

# 11. Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review

## 11. Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review

### Introduction

Self-evaluation, monitoring, and review are fundamental to quality assurance at ELI Schools. Continuous improvement depends on systematic evaluation of performance, gathering and analysing data and feedback, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and taking action based on evidence. This section establishes ELI Schools' approach to self-evaluation, monitoring, and review across all aspects of provision.

### Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this section is to:

- Articulate ELI Schools' commitment to continuous improvement through self-evaluation
- Establish systematic processes for monitoring quality and gathering evidence
- Define how feedback from learners and staff is collected, analysed, and acted upon
- Ensure all aspects of provision are regularly reviewed
- Create a culture of reflection, evaluation, and improvement

This section addresses:

### Regulatory Context

ELI Schools' approach to self-evaluation is informed by and complies with:

- QQI Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines 2016
- Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of English Language Education to International Learners

## ELI Schools' Self-Evaluation Philosophy

### Core Beliefs:

ELI Schools' approach to self-evaluation is founded on the following core beliefs:

- Continuous Improvement is Possible and Necessary:**
  - No matter how good we are, we can always improve
  - Quality is journey, not destination
  - Commitment to getting better every year
  - Learning organization that reflects, learns, adapts
- Evidence-Based Decision Making:**
  - Decisions informed by data and evidence, not just intuition or assumption
  - "What does the evidence tell us?" is key question
  - Data collection and analysis essential
  - Multiple sources of evidence provide comprehensive picture
- Student Voice is Central:**
  - Students are primary stakeholders and best judges of their experience
  - Student feedback must be actively sought, listened to, and acted upon
  - Students involved in evaluation through feedback and representation
- Staff Voice Matters:**
  - Staff have valuable insights and expertise
  - Staff feedback and reflections inform improvement
  - Inclusive approach to evaluation (not just top-down)
  - Staff empowered to identify and address issues
- Honesty and Self-Criticism:**
  - Honest self-assessment (acknowledging weaknesses as well as celebrating strengths)
  - Safe environment for raising concerns
  - Problems viewed as opportunities for improvement, not failures to be hidden
  - Transparency internally about challenges
- Action-Oriented:**
  - Evaluation is not end in itself; purpose is improvement
  - Evidence must lead to action
  - Closing the feedback loop (responding to feedback and communicating actions taken)
  - Monitoring impact of improvements
- Systematic and Embedded:**
  - Evaluation is systematic, regular, structured (not ad hoc or sporadic)
  - Embedded in all activities (not separate "quality assurance" exercise)
  - Part of how we operate (everyone's responsibility)
  - Cyclical (ongoing, not one-off)
- Proportionate:**
  - Evaluation proportionate to scale and nature of provision
  - Balance of rigor and practicality
  - Avoiding bureaucracy for its own sake
  - Evaluation serves improvement, not just compliance

## Types of Evaluation at ELI Schools

- Ongoing Monitoring:**
- Continuous, real-time monitoring of quality indicators
  - Day-to-day oversight by Programme Leaders, teachers, managers
  - Identifying issues as they arise
  - Immediate action when problems detected

**Examples:**

- Monitoring attendance rates (drop alerts immediate follow-up)
- Monitoring student progress during programmes
- Observing teaching quality
- Addressing complaints promptly
- Checking assessment processes being followed

- Periodic Formal Review:**
- Structured, scheduled review processes
  - Annual programme reviews
  - Policy reviews (biennial or as needed)
  - Comprehensive evaluation at set intervals

- Cyclical Review:**
- Major reviews on longer cycles (3-5 years)
  - Comprehensive programme reviews
  - Strategic reviews
  - QA framework review

- Event-Driven Evaluation:**
- Evaluation triggered by specific events
  - Post-incident reviews (after critical incident, what can we learn?)
  - Review after changes (did new initiative work?)
  - Response to external feedback (inspection, external examiner, complaints)

## Sources of Evidence for Evaluation

**Multiple sources provide comprehensive evidence base:**

- Student Feedback:**
- Course review surveys (end-of-programme feedback from students)
  - Mid-programme feedback (check-ins during longer programmes)
  - Programme Board student representatives
  - Informal feedback (student comments, questions, concerns raised with teachers or Student Services Officer)
  - Complaints and appeals (patterns or issues identified)
  - Exit interviews or surveys (for students leaving early)

- Student Outcomes Data:**
- Assessment results (pass rates, grade distributions, progression rates)
  - Attendance rates
  - Retention rates (programme completion rates)
  - Progression (students progressing to next level, to university, to employment, etc.)
  - External examination results (Cambridge, IELTS, Trinity, etc.)

