Revisiting the "Success Factors"

> We listed a number of "success factors" at our first Project Team Meeting. It may be worth revisiting these to examine where we have made progress, where we need to do more, and where we might save ourselves some effort!
>
> **Circle the number corresponding to the "score" (according to the column labels) to give your informal assessment of how we have done.**
>
> On the reverse are some of the Risk Factors we identified.

The OLAAF Project will have been a success if:

	No Longer Relevant/Impossible	Not Yet fulfilled	Partly Fulfilled	Clearly Fulfilled
we promote the idea of designing CBAF tests to **support other types of learning**	1	2	3	4
we manage to **extend the use of CBAF beyond the small group of enthusiasts** and into wider use within the institutions	1	2	3	4
we **change both practices and perceptions** in regard to CBAF	1	2	3	4
we provide people with **training in CBAF authoring**	1	2	3	4
we reach out **beyond our subject areas**	1	2	3	4
the project **transfers into the Higher Education of the future** – if it's outcomes are applicable in 3 years time	1	2	3	4
it encourages the **development of e-learning**	1	2	3	4
it provides a means to enhance **web-based delivery of programmes**	1	2	3	4
we show that CBAF is **effective in enhancing retention rates**	1	2	3	4
we develop CBAF as a means of **mimicking microscopy classes**	1	2	3	4
we develop a means of **making tests realistic (e.g. emulating medical practice)** by using scenario setting and providing lists of all possible drugs and a glossary of terms, instead of standard MCQs	1	2	3	4
we develop a CDRom package of **numeracy problems** to use with students with random number generation capability. For formative and diagnostic use	1	2	3	4
we develop tests with an ability to **evaluate student usage**	1	2	3	4
we are able to present students with **problems that require them to draw from underlying theory** and come up with solutions that they can then test in the laboratory	1	2	3	4
we develop tests that **provide model data** and require students to solve genuine biological problems	1	2	3	4
we address the problem of **assessing originality** via CBA.	1	2	3	4
we develop and disseminate an evaluation strategy that focuses on **evaluating CBAF in terms of its assessment value**, rather than simply asking 'do you like using a computer to do assessment?'	1	2	3	4
we include **external examiners** in evaluating CBAF	1	2	3	4

Risk Factors

1. People reject involvement because they perceive TRIADS and CBAF as too difficult.
   Control: Provide support, staff development, and high quality materials aimed at supporting inexperienced staff.

2. Networks within the institutions, in particular the IT department, do not support the project.
   Control: Provide technical teams with clear information on what is required, and how to achieve this, use any contacts within the institutions to leverage support, seek out good practice from CIAD and TRIADS evaluation sites.

3. Staff outside the immediate team reject involvement.
   Control: Emphasise the benefit of involvement in terms of professional development; emphasise the long-term time saving in terms of reduced marking; research and quantify how it can enhance learning; look into institutional learning and teaching strategies and show how involvement in the project can help to meet these targets.

http://www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf/events/olaaf_conf2.htm