For example, the items in the Resources graph may receive a higher mean response (e.g. 3.8), than the items from the GTS and OSI and Value Add graphs (e.g. 2.4).
- Due to the number of CES forms completed:
  - 190 out of 425 students enrolled in 2007
  - 217 out of 416 students enrolled in 2008,
  this data is considered to be of high reliability.

For more information: CES Project Website: www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis
Sally (Quantitative RA) at sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au or Michelle (Qualitative RA) at michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au.
21 Items on the CES

1. The learning objectives are clear to me
2. I am learning what I expected to in this course.
3. The course is well organised
4. The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things
5. The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going in this course
6. This course contributes to my confidence in tackling unfamiliar problems
7. Assessment tasks in this course require me to demonstrate what I am learning
8. The amount of work required in this course is about right
9. The teaching staff in this course motivate me to do my best work
10. I enjoy doing work for this course
11. I find the learning resources useful
12. The web-based materials for this course are effective in assisting my learning
13. There is effective use of other computer-based teaching materials in this course
14. The facilities are adequate for this course
15. I feel I can actively participate in my classes
16. There is a good balance between theory and practise
17. The teaching staff work hard to make this course interesting
18. I can see how I’ll be able to use what I am learning in this course in my career
19. The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work
20. The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work
21. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this course

For more information: CES Project Website: www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis
Sally (Quantitative RA) at sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au or Michelle (Qualitative RA) at michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au.
Qualitative CAPTURE Report:
MUGG 1945 Understanding Muggle Society – Professor Dumbledore (Semester 1, 2008)

Summary of recurring themes in student comments

**Positive aspects of the course as seen by students providing comments** (where appropriate, linked to items from the CES)

(Please note that programs are referred to as follows: (n = overall number of students from that program who made comments in this section). Two students did not specify program.)

MS = Muggle Studies (n = 28)
EM = Ethical Use of Magic (n = 10)
MH = Magical Healing (n = 23)
O = Obliviation (n = 19)
DAD = Defence Against the Dark Arts (n = 33)
A = Auror Studies (n = 19)
HM = History of Magic (n = 17)
CNM = Care of Non-Magical Creatures (n = 25)

**Tutors/tutorials:** 102 students found the tutors and/or the tutorials to be a best aspect of the course. Some of the reasons given for enjoying the tutorials were that they were fun, friendly and interesting, and encouraged participation and the forming and sharing of opinions. Many students felt that there was a comfortable, open and non-threatening atmosphere in the tutorials where everyone was given the opportunity to “have a say”. 37 students specifically mentioned the class discussions, including 4 who had enjoyed the “debates”. Students appreciated tutors for being friendly, approachable, helpful and understanding. Several were named. **Professor McGonagall** (6): approachable, keen, considerate, clarifies lecture, feedback. **Professor Slughorn** (4): encourages participation, use of video footage. **Professor Grubbly-Plank** (4): explains well, good feedback, fun. **Professor Snape** (3): good explaining, discussion, well organised, helpful. **Professor Sprout** (2): humour, interesting, encouraging. **Professor Dumbledore** (2): engaging, knowledgeable, approachable. **Professor Flitwick** (2): well informed, helpful, awesome. **Professor Trelawney** (1).

The students making these comments were fairly evenly spread across programs (approximately 50% - 60% of those making comments in each program), except for HM (30%) and CNM (80%).

Several CES items would appear to link to these comments, especially Item 15 ‘I feel I can actively participate in my classes’ with which 73% of students responding to the CES agreed. Also related are Item 17 ‘The teaching staff work hard to make this course interesting’ (69% agree), Item 4 ‘The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things’ (67% agree), Item 5 ‘The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going in the course’ (60% agree) and Item 19 ‘The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work’ (56% agree). These four items all contribute to the GTS, and Items 5 and 19 were highly correlated with the teaching factor for MUGG students in Semester 1 2008.

**Lectures/lecturer:** 81 students cited the lectures and/or the lecturer as a best aspect. Professor Dumbledore was deemed to be dedicated, enthusiastic, interesting and approachable. Many students felt he gave good explanations, and appreciated the effort put into making lectures interesting and
entertaining. 14 students specifically noted the use of audio visual material to enhance lectures, mainly those from MS (5) and HM (3).