## Sources of Evidence for Evaluation (Continued)

- Teaching Quality Data:**
- Teaching observation scores and reports
  - Peer observations
  - Student feedback on teaching quality
  - Teacher self-reflection and evaluation
- Staff Feedback:**
- Staff surveys
  - Programme Board teacher input
  - Staff meetings discussions
  - Individual feedback from staff
  - Exit interviews (if staff leave, why?)
- Operational Data:**
- Enrolment numbers (demand trends)
  - Financial data (sustainability)
  - Resource utilization
  - Efficiency metrics
- Compliance and Process Data:**
- Completion of required QA processes (moderation conducted? Reviews completed? Policies reviewed?)
  - Audit findings (internal audits, Quality Officer checks)
  - Policy compliance
  - Timeliness (were deadlines met?)
- External Feedback:**
- QQI review or audit (if applicable)
  - External examiner reports (if used)
  - Agent feedback
  - Parent feedback (for junior programmes)
- Benchmarking Data:**
- Comparison with sector norms or standards
  - Comparison with similar institutions
  - External examination results compared to national/international averages
  - Best practice from sector
- Critical Incidents and Issues:**
- Analysis of incidents (safeguarding concerns, accidents, serious complaints, etc.)
  - What went wrong? What can be learned? What needs to change
- Self-Reflection:**
- Management reflection on what's working and what's not
  - Staff reflection
  - Strategic thinking
  - Professional judgment informed by experience

**Evaluation Focus Areas - Self-evaluation covers all aspects of provision:**

- Programmes:**
- Are programmes meeting aims and learning outcomes?
  - Are students achieving intended learning?
  - Are students satisfied?
  - Is content current and relevant?
  - Is level appropriate? Is progression logical?
  - Are resources adequate?
  - Are programmes viable and sustainable?
- Teaching Quality:**
- Are teaching standards high?
  - Are students satisfied with teaching?
  - Are teaching approaches effective?
  - Are teachers implementing inclusive, engaging practice?
  - Is there consistency in teaching quality?
  - Are CPD needs being met?
- Assessment:**
- Is assessment fair, valid, reliable? Are standards maintained?
  - Are assessment processes (moderation, etc.) working effectively?
  - Are students satisfied with assessment and feedback?
  - Are pass rates appropriate?
- Student Support:**
- Are support services accessible and effective?
  - Are students satisfied with support?
  - Are students' needs being met?
  - Are vulnerable students adequately supported?
  - Are there gaps in support provision?
- Resources:**
- Are facilities adequate (classrooms, technology, materials)?
  - Is staffing adequate (numbers, qualifications, workload)?
  - Are financial resources adequate?
  - Are resources used efficiently?
- Governance and Management:**
- Are governance structures functioning effectively?
  - Is decision-making timely and effective?
  - Is communication effective?
  - Is leadership effective
- Compliance:**
- Are regulatory requirements met (QQI, Code of Practice)?
  - Are policies and procedures being followed?
  - Are legal obligations met (employment law, equality, data protection, safeguarding, health and safety)?
- Student Experience:**
- Overall student satisfaction
  - Sense of belonging and community and wellbeing
  - Student voice heard and acted upon
- Outcomes:**
- Are students achieving learning outcomes?
  - Are students progressing as intended?
  - Are students satisfied with their achievement?
  - Are graduates succeeding in next steps?
- Continuous Improvement:**
- Is evaluation leading to improvement?
  - Are improvements implemented and effective?
  - Is there culture of continuous improvement?

## Evaluation Cycle

### Self-evaluation operates on multiple overlapping cycles:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Ongoing (Continuous):</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily/weekly monitoring by Programme Leaders and managers</li> <li>• Informal student and staff feedback collected</li> <li>• Issues identified and addressed promptly</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Termly (Every 8-12 weeks):</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course review surveys (end of each cohort/term)</li> <li>• Programme Board meetings (twice per programme cycle or term)</li> <li>• Review of term/cohort data (pass rates, attendance, progression, etc.)</li> <li>• Immediate improvements identified and implemented for next cohort</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Annual:</b>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual programme reviews (comprehensive evaluation of programmes)</li> <li>• Annual review of student support services</li> <li>• Annual review of teaching quality data</li> <li>• Staff performance reviews</li> <li>• Policy reviews (for policies on annual review cycle)</li> <li>• Academic Committee annual review of QA</li> <li>• Board annual review of strategic plan and QA</li> </ul> |
| <b>Biennial (Every 2 years):</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy reviews (for policies on biennial cycle)</li> <li>• Review of QA framework overall</li> <li>• Strategic planning review</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Major Review (Every 3-5 years):</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive programme review (may involve external review)</li> <li>• Strategic plan review</li> <li>• Major review of QA framework (in preparation QQI engagement, etc.)</li> </ul>   |

### From Evaluation to Action: Closing the Loop

#### Evaluation is only valuable if it leads to improvement.

#### ELI Schools closes the feedback loop:

##### **Gather Evidence**

**Analyse Evidence** (What does the data/feedback tell us? What's working well? What needs improvement? What are priorities?)

