Appendix 1: OLAAF Partner Site Summaries

The 7 Consortium Partners are representatives of the following institutions:

Birkbeck College (Lead Site); Brunel University (from 1 October 2004, activity will transfer to University of Kent); London Metropolitan University; University of Birmingham; University of Brighton; University of Plymouth; University of Wales College of Medicine.

Following are brief accounts of activities of the Consortium Partners with respect to OLAAF in Year 2 of the project.

Birkbeck, University of London

Biological & Chemical Sciences

Molecular Cell Biology assessments have been updated and were delivered in Spring Term. A new version of the final exam was administered at the end of May 2004. This test included a new presentation format of the questions that we think will be very useful, as it is more readable and can be flexibly employed for a variety of question styles. (These developments would not have been possible without the expert work of Ellen Howey who authored the tests.) Students in this course were extensively surveyed using validated survey instruments on their study habits and on their experience of assessment in this and their other courses. Analysis of the results will be undertaken in collaboration with the FDTL4 FAST project (Formative Assessment in Science Teaching). A new exam for *Cellular Metabolism* was authored will be delivered in late April 2004. Several new formative tests for *Statistics for Biologists* have been given over the Spring Term and student evaluations have been collected. A new series of Field Biology assessments (delivered by CD in summer 2004) were authored and some evaluation of these materials was undertaken by an external evaluator in August. End user evaluations focusing on students' perceptions of the assessment strategy in this course were undertaken last year and this will be repeated for this cohort of students.

--Glenn Baggott, Site Leader

Earth Sciences

Originally paper-based assessments for a distance education course are being converted to TRIADS; to be delivered in Oct 2004.

A selection of questions from originally paper-based assessments for a distance education module in Geochemistry has been converted to appropriate TRIADS formats. Dr Karen Hudson-Edwards, the module leader, has reviewed these and provided feedback on their design. Minor

edits are now being made in line with her comments, and she is now re-writing some of the questions so that they will fit better to the TRIADS formats that we have developed. She will complete the next version of the questions before the end of July; after this, the complete set of assessments will be authored. The tests are to be delivered in Oct 2004 by CD. We have made preliminary plans with Dr Hudson-Edwards re: student evaluation of these materials; an evaluation plan will be finalised by mid-September. It should be noted that this effort has been accelerated by the appointment of Caroline Pellet-Many in March. She has done much of the work on conversion of these materials to computer-based formats. Caroline has degree-level qualifications in Earth Sciences and has been able to put this knowledge to good use in this work.

--Glenn Baggott, Site Leader (for K Hudson-Edwards)

Brunel University (Biological Sciences)

The eLearning section of the Cell and Chromosome Biology Group at Brunel University specialises in Virtual Lectures, simulated practical classes and computer-based assessment of biological subject matter. Currently we incorporate CBL in several of our modules and are particularly interested in instances where electronic simulations are an improvement on “wet” practical classes. The past year has been extremely busy with the submission and publication of several manuscripts, presence at international conferences and integration with LTSN (Biosciences). We now look forward to an imminent move to the University of Kent where we will liaise closely with the learning in Biosciences group there.

In projects funded directly by OLAAF we have been involved in the development and evaluation of the field biology modules (for specifics see report by Dr Baggott) We are now turning our attention to problem-based eLearning in basic genetics and are using the TRIADS software to this end. We expect to develop a question bank with related, but different questions to promote learning and minimise student collusion in this area. Finally we are in discussions with OLAAF partners to make use of the virtual microscope to simulate practical classes in genetics and cell biology.

In related projects we have developed and evaluated practical classes in Karyotyping and in Bioinformatics that instructs and gives formative and summative feedback to the learner (using Authorware). We have adapted karyotyping software into a pig version both for student practical classes and for use in the pig breeding industry; we developed a new computer-based module in level 2 genetics and are collaborating closely with Dr Cliff Brown at Brunel University for the delivery of web-based lectures and the collation of electronic conference proceedings.