Again, these comments were fairly consistent across programs (approximately 50% of those making comments), although MH (25%) and CNM (30%) were slightly underrepresented.

**CES Item 4** ‘The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things’ and **Item 17** ‘The teaching staff work hard to make this course interesting’, both GTS items, reflect these comments and received percentage agree scores of 67% and 69% respectively.

**Content:** 42 students commented on the content of the course. Of these, 17 were pleased with the deeper understanding of Muggle society which the course had given them, while 12 were impressed with the variety and broad range of topics covered. 13 students emphasised that they had found the course interesting.

**Relevance:** 35 students stated as a best aspect that they found the course to be relevant. 19 of these students specified that the course was relevant to real life and 7 that they saw the course as relevant to their career or program.

The highest number of responses came from students in MS (9) and MH (7), while responses from EM (0), A (1), DAD (3) and CNM (3) were quite low, and O (4) and HM (3) were moderate. Comments from these students were well supported by responses to CES Item 18 ‘I can see how I’ll be able to use what I am learning in this course in my career’, with which 61% of students agreed.

**Assessment:** was noted as a best aspect of the course by 15 students for varying reasons. The draft process was appreciated by 4 students, especially as providing feedback and the chance to improve, 4 liked the choice of topics available and 4 felt the assessment was well spread out/manageable. That there was no exam was seen as a positive by 2 students, and 1 thought assignments were well linked to lectures and tutes. These comments may explain why 73% of students agreed with Item 8 ‘The amount of work required in this course is about right’, and 60% agreed with Item 7 ‘Assessment tasks in this course require me to demonstrate what I am learning’.

**Online notes:** were mentioned by 8 students, from MS (4), EM (2), DAD (1) and HM (1).

**Exceeded expectations:** 7 students commented in this section that they were either enjoying the course more, or learning more, than they had expected. This includes 2 students who commented that this was their favourite course. These students were from MS (3), DAD (2), O (1) and A (1).

**Other aspects:** Some other aspects of the course cited by students in this section were the small class sizes (2), that the course was practical (4) and well organised (3), and that students were learning about things that were new to them (3).

**Aspects of the course in need of improvement as seen by students providing comments (where appropriate, linked to items from the CES)**

(Please note that programs are referred to as follows: (n = overall number of students from that program who made comments in this section). One student did not specify program.)

MS = Muggle Studies (n = 21)
EM = Ethical Use of Magic (n = 10)
MH = Magical Healing (n = 16)
O = Obliviation (n = 18)
DAD = Defence Against the Dark Arts (n = 29)
A = Auror Studies (n = 19)
HM = History of Magic (n = 13)
CNM = Care of Non- Magical Creatures (n = 25)

**Lectures:** 50 students felt that some improvement to lectures would be beneficial to the course, including that they could be more interesting (9), contain more engagement/interaction (4), and that the
lecturer could speak more slowly/clearly (4). Half of these students (25) requested the use of more visual aids in the lecture, with 8 of those suggesting it would assist them in note taking if there were slides to copy from. These students were predominantly from CNM (8), MH (6), and A (5), as well as DAD (5) and HM (1), while there were no such requests from MS, EM or O students. In fact, MS, EM and HM students seemed basically happy with lectures, making only five suggestions in this section between them. The majority of comments came from students in CNM (17), MH (9), DAD (9) and A (7). Although there was good agreement with Item 17 ‘The teaching staff work hard to make this course interesting’, these comments may partly explain the 31% of students who did not agree with this GTS item. The requests for visual aids/notes during the lectures may be partly indicative of the 42% of students who did not agree with Item 11 ‘I find the learning resources for this course useful e.g. notes, handouts, readings, AV materials.’