**Identify Actions** (What specific actions will we take to address issues or build on strengths?)

**Implement Actions** (Actions are assigned, resourced, implemented, timelines set)

**Monitor Impact** (Is the action working? Is the improvement happening? Evidence of impact?)

**Communicate** (Tell stakeholders what we heard and what we're doing about it - "You said, we did")

**Return to 1: Gather Evidence** (cycle continues)

#### Accountability:

- Actions identified in reviews assigned to specific person with deadline
- Progress monitored
- Academic Committee and Board hold management accountable for implementation
- Annual reviews check if previous year's actions were completed and effective

#### Documentation:

- Evaluation reports document findings and actions
- Action plans track implementation
- Audit trail of improvement over time

## Culture of Continuous Improvement

### Self-evaluation embedded in organizational culture:

- Values:**
- Reflection valued (encouraged to think critically about practice)
  - Honesty valued (safe to acknowledge problems)
  - Learning valued (mistakes seen as learning opportunities)
  - Student voice valued (feedback taken seriously)
  - Excellence valued (continuous striving to improve)
- Practices:**
- Evaluation integrated into all activities (not separate)
  - Regular feedback sought and shared
  - Data readily available and used for decisions
  - Staff meetings include reflection and evaluation
  - Successes celebrated; challenges addressed
  - Continuous improvement is everyone's job, not just management's
- Leadership:**
- Leaders model reflective practice
  - Leaders act on feedback (demonstrating that feedback matters)
  - Leaders transparent about challenges and improvements
  - Leaders empower staff to identify and implement improvements
  - Leaders provide resources for improvement

## 11.1 Policy for Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review

<b>QA Area(s)</b>	Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review; Governance and Management of Quality; Documented Approach to QA		
<b>Applies to</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff only	<input type="checkbox"/> Learners only	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff and learners
<b>Policy Owner</b>	Managing Director (overall); Senior Academic Manager (academic areas); Quality Officer (coordination)		

### Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish a systematic, evidence-based approach to self-evaluation, monitoring, and review across all aspects of ELI Schools' provision, ensuring continuous improvement and maintaining high quality.

### Scope

This policy applies to:

- All programmes, services, and activities at ELI Schools
- All locations
- All staff with responsibilities for quality
- All governance and management processes

### Policy Statement

#### Commitment to Self-Evaluation and Continuous Improvement:

ELI Schools is committed to continuous improvement through systematic self-evaluation, monitoring, and review. We will:

- Regularly evaluate all aspects of our provision
- Gather evidence from multiple sources, particularly student and staff feedback
- Analyse evidence to identify strengths and areas for improvement
- Take action based on evaluation findings
- Monitor the impact of improvements
- Foster a culture of reflection, learning, and continuous improvement

## Principles of Self-Evaluation

- Systematic and Regular:** **Principle:** Self-evaluation is systematic (structured, planned, consistent) and regular (ongoing and periodic), not ad hoc or sporadic.  
**Implementation:**
- Evaluation processes and schedules defined
  - Evaluation activities planned and calendared
  - Responsibility and timelines clear
  - Regular evaluation cycles (ongoing, termly, annual, longer-term)
  - Consistency across programmes and locations
- Evidence-Based:** **Principle:** Evaluation based on evidence and data, not just opinion or assumption. Multiple sources of evidence provide comprehensive picture.  
**Implementation:**
- Data collected systematically (student outcomes, feedback, observation data, operational data, etc.)
  - Data analysed (not just collected but examined for patterns, trends, insights)
  - Evidence from multiple sources triangulated
  - Decisions informed by evidence
  - "What does the evidence tell us?" is guiding question
- Student-Centered:** **Principle:** Student feedback and student outcomes are central to evaluation. Students are primary stakeholders; their experience and achievement are key quality indicators.  
**Implementation:**
- Student feedback actively sought through multiple mechanisms (surveys, Programme Boards, informal feedback)
  - Student feedback taken seriously and acted upon
  - Student outcomes data (pass rates, progression, retention, satisfaction) monitored
  - Students informed of actions taken in response to feedback ("You said, we did")
  - Student representatives involved in governance (Programme Boards)
- Inclusive of Staff:** **Principle:** Staff feedback and reflections are valued and integral to evaluation. Staff have expertise and insights essential for understanding quality and identifying improvements.  
**Implementation:**
- Staff feedback sought (surveys, meetings, Programme Boards, informal feedback)
  - Staff encouraged to reflect on practice and share insights
  - Staff involved in identifying improvements
  - Staff feedback acted upon
  - Inclusive approach (not just top-down evaluation; staff empowered)
- Comprehensive:** **Principle:** Evaluation covers all aspects of provision (programmes, teaching, assessment, support, resources, governance, etc.), not just selective areas.  
**Implementation:**
- All QAF areas subject to evaluation
  - No blind spots
  - Both academic and operational areas evaluated
  - Both quantitative and qualitative evidence considered

## Principles of Self-Evaluation (Continued)

**Honest and Self-Critical:** **Principle:** Honest self-assessment, including acknowledging weaknesses and challenges, not just celebrating successes. Safe environment for raising concerns.