--Darren Griffin, Site Leader (at University of Kent from 1 October 2004)

London Metropolitan (Human & Health Science)

In Year 2 the OLAAF project has focused on first year Cell Biology (170 students) with the aim of incorporating CBA into other modules in the future. Issues relating to security / firewalling on student machines prevented successful piloting of tests in this module in Semester A; since the module also runs in Semester B, a second pilot was run. Some responses were obtained, but it was clear that there were still some residual filing problems, however there is optimism that these have now been overcome. In addition, to help us deliver the OLAAF system as adopted by London Met, we are about to appoint a teaching assistant who has excellent CIT skills. It is worth noting that teaching staff involvement in this project over the past year has been limited due to the revalidation of all London Met courses and modules (a result of the UNL and London Guildhall Universities' merger in 2002); however, confidence in the OLAAF model is reflected in the new Cell Biology module specification - we now require students to attempt web-based formative tests as a compulsory assessment component. This is effective from October 2004.

Goals for 2004-05: We intend to run full-scale OLAAF tests in semesters A and B. The module also runs May - July at the Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine with whom we have a jointly validated degree programme. We hope to trial the tests on these students as well; use of all tests will be monitored and evaluated using student questionnaires.

2005-2006: we hope to pilot CBA&F in the University's Biology and Chemistry Foundation degree course (the rationale of which was outlined at the OLAAF meeting in Oxford).

--Chris Bax (for Prof Christopher Branford-White, Site Leader)

University of Birmingham (Civil Engineering)

From the OLAAF Project Director: OLAAF-related activity at Birmingham has been confined to continued running of existing TRIADS CBA materials in the School of Engineering. Both of the Site Co-Leaders, Richard Freer-Hewish and Barbara Hallam, have now retired. Ms Hallam will compile a Case Study relating to the recent results of student evaluations of the TRIADS materials. A new Site Leader, Dr Jill Ramsay (in Physiotherapy, rather than Engineering) takes over for Year 3 and will evaluate her implementation of CBA via WebCT.

University of Brighton (Institute of Nursing and Midwifery [INaM])

The designed Online drug calculations developed to facilitate the acquisition of competency in Numeracy by Pre-Registration students of nursing has been incorporated into our Virtual Learning Environment and tested with a cohort of students undertaking their pharmacology module. A survey was undertaken with this cohort and the feedback obtained has

been used to rectify the networking problems and the storage of results for analysis.

The drug calculation package is now ready to be used by Pre-Registration students with sessions scheduled in October. The data obtained will then be analysed and a reflection/ evaluation of the process and outcome will then be undertaken.

Dr. Richard Rayne and I participated in a seminar organised by the University of Brighton Centre for Learning and Teaching on the 16th of January where issues related to Online Assessment and Feedback were discussed and participants were shown examples of assessments used and developed by the OLAAF sites. This seminar was also attended by academic colleagues from our partners in Further Education Colleges.

Professor Don Mackenzie from the Centre of Interactive Assessment Design at the University of Derby and I led a discussion session entitled *Beyond Multiple Choice- Using TRIADS to design Online Assessment* as part of the University of Brighton Learning and Teaching Conference on the 16th of July.

--Patrick Saintas, Site Leader

University of Plymouth

Biological Sciences

In spite of time lost through ill health of the Site Leader, TRIADS-based assessments are being implemented in the 2004 Autumn Term. In the main target module (BIOL2303 – Environmental and Ecological Biochemistry - 106 students in 2004), the first assessment is based on the impact of environmental stress on a short metabolic pathway in chloroplasts. In the first year Molecular and Cellular Biology module (BIOL1005), TRIADS-based material has been developed to support chemical biology workshops. This material will be used on a full scale with 240 students in the 2004 Autumn Term. We have lost one of our two TRIADS-trained support staff (Janet Corboy). However, we have a replacement (Mark Pannell) who is already working on TRIADS materials. Mark has brought experience of developing on-line material with him from the Open University.

Question design approaches for problem-solving has been difficult. By using the definition of problem-solving developed by George Bodner and referring back to the excellent text by Kerridge and Tipton (Biochemical Reasoning, W.A. Benjamin publishers, 1972) used by the authors at the University of Cambridge, we are becoming more successful at effective question design.

