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|  |
| --- |
| Record Sheet for Follow-up Actions on the Use of Feedback Data |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme / Course Title (Code): | Master of Education | (A1M043 and C2M001 ) |
| Area of Focus: |  |  |
| Stakeholder: | External Reviewer | Feedback channel: | External Review on MEd Area of Focus |
|  | *(For example: students, external examiner, external reviewer, staff, internship providers and supervisors, etc.)* |  | *(For example: Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting, Dean’s Forum, periodic review, external examiner review, etc.)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback / Comments** | **Follow-up action proposed/completed, if not, reasons for not taking follow-up actions Notes** | **Action party for the follow-up action, if applicable** | **(Expected) completion date, if applicable** | **Way(s) to close the feedback loop** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*(Please attach additional sheets if necessary)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Prepared by:  |  | Signature: |  |
|  | Name of Programme Leader / Course Coordinator |  |  |
| Date: |  |  |  |

*Notes:*

1. *Programme Committee / department concerned will (i) address the programme / course-related comments and (ii) send non-programme / course-related comments to unit concerned to provide responses, including plans for follow-up actions if applicable.*
2. *In case that relevant units need time to address the comments and there is a tight timeline for processing the pertinent document, the Programme Committees / departments could add a remark under the item concerned to indicate that comments have been sent to the relevant unit and will be followed up in due course.*
3. *Under normal circumstances, it is expected that all comments and feedback should have been addressed properly by the time of annual review by the Faculty / Departmental Learning and Teaching Committees.*
4. *For the preparation of programme reviews, departmental reviews and audit exercises, Programme Committees and departments concerned could make use of the completed feedback record sheet to demonstrate that comments from stakeholders have been properly addressed and followed through.*
5. *The feedback record sheet does not apply to the feedback data received from the Institutional Research on Graduates (IRG) reports, noting that the Learning and Teaching Quality Committee has developed a separate template for processing the IRG results.*
6. *Two examples adapted from previous reports are provided below for reference on how to complete the template. These are for illustrative purpose only. Colleagues are expected to provide appropriate and sufficient evidence to demonstrate the follow-up actions taken to address the feedback / comments received.*

***Example 1***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Stakeholder: | Students | Feedback channel: | Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting |
|  | *(For example: students, external examiner, external reviewer, staff, internship providers and supervisors, etc.)* |  | *(For example: Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting, Dean’s Forum, periodic review, external examiner review, etc.)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback / Comments** | **Follow-up action proposed/completed, if not, reasons for not taking follow-up actions Notes** | **Action party for the follow-up action, if applicable** | **(Expected) completion date, if applicable** | **Way(s) to close the feedback loop** |
| 1. Student pointed out in the Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting the following concerns:
2. Can the existing programme be divided into two classes, one for junior form and the other for senior form?
3. Can the same secondary mathematical topics be used for the two different course assignments of the programme?
 | Responses to students were given during the Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting and in class.1. The programme will be divided into two classes, one for junior form and one for senior form when there are enough students to do so. That was what had been done in the past.

On the other hand, teaching staff of the programme pointed out to students that in a class with mathematics teachers from both junior and senior forms, participants could actively exchange their ideas on the how to make effective linkages between the junior and senior secondary mathematics teaching.1. Teaching staff of the programme pointed out to students that they were allowed to choose the same topic for the two assignments if different approaches were used.
 | Teaching staff of the programme | Not applicable | Teaching staff and students in-class discussion, and Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting |

***Example 2***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Stakeholder: | External Examiner | Feedback channel: | External Examiner’s report |
|  | *(For example: students, external examiner, external reviewer, staff, internship providers and supervisors, etc.)* |  | *(For example: Staff-Student Consultative Committee Meeting, Dean’s Forum, periodic review, external examiner review, etc.)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback / Comments** | **Follow-up action proposed/completed, if not, reasons for not taking follow-up actions Notes** | **Action party for the follow-up action, if applicable** | **(Expected) completion date, if applicable** | **Way(s) to close the feedback loop** |
| 1. EE pointed out that students couldn’t clearly write up their ideas and supporting their arguments.
 | The programme team agreed the EE’s comments. Students were required to submit the draft abstracts to the course lecturer for advice in earlier stage. Consultation and feedback sessions were set up for follow-up discussion with students.  | Course Lecturer | When the course to be delivered again in the forthcoming semesters | Course Lecturer will inform the students verbally at class and a reminder note will be included in the assignment brief. |
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