**Implementation:**

- Culture where it's safe to identify problems
- Problems viewed as opportunities for improvement, not failures
- Honest reporting (not glossing over issues)
- Transparency internally about challenges
- Management receptive to critical feedback
- No blame culture (focus on systems improvement, not blaming individuals)

**Action-Oriented:** **Principle:** Evaluation must lead to action and improvement. Evidence informs decisions; actions are taken; improvements are implemented and monitored.

**Implementation:**

- Evaluation reports include action plans
- Actions assigned to specific people with deadlines
- Actions implemented
- Progress monitored
- Impact of actions evaluated
- Accountability for implementation
- Closing the feedback loop

**Transparent and Communicated:** **Principle:** Evaluation findings and actions communicated to stakeholders. Transparency builds trust and demonstrates responsiveness.

**Implementation:**

- Students informed of feedback themes and actions taken ("You said, we did")
- Staff informed of evaluation outcomes and improvement plans
- Governance bodies (Academic Committee, Board) receive evaluation reports
- Public information (annual reports, website) includes overview of quality and improvements
- External stakeholders (QQI, partners) receive information as required

**Continuous:** **Principle:** Evaluation is ongoing, cyclical, continuous. Not one-off exercise but embedded in how we operate.

**Implementation:**

- Multiple overlapping evaluation cycles (ongoing, termly, annual, longer-term)
- Evaluation never "finished" - always learning and improving
- Each evaluation cycle informs next
- Long-term trends tracked over years

**Proportionate and Practical:** **Principle:** Evaluation is proportionate to scale and context of provision. Rigorous but practical. Serves improvement, not bureaucracy.

**Implementation:**

- Evaluation fit for purpose (small school, proportionate processes)
- Balance of rigor and efficiency
- Using existing data where possible (not creating unnecessary data)
- Technology used to streamline (online surveys, data systems)

## Evaluation Processes

### Ongoing Monitoring

**What:** Continuous, real-time monitoring of key quality indicators by management and Programme Leaders.

**How:**

- Daily/weekly monitoring of attendance, participation, academic progress, student wellbeing
- Teaching observations throughout term
- Informal feedback from students and staff noted
- Issues identified and addressed promptly
- Day-to-day oversight ensuring things running smoothly

**Responsibility:** Programme Leaders, Academic Managers, Senior Academic Manager, Managing Director, Student Services Officer

**Documentation:**

- Attendance registers
- Teaching observation records
- Informal notes
- Issue logs (if issues arise)

**Outcome:**

- Immediate action when problems identified
- Prevention of escalation

### Course Review Surveys

**What:** Structured feedback surveys completed by students at end of programme/cohort, evaluating all aspects of their experience.

**When:** End of every programme cycle (every 4-12 weeks depending on programme)

**How:** See Procedure 12.2 for detailed process.

**Summary:**

- Students complete online or paper survey
- Anonymous (to encourage honesty)
- Covers: teaching quality, programme content, assessment, resources, accommodation (if applicable), support services, overall satisfaction
- Mix of rating scales and open-ended comments
- High response rate encouraged (time given in class, importance explained)

**Responsibility:**

- Programme Leader administers survey
- Quality Officer analyses data
- Results shared with Programme Leader, teaching team, Senior Academic Manager, Academic Committee

**Outcome:**

- Strengths and issues identified
- Actions for improvement
- Programme-level improvements implemented for next cohort

## Evaluation Processes

### Programme Boards

**What:** Meetings of programme team (Programme Leader, teachers, student representatives, Academic Manager) to discuss programme quality, issues, improvements.

**When:** Twice per programme cycle or term (mid-point and end, or as appropriate)

**How:**

- Structured meetings with agenda
- Review of programme delivery, student feedback, assessment, issues
- Student representatives bring student perspective
- Collaborative identification of issues and improvements
- Actions agreed

**Responsibility:** Programme Leader chairs; all participants contribute

**Documentation:**

Programme Board minutes (actions recorded)

**Outcome:**

- Ongoing programme monitoring
- Issues identified and addressed
- Improvements identified and implemented
- Student voice in governance

### Annual Programme Reviews

**What:** Comprehensive annual review of each programme, evaluating all aspects and identifying improvements for next year.