**Tutorials:** There were 39 students who commented on the tutorials, including suggestions that they could be structured better (9), be more interactive/inclusive (7) or more interesting (5). 6 students experienced some discontinuity between tutorials and lectures, arising from the tutorial topic being linked to the previous week’s lecture, and 2 thought tutorials were too large. There were 9 comments directly regarding tutors. 3 of these students felt their tutor was lacking in experience, 1 that the tutor was arrogant, and 1 named Professor Slughorn as being boring and unhelpful. It may be helpful/interesting to know that the majority of comments regarding staff issues, and lack of direction or inclusiveness in classes were from DAD students (10). Conversely, there was only 1 comment each from CNM and A students regarding tutorials. While there was good agreement with CES Item 15 ‘I feel I can actively participate in my classes’, these comments may help to understand the 27% of students who did not agree. They may also relate to Item 19 ‘The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work’. 17% of students disagreed with this GTS item, while 27% neither agreed nor disagreed.

**Assessment:** Of 32 students who suggested improvements in this area, 21 (from across all programs) felt that there needed to be more or better explanation of criteria and expectations for assessment tasks. These comments appear to relate to two CES items: Item 4 ‘The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things’, a GTS item, and Item 1 ‘The learning objectives in this course are clear to me’. They may give some insight as to why 33% of students did not agree with Item 4, and 37% of students did not agree with Item 1. Interestingly, these items were correlated for MUGG students. 3 students believed that assessment tasks were not reflective of what they had learned in the course, which was echoed in the responses to Item 7 ‘Assessment tasks in this course require me to demonstrate what I am learning’, where 40% of students did not agree. This item explained the most variation in student responses for the MUGG discipline. Finally, 8 students requested more feedback and commenting on assessment tasks. While this is not a high number, 52% of students did not agree with Item 20 ‘The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work’, and 40% did not agree with Item 5 ‘The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going in the course’, indicating that many students perceive a lack of feedback within the course. These two items contribute to the GTS and were highly correlated with the teaching factor for MUGG students.

**Resources:** 30 students made suggestions with regard to resources. 20 comments related to online resources, including notes online, more readings, better organisation and course guide, and more use of the discussion board. The text book was seen as dry, out of date or hard to understand by 9 students, while 2 suggested that questions on the reading might encourage its completion, and 2 requested handouts. While most students found resources useful, 17% disagreed with Item 11 ‘I find the learning resources for this course useful e.g. notes, handouts, readings, AV materials’, while 24% neither agreed nor disagreed. However, CES responses to Item 12 ‘The web-based ‘online’ materials for this course are effective in assisting my learning’ were less positive, with 24% disagreeing, 8% answering “Not applicable” and 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. 11 of these comments regarding resources were from MS students, while only 1 came from CNM students, and the rest were fairly evenly spread across programs.

**Content:** 18 students felt that the course could be improved if it was more relevant (7), more practical (7), more interesting (2) or contained more wizard/witch perspective (2).

For more information: CES Project Website: [www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis](http://www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis)
Sally (Quantitative RA) at [sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au](mailto:sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au) or Michelle (Qualitative RA) at [michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au](mailto:michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au).
**Explanation:** 15 students stated that they would have benefited from more/better explanation of some of the basics of the course, including terms which may be unfamiliar to students without any prior knowledge of Muggles. These students may have contributed to the 33% who did not agree with Item 4 ‘The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things’.

**Facilities:** were mentioned by 13 students. 10 students felt that the classrooms were unacceptable, including 4 who said that their tutorial room was noisy and too hot or cold. 3 also thought there should be better seats and/or tables, and 2 complained there were not enough cauldrons. These comments may explain why 18% of students disagreed with Item 14 ‘The facilities ‘such as classrooms, lecture theatres, studios, labs’ are adequate for this course’, while 3 were non committal. However, the percentage of agreement for this item was 70%.

**Suggestions for focus**

Considering the qualitative comments regarding assessment, and their apparent links to CES responses as outlined in the above summary, we would suggest course assessment as a primary focus for improvement. As can be seen in the factor structure for the MUGG discipline for Semester 1 2008, Item 20 ‘The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work’ correlated most highly with the teaching factor for these students, and both the quantitative and qualitative feedback for this course suggest that students perceived some need for improvement in this area. We also note that the majority of comments regarding assessment related to the explanation of criteria and expectations. CES Item 4 ‘The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things’ was the GTS item which explained the most variation in student responses for MUGG students. Furthermore, the CES item which correlated most highly with Factor 1 (Coursework/course enjoyment) for MUGG students was Item 7 ‘Assessment tasks in this course require me to demonstrate what I am learning’. By reflecting on the on the way course assessment is set, explained, and reviewed within the course, staff may be able to effect a change in student perceptions of the course relative to these several areas of the CES.