Case studies will be available as soon as we have evidence from student usage by Christmas 2004. In spite of the enforced disruption, output has been significant with the first peer-reviewed conference presentation at Bioscience 2004 in Glasgow in July 2004. A second conference paper has

been submitted for the TEL '04 conference in Milan in November 2004. A presentation was also given to the Variety in Chemistry Education meeting held in Plymouth in September 2004.

We have chosen conference presentations for the first output in the hope of encouraging both interest in OLAAF and getting help on designing effective questions and feedback. We need more advice on design from the central OLAAF team at Birkbeck and probably from Don Mackenzie at Derby. We will be seeking this shortly.

--Les Jervis, Site Leader

Chemistry

Simon Belt has developed a series of questions on 4 topics in organic chemistry. There is a range of question styles from single correct answers to 'ordering' to 'reasoning' type answers. The questions demand some integration of chemical structure information which should put TRIADS through its paces. Once these are uploaded onto the system and modified as required for TRIADS, feedback can be constructed. Testing will take place in Spring Term 2005.

--Les Jervis

Navigation

Neil Witt stepped into the gap left by Les Jervis' enforced absence from the OLAAF meeting at Plymouth last October. His presentation drew favourable comment from Graham Gibbs and he has since been working on simulation-based material for TRIADS. This is being loaded onto the system for trial in the autumn term 2004.

Overall, progress has been quite good, in spite of health problems, support staff changes and other demands on staff time. We hope to have very positive presentations for the second OLAAF conference.

--Les Jervis

University of Wales College of Medicine (Dental School)

This year TRIADS has been used to support the Year 2 course in Dental Pathology and Microbiology. A number of previously available computer-aided assessments with feedback were modified for this new course, converting them to the latest version of TRIADS. Additional assessments were also created for this course. These are assessments are used formatively, with one assessment associated with each major topic of the course. Following student comments on previous assessments the feedback has been enhanced. These assessments were popular with the students and where the subject of many positive unsolicited comments in the formal student appraisal of the teaching of this course. It is intended to

increase the number of assessments used in this course for the next session, with further enhancements to the feedback.

Dissemination within the School and University has been disappointing. The system has been shown to a number of academic staff and also to members of the Learning Technology team. We are currently developing computer-aided assessments to be used formatively in the Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology course within the School. This makes extensive use of images.

The eLearning strategy of the new merged Cardiff University is being developed. OLAAF and TRIADS have been demonstrated briefly to responsible staff in Information Services and it is hoped that it can be demonstrated more widely within the University. We also plan to develop a model for simulation of the clinical situation with others in the OLAAF community.

The support of the OLAAF team, particularly Glenn, Dick and Ellen, is very much appreciated and has enabled progress to be made in some areas more easily and that might otherwise have been the case. I look forward to continuing collaboration.

--John Potts, Site Leader

Appendix 2: OLAAF Interest Group Summaries

The 9 OLAAF Interest Group members are representatives of the following institutions:

British School of Osteopathy; Edge Hill College of Higher Education; Keele University; Kingston University; Manchester Metropolitan University; Warwickshire College; University of Central Lancashire; University of Liverpool; University of Ulster.

Following are brief accounts of activities of the Interest Group members with respect to OLAAF in Year 2 of the project.

British School of Osteopathy

As members of the OLAAF Interest Group the team at the BSO are using TRIADS to develop Computer Based Assessment for the Bachelor of Osteopathy Degree. The focus has been on developing a formative assessment in the level 3 unit: Professional Capability, to support students' clinical decision-making skills. It was realised that the project was quite ambitious and required sophisticated assessment instruments to identify students' decision-making skills. The first draft of the assessment was designed by the teaching team and programmed by the team at Birkbeck. This was reviewed and a number of suggestions made to develop both the questions and the way they were presented. The subsequent modifications have recently been reviewed and it is anticipated that a pilot study will begin with students this year.

The last twelve months at the BSO have been dominated by the drive to gain HEFCE funding for students. This has reduced the human resources available to develop CBAF in the short-term. However, it is anticipated that in the longer term, being part of mainstream funded HE will have positive outcomes because of the relationship BSO will have with its larger validating university. One effect of the funding issue is that we anticipate a larger number of applications for places on the course programme; the admissions process is therefore being reviewed along with the criteria used to assess potential students. The old evaluation process utilised a relatively simple MCQ basic science and biology assessment which had been translated into TRIADS format. However because of the major changes it has been decided that this should also be reviewed and so it hasn't yet been implemented.