**When:** Annually, at end of academic year or after full year of programme delivery

**How:** See existing QAF for programme review process (Section 5 - if procedure exists or create procedure).

**Summary:**

- Programme Leader prepares comprehensive review report
- Covers: student numbers, demographics, learning outcomes achievement, assessment data, student feedback, teaching quality, resources, issues, strengths, areas for improvement
- Actions identified for next year
- Report reviewed by Senior Academic Manager and Academic Committee

**Responsibility:**

- Programme Leader prepares review
- Senior Academic Manager oversees
- Academic Committee approves review and actions

**Documentation:**

- Annual Programme Review Report
- Action plan

**Outcome:**

- Comprehensive evaluation of programme
- Evidence-based improvements
- Continuous enhancement
- Accountability

## Teaching Quality Monitoring

**What:** Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of teaching quality through observations and student feedback.

**How:**

- Teaching observations (Section 6.3) - all teachers observed at least twice per year
- Student feedback on teaching (part of course review surveys)
- Analysis of teaching quality data
- Identification of excellent practice and development needs
- Teacher development and support

**Responsibility:**

- Programme Leaders / Academic Managers conduct observations
- Senior Academic Manager oversees teaching quality
- Quality Officer analyses aggregate data

**Outcome:**

- Assurance of teaching quality
- Teacher development
- Recognition of excellence
- Improvement of teaching practices

## Student Outcomes Monitoring

**What:** Monitoring student achievement, progression, retention, and destination outcomes.

**Data Monitored:**

- Assessment results (pass rates, grade distributions, by programme, level, cohort)
- Progression rates (students progressing to next level or completing programme)
- Retention rates (students completing vs. withdrawing early)
- Attendance rates
- External examination results (Cambridge, IELTS, Trinity, etc.)
- Destination data (progression to university, employment, further study, etc.)

**Analysis:**

- Trends over time
- Comparison across programmes, levels, locations
- Comparison with benchmarks (sector norms, previous years, external exam national averages)
- Identifying patterns (are certain groups underperforming? Are pass rates declining? etc.)

**Responsibility:**

- Quality Officer collects and analyses data
- Programme Leaders review programme-level data
- Senior Academic Manager reviews overall data
- Academic Committee reviews high-level outcomes

**Reporting:**

- Data reported termly and annually to governance
- Included in programme reviews and annual reports

**Outcome:**

- Evidence of student achievement and programme effectiveness
- Identification of issues requiring intervention
- Demonstration of impact and value

## Stakeholder Feedback

**What:** Feedback from stakeholders beyond current students and staff.

**Who:**

- Education agents (feedback on programmes, admissions, student satisfaction)
- Alumni (longer-term outcomes and satisfaction)
- Parents/guardians (particularly for junior programmes)
- University partners (for pathway students - how students performing at university?)
- Employers (if partnerships exist)
- Host families (feedback on students and on ELI Schools support)

**How:**

- Surveys, interviews, informal feedback
- Periodic consultation
- Relationship management

**Responsibility:**

- Managing Director or Senior Academic Manager
- Quality Officer

**Outcome:**

- External perspectives on quality
- Identification of issues or improvements
- Strengthening relationships

## Staff Feedback

**What:** Systematic gathering of staff feedback on all aspects of operations, working environment, professional development, etc.

**How:**

- Staff surveys (annual or biennial)
- Staff meetings (discussion of issues and improvements)
- Programme Boards (teacher input)
- Individual feedback (open-door policy, suggestion mechanisms)
- Exit interviews (if staff leave voluntarily)

**Responsibility:**

- HR Manager / Managing Director (overall staff satisfaction and environment)
- Senior Academic Manager (academic staff feedback)
- Quality Officer (staff feedback as QA data)

**Outcome:**

- Staff voice heard
- Staff satisfaction and engagement monitored and Staff retention
- Issues affecting staff addressed
- Improvements to working environment, resources, support, etc.