It is important to also consider the factor structures for students from different programs (discipline factor structures are available on our website) which demonstrate the way CES items link together for students from different disciplines. Factor structures for DADS, MSTY, SPEW and AURO indicate that Items 4 and 20 (both of which contribute to the GTS) correlated highly with the teaching factor for all but SPEW students. They also indicate that responses to these items correlated with responses to Items 1 and 7 (except for MSTY students). This would appear to indicate that these items tend to be related to some degree in the perceptions of most students undertaking this course. The student comments above provide some insight as to why this may have been so in Semester 1, 2008.

As a positive observation, the GTS of 58.8% and Overall Satisfaction Index score of 68.7% are quite good for a course containing this number of students. Also, as the CES summary shows, where students did not agree with a CES item, they were more likely to “neither agree nor disagree” than to actively disagree. In fact, when looking at Items 1, 4, 7 and 20, only around 15% of students actually disagreed with these items. Considered along with the qualitative comments on both best aspects of the course, and those in need of improvement, this may indicate that most students saw the course reasonably positively, and that drastic changes are not necessarily required.

If you would like some tips or guidance, you will find some helpful information on our website or in the ‘Practical Guide to Teaching’ at [http://www.rmit.edu.au/teaching-guides/practical](http://www.rmit.edu.au/teaching-guides/practical). You may also wish to contact the Academic Development Group for your College. There is space below for you to reflect upon this report, how you feel about your course this semester, and where you would like to make changes or are happy with things that worked well for you and your students.

For more information: CES Project Website: [www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis](http://www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis)
Sally (Quantitative RA) at [sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au](mailto:sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au) or Michelle (Qualitative RA) at [michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au](mailto:michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au).
Lecturer Reflection

Appendix A: Student comments as they appeared on feedback forms
(Please note this appendix has been provided separately due to its size)

Appendix B: Factor Structure for MUGG Discipline Semester 1, 2008

Note: Stars indicate which other factor an item loads on and italicised text signifies that a complex item loads the strongest on the corresponding factor. (E.g. Item 2 correlates with both Factor 1 & Factor 2, but more strongly with Factor 1)
GTS items are in blue text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>Coursework / course enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Assessment tasks in this course require me to demonstrate what I am learning 0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>The amount of work required in this course is about right 0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>There is a good balance between theory and practice 0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>I feel I can actively participate in my classes 0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 **</td>
<td>I am learning what I expected to in this course 0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 ***</td>
<td>This course contributes to my confidence in tackling unfamiliar problems 0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>I can see how I'll be able to use what I am learning in this course in my career 0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>I enjoy doing the work for this course 0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 **</td>
<td>The learning objectives in this course are clear to me 0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 **</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this course 0.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>Organisation &amp; explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>The teaching staff are extremely good at explaining things 0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>This course is well organized 0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>The teaching staff work hard to make this course interesting 0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 *</td>
<td>The learning objectives in this course are clear to me 0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 *</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this course 0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 *</td>
<td>I am learning what I expected to in this course 0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 ***</td>
<td>The teaching staff in this course motivate me to do my best work 0.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work 0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work 0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going in this course 0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 **</td>
<td>The teaching staff in this course motivate me to do my best work 0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 *</td>
<td>This course contributes to my confidence in tackling unfamiliar problems 0.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>There is effective use of other computer-based teaching materials in this course 0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>The web-based (online) materials for this course are effective in assisting my learning 0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>I find the learning resources for this course useful (e.g. notes, handouts, readings, AV materials) 0.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 5</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>The facilities (such as classrooms, lecture theatres, studios, labs) are adequate for this course 0.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information: CES Project Website: www.rmit.edu.au/teaching/cesanalysis
Sally (Quantitative RA) at sally.daniel@rmit.edu.au or Michelle (Qualitative RA) at michelle.bedford@rmit.edu.au.