There are plans to use CBAF to support the teaching of anatomy in the early part of the course, though mainly as a formative tool with the main focus on feedback.

--Stephen Tyreman, Site Contact

Edgehill College of Higher Education

It is expected that CBA will form a significant component of a new geography course at Level 1 running as from Sept 2003. This course (a revamped Year 1) integrates theoretical knowledge and practical skills. It will also be used in other modules, and all initiatives will be placed in a proper experimental context so that we can report on its utility.

TRIADS will be the main authoring tool.

--Gerry Lucas, Site Contact

[Note: There have been delays in undertaking development of CBA at Edgehill over the past year, and for the present time, they will be following a watching brief with respect to OLAAF.]

Keele University

Plans to implement CAA at Keele have been set back 12 months for administrative reasons and availability of Questionmark Perception is now promised for Semester 1 in 2004-05. It was therefore necessary to continue with paper-based in-course testing in 2003, in the Animal Physiology module referred to in last year's plans. 55 students registered for the module, and were directed as planned to specified reading on a weekly basis through the module. Each block of reading was formatively assessed by objective questions, with feedback. Six times during the semester summative tests were administered using questions of the same type (and including some identical questions) also with feedback.

We now hope to implement CAA using QM Perception during the autumn semester of 2004, and compare the effectiveness of on-line presentation of formative tests with the paper-based test used in 2003. Because the paper-based tests were effectively compulsory whereas on-line access will be voluntary, students may not use them or the associated feedback as effectively. Conversely, they may choose to access them on more than one occasion. Provided the infrastructure is available, we shall monitor their use of the on-line tests, as well as their final performance.

At the time of writing it is uncertain whether colleagues who jointly with me teach this module will transfer their questions to CAA. Others within our School intend to move to on-line assessment, so other opportunities for comparison of objective testing before and after implementation of CAA may present themselves.

--Peter Chevins, Site Contact

Kingston University

The current Site Contact, Tim Linsey, reports that there have been delays in undertaking development of CBA at Kingston over the past year. Two further Site Contacts in other subject areas have taken on new duties and

therefore are unable to continue with their involvement in OLAAF. For the present time, Kingston will be following a watching brief with respect to OLAAF.

Manchester Metropolitan University

Alan Fielding, the Site Contact has no OLAAF-related activity to report, but maintains a watching brief with respect to OLAAF.

Warwickshire College

During 2003 the TRIADS-based study programme attracted a Beacon Award sponsored by Becta (British Educational Communications and Technology Agency) for the 'Use of ILT to Support Teaching and Enhance Learning' and has subsequently been short-listed in a second category of award for occupational health and safety training. Undoubtedly assessors have been impressed by the innovative use of both formative and summative computer based assessment strategies used within the programme.

Approximately one hundred first year, full time higher education students undertook the programme itself for the purposes of achieving an entry level knowledge in safety with horses. In addition this allowed students the opportunity to carry out a close study of the innovative nature of the programme delivery and assessment. Year 2 students following a BA in Equine Business Management programme carried out a full evaluation within course work forming part of a Human Resources module.

It is intended to further develop an additional 70 questions through the TRIADS system to achieve a robust question bank for the randomised final programme assessment. This process will be assisted greatly though the support of the OLAAF Project.

--Karen Tolley, Site Contact

University of Central Lancashire

The university is relatively new to Computer Assisted Assessment (CAA) and is piloting Questionmark perception within the Department of Computing with a view to institutional wide deployment and I am presently involved in this project. In addition to this I am currently enrolled on a PhD within the Department of Computing exploring the appropriateness of CAA within the computer science subject domain. Furthermore, I have recently received funding for a small project entitled ‘Exploring Multimedia issues in Computer Assisted Assessment’ which aims at developing multimedia style questions using Flash to be integrated into Questionmark software. To date CAA has been predominately used for summative assessment within the department within first and second year modules. Over the next academic year CAA will be integrated into MSc modules for formative purposes and

this is an area that the OLAAF project could assist with. The project could help us gain an understanding of how questions have been developed in other science disciplines and also gain an appreciation of the various forms of feedback.