## Compliance And Process Audits

**What:** Internal audits checking that QA processes are being followed and requirements met.

**How:**

- Quality Officer conducts periodic audits (checking: are teaching observations being conducted? Are Programme Boards meeting? Are policies being followed? Are records being maintained? etc.)
- Checklist-based audits
- Sampling of documentation
- Reporting findings

**Responsibility:** Quality Officer

**Outcome:**

- Assurance that QA processes functioning
- Identification of non-compliance or gaps and corrective action

## External Validation

**What:** External evaluation providing independent perspective on quality.

**Types:**

- QQI review/audit (if applicable)
- External examiner reports (if used)
- Awarding body quality assurance (Cambridge, Trinity, etc. if offering accredited programmes)
- External consultants or reviewers (if engaged for specific purpose)

**How:**

- External body conducts inspection, audit, or review
- Report with findings and recommendations provided
- ELI Schools responds to findings and implements recommendations

**Responsibility:**

- Managing Director and Senior Academic Manager coordinate external validation
- Whole organization participates
- Quality Officer tracks recommendations and implementation

**Outcome:**

- Independent validation of quality
- Credibility and assurance
- Identification of areas for improvement from external perspective
- Recognition of strengths
- Compliance with regulatory requirements

## Critical Incident Reviews

**What:** After any critical incident (serious safeguarding concern, serious accident, serious complaint, crisis, etc.), review is conducted to learn and prevent recurrence.

**How:**

- Incident documented
- Review conducted (what happened? What went well? What went wrong? What can we learn? What needs to change?)
- Actions identified
- Actions implemented
- Monitoring

**Responsibility:**

- Managing Director or Senior Academic Manager
- Relevant staff involved in review

**Outcome:**

- Learning from incidents
- Prevention of recurrence
- Continuous improvement of safety and processes

<b>Version</b>	1.0
<b>Date Approved</b>	June 2025
<b>Approved by</b>	Board of Directors
<b>Next Review Date</b>	June 2026

**Related legislation, regulation or guidelines:**

- Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines 2016 (QQI)
- Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of English Language Education to International Learners

## 11.2 Procedures for Collection of Learner and Staff Feedback

<b>QA Area(s)</b>	Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review		
<b>Applies to</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff only	<input type="checkbox"/> Learners only	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff and learners
<b>Policies this Procedure relates to:</b>	Policy for Self-Evaluation, Monitoring and Review (12.1)		

### Purpose

This procedure outlines the systematic processes for collecting, analysing, and acting on feedback from learners and staff, ensuring that stakeholder voices inform continuous improvement at ELI Schools.

### Scope

This procedure applies to:

- All programmes at ELI Schools
- All locations
- All students
- All staff
- All feedback collection activities

### Procedure

#### Part A: Learner Feedback Collection

##### Mechanism 1: Student Feedback Surveys

**Course Review Surveys** Programme Content and Structure  
Teaching Quality  
Learning Outcomes and Progress  
Assessment and Feedback  
Resources and Facilities  
Support Services  
Overall Satisfaction

**Survey Format:** **Online survey** (using SurveyMonkey, Google Forms, or similar platform) - efficient, data automatically collected, easy to analyse

**Survey Length:**

- **15-20 questions** (takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete)
- Balance of comprehensiveness and avoiding survey fatigue
- Concise, clear questions

**Survey administered:**

- In final week of programme, or on final day
- When students have experienced full programme and can provide informed feedback
- Before students leave (maximizes response rate; difficult to get responses after students have left)

**Data Collection and Compilation**

- **Who:** Quality Officer (with support from office staff if needed)
- **When:** Immediately after survey administration (within 1 week)

## Mechanism 2: Programme Board Student Representatives

**Purpose:** Student voice in governance; ongoing feedback and dialogue.

**Process:**

- Step 1: Student Representatives Elected or Volunteered**
- 1-2 student representatives per programme
  - Elected by classmates or volunteer
  - Diverse representation (different nationalities, genders, etc.)

- Step 2: Programme Board Meetings**
- Twice per term/programme cycle
  - Student representatives attend
  - Provide student perspective on:
    - How programme going
    - Issues students experiencing
    - Suggestions for improvement
    - Feedback on proposed changes
  - Student representatives bring voice of classmates (not just own views)

- Step 3: Actions Taken**
- Issues raised by student representatives addressed
  - Actions discussed and agreed at Programme Board
  - Student representatives report back to classmates

**Benefits:**

- Ongoing feedback, not just end-of-programme
- Dialogue and collaboration
- Student representatives develop leadership skills
- Immediate responsiveness to issues

## Mechanism 4: Informal Feedback from Students

**Purpose:** Capturing feedback that arises spontaneously in conversations, comments, questions.

- Step 1: Staff Listen and Note**
- Teachers, Programme Leaders, Student Services Officer, office staff listen to students
  - Students may mention issues, make suggestions, express satisfaction or dissatisfaction in casual conversations
  - Staff note significant feedback (not every casual comment, but patterns or important issues)

- Step 2: Share Feedback**
- Staff share feedback with Programme Leader or Senior Academic Manager
  - Formal mechanism: Email or mention in staff meeting
  - Informal: "Several students mentioned..."

- Step 3: Action if Appropriate**
- If feedback indicates issue, investigate and address
  - If pattern emerges (multiple students saying same thing), prioritize

**Benefits:**

- Captures feedback that might not come out in surveys (some students more comfortable with informal conversation)
- Responsive to issues as they arise
- Builds trust (students see that when they mention something, staff listen and act)

### Mechanism 3: Complaints And Appeals

**Purpose:** Complaints and appeals data provide feedback on issues that students found serious enough to escalate formally.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Step 1: Track Complaints and Appeals</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Officer maintains log of all complaints and appeals</li> <li>• Categorizes by type (teaching, assessment, accommodation, other)</li> <li>• Tracks outcomes (upheld, partially upheld, not upheld)</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Step 2: Analyse Patterns</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there recurring issues?</li> <li>• Are complaints concentrated in particular programme, location, teacher?</li> <li>• Trends over time (increasing, decreasing)?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Step 3: Use as Evaluation Data</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patterns in complaints indicate systemic issues requiring attention</li> <li>• Example: If multiple complaints about same issue (e.g., classroom facilities inadequate), this is clear signal for improvement</li> <li>• Included in annual quality reports</li> </ul> |
| <b>Step 4: Actions Taken</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues identified through complaints addressed systemically (not just for individual complainant)</li> <li>• Changes made to prevent recurrence</li> </ul>   |

### Part B: Staff Feedback Collection

#### Mechanism 1: Annual Staff Survey

**Purpose:** Systematic collection of staff feedback on working environment, resources, support, professional development, management, etc.

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Step 1: Survey Design</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Who:</b> HR Manager or Managing Director, with input from staff</li> <li>• <b>When:</b> Annually (survey reviewed and updated as needed)</li> <li>• <b>What: Staff Survey includes questions covering:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Job Satisfaction</li> <li>• Working Environment</li> <li>• Management and Leadership</li> <li>• Resources and Facilities</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Workload</li> <li>• Recognition and Reward</li> <li>• Communication and Information</li> <li>• Overall</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Step 2: Action Planning</b> | <p><b>Similar to student feedback action planning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify specific actions to address priorities for improvement</li> <li>• Assign responsibility, timelines, resources</li> <li>• Implement actions</li> <li>• Communicate actions to staff ("You said, we did")</li> <li>• Monitor impact</li> <li>• Review in next year's survey</li> </ul>   |

## Mechanism 2: Staff Meetings

**Purpose:** Regular forums for staff to raise issues, provide feedback, discuss improvements.

**Process:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Step 1: Regular Staff Meetings Scheduled</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All-staff meetings (termly or monthly, depending on size)</li> <li>• Teaching team meetings (more frequent - weekly or fortnightly)</li> <li>• Agenda includes standing item: "Issues and feedback"</li> </ul> |
| <b>Step 2: Staff Encouraged to Raise Issues</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open, safe environment for raising concerns</li> <li>• Issues raised by any staff member</li> <li>• No blame culture; focus on solutions</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Step 3: Issues Discussed and Actions Agreed</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative problem-solving</li> <li>• Actions agreed</li> <li>• Responsibility assigned</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Step 4: Follow-Up</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions tracked</li> <li>• Progress reported in next meeting</li> <li>• Accountability</li> </ul>  |
- Benefits:**
- Regular, ongoing feedback mechanism
  - Immediate discussion and action
  - Collective ownership of issues and solutions

## Mechanism 3: Individual Feedback to Management

**Purpose:** Staff can provide feedback individually to managers (line managers, senior management).

**Mechanisms:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Open-Door Policy:</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managers available for staff to raise concerns, make suggestions</li> <li>• Informal conversations</li> <li>• Regular one-to-ones (line manager and staff member)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Suggestion Box (Physical or Digital):</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff can submit suggestions anonymously if prefer</li> <li>• Reviewed regularly by management</li> <li>• Suggestions considered and responded to</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Exit Interviews:</b>                      | <p>If staff member leaves voluntarily, exit interview conducted (by HR Manager or Managing Director)</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are you leaving?</li> <li>• What did you like about working here?</li> <li>• What could be improved?</li> <li>• What could have persuaded you to stay?</li> <li>• Honest feedback often obtained in exit interviews</li> <li>• Analysed for patterns (staff retention issues? systemic problems?)</li> </ul> |

#### **Mechanism 4: Programme Boards**

**Purpose:** Teaching staff participate in Programme Boards, providing ongoing feedback on programmes.

**Process:**

**See Section 2 for Programme Board Terms of Reference.**

#### **Mechanism 5: Teaching Observation Feedback**

**Purpose:** Teaching observations provide feedback to individual teachers and identify development needs but also inform organizational learning about teaching quality overall.

**Process:**

**See Section 6.3 for Teaching Observation Procedure.**

### **Part C: Other Stakeholder Feedback**

#### **Mechanism 1: Agent Feedback**

**Purpose:** Education agents who send students to ELI Schools provide valuable feedback on programmes, services, student satisfaction, and competitiveness.

**Process:**

**Step 1: Regular**

**Communication with Agents**

- Managing Director or designated staff maintain relationships with agents
- Regular email contact, phone calls, visits

**Step 2: Formal Agent**

**Feedback**

Survey or structured feedback request sent to agents

Questions:

- How do your students rate ELI Schools?
- What do students say they like?
- What complaints or issues have students raised?
- How do we compare to other schools you work with?
- What could we improve?
- What new programmes or services would be attractive to your market?
- May be phone/Zoom interviews rather than survey

**Step 3: Analyse and Act**

- Agent feedback analysed
- Actions identified
- Changes communicated back to agents
- Strengthens partnerships

## Mechanism 2: Host Family Feedback

**Purpose:** Host families who accommodate students provide feedback on students and on ELI Schools support.

### Process:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Step 1: Regular Communication with Host Families</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodation Officer maintains contact with host families</li> <li>• Check-ins during student stays</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Step 2: End-of-Stay Feedback</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After student leaves, host family may be asked for brief feedback:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was the student?</li> <li>• Any issues?</li> <li>• How was ELI Schools' support?</li> <li>• Any suggestions for improvement?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                                  |
| <b>Step 3: Annual Host Family Survey or Meeting</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual survey or meeting with host families</li> <li>• Feedback on:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support provided by ELI Schools</li> <li>• Communication</li> <li>• Payment processes</li> <li>• Training or information needed</li> <li>• Issues or suggestions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Step 4: Actions</b>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback informs improvements to accommodation services</li> <li>• Host family relationships strengthened</li> </ul>   |

## Mechanism 3: Group Leader and Parent Feedback (For Junior Programmes)

**Purpose:** Parents of junior students (under-18s) provide feedback on their child's experience and on ELI Schools' duty of care.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Step 1: End-of-Programme Parent Survey</b> | <p>After junior programme ends, parents sent brief survey</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was your student/child safe and well cared for?</li> <li>• Was your student/child happy with programme?</li> <li>• Did your student/child's English improve?</li> <li>• Quality of accommodation?</li> <li>• Quality of communication from ELI Schools?</li> <li>• Would you send your student/child again or recommend to others? Any issues or suggestions?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Step 2: Analyse</b>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback analyzed</li> <li>• Safeguarding and welfare are paramount for junior programmes; any concerns about safety or care addressed immediately and seriously</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Step 3: Actions</b>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to junior programme delivery, safeguarding, communication, accommodation, etc.</li> <li>• Parent feedback particularly important for junior programmes (parents making decision to send child; their trust and confidence critical)</li> </ul>  |

## Part D: Closing The Feedback Loop - Ensuring Impact

### The Critical Step: From Feedback to Improvement

Feedback is only valuable if it leads to action and improvement.

- Step 1: Prioritization**
  - **Not all feedback can be acted on immediately. Prioritize based on:**
  - **Impact:** How significantly does this issue affect students or quality?
  - **Frequency:** How many people raised this issue? (Pattern vs. isolated comment)
  - **Feasibility:** Can this be addressed? What resources required?
  - **Urgency:** Does this need immediate action, or can it wait?
  - **Alignment:** Does this align with strategic priorities?
- Step 2: Action Planning** For each priority:
  - Specific action (SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound)
  - Rationale (why will this address issue?)
  - Responsibility (who will do it?)
  - Resources (what's needed?)
  - Timeline (by when?)
  - Success measure (how will we know it worked?)
- Step 3: Implementation**
  - Actions implemented according to plan
  - Responsibility assigned = accountability
  - Progress monitored (regular check-ins, action plan tracking)
  - Adjustments made if barriers encountered
- Step 4: Communication**
  - Stakeholders informed of actions taken ("You said, we did")
  - Demonstrates responsiveness
  - Encourages future participation (people see that feedback matters)
- Step 5: Evaluation of Impact**
  - Next feedback cycle shows if actions effective
  - Comparison: Did scores improve? Did complaints about issue stop? Did positive comments increase?
  - Evidence-based continuous improvement
- Step 6: Continuous Cycle**
  - Feedback → Analysis → Action → Implementation → Impact Evaluation → (Feedback again)
  - Ongoing, cyclical
  - Each cycle informs next
  - Continuous improvement over time
  - Long-term trends tracked (improvement year-on-year)

<b>Version</b>	1.0
<b>Date Approved</b>	March 2026
<b>Approved by</b>	Board of Directors
<b>Next Review Date</b>	March 2027

#### Related legislation, regulation or guidelines:

- Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines 2016 (QQI)
- Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of English Language Education to International Learners
- Data Protection Act 2018