--Gavin Sim, Site Contact

University of Liverpool

Earth & Ocean Sciences

Authorware version 7, the latest TRIADS engine have been installed and 5 TRIADS assessments have been updated for delivery in semester 1 of session 2004-5. Five other assessments remain to be updated for semester 2. All assessments are embedded as tasks in a Blackboard VLE and delivered using the Authorware Web Player plugin with ftp used for saving results.

In updating the assessments to take advantage of new screen layouts with more space, I have varied the amount and style of feedback given to students, and I plan to get feedback from the students on this aspect.

--Alan Boyle, Site Contact

Civil Engineering

In a presentation at the OLAAF workshop in Oxford at the start of the year, I outlined how TRIADS had been used in Civil Engineering to develop four computer-aided assessments exercises in conjunction with second year "Reinforced Concrete". The first two of these assessments were multiple-choice format and were used in conjunction with the computer aided learning package RC-CAL. The third and fourth assessments were more mathematical in format and contained problems with randomised variables, so that every student received a different test with every attempt. Hence the opportunities for cheating or copying are minimised. Correlation with examination results has shown a positive effect. Three similar randomised variable tests were also developed for use for fourth-year MEng/MSc students in conjunction with the structural timber part of the course "Timber, Steelwork and Masonry".

Since January the pace of development in computer-aided assessments has not be as fast as expected. The upgraded software, Authorware ver.7 and TRIADS ver.5zh, funded by OLAAF, have been installed and trialled. Computer-aided assessments developed using earlier versions of Authorware and TRIADS have been upgraded. The upgrade has the potential to enable Web delivery of an assessment or delivery using the University Blackboard learning system, but this has not yet been implemented. It will be also possible to make nice cosmetic changes such as increasing the screen display size to fit more modern larger screens. Plans to develop further TRIADS assessments in the area of year 2

Structures are on hold at present due to other academic/administrative commitments. One exciting possible development is a £4.5 million bid currently being made by the Engineering Department for CETL (centre of excellence for teaching and learning) funding. If successful this could enable the employment of a full-time member of staff to develop a range of computer aided assessments using TRIADS for many members of staff within Engineering.

I also am planning to attend an engineering conference in Perth, December 2004 to present a technical paper on civil engineering research. However in addition I plan to present a paper on computer-aided learning and assessment entitled "Experiences with the use of computer-aided learning and computer-aided assessment in the teaching of structural design".

--Steve Millard, Site Contact

University of Ulster

Our interest in OLAAF is not only to share good practice but also to explore the use of innovative question types aimed at testing higher order skills. In QM Perception the hotspot or drag and drop question template is the ideal vehicle for this. We would also be very interested in establishing a database of research publications on fixed response questions and in conducting research collaboratively in this field.

--Keith Adams, Site Contact

OLAAF Project: Assessment Construction Resources

Notes on contents, format [for discussion]
Main headings refer to the main "components" of the ACR.

OLAAF Briefings

- Up to ca. **6 briefings** on relevant issues; available in PDF (and Word in appropriate cases; e.g. proformas).
- References available separately as 1) EndNote Libraries, 2) tab-delimited text.
- Goal is NOT (necessarily) to provide an encyclopaedic coverage of the topic, but to point to useful resources and to fill in gaps with our own contributions.
- Also want to point to any of our "tools" (esp. proformas, exemplars, etc.) where applicable to the topic.
- Need to identify where Case Studies can contribute to Briefings, so that we are making a unique contribution.
- Should "farm out" briefing topics to Project Partners who have interests/expertise in the areas covered (for authoring and/or for review).
- Put through PEER REVIEW (possibility of honoraria for specialist reviewers?). Add to each Briefing over time, e.g. use synopses of case studies where applicable (these won't be available in full until end of project).

Pre-/co-requisites

- design layout
  - citation instructions
  - copyright
  - authorship
- get references into EndNote bibliographies

Possible Briefing Titles

- **A Model for Assessment Development**
  - use the diagram and explain each part
  - point to other briefings that will amplify particular themes (fill gaps)
  - point to key references, web sites, etc where high-quality advice is available
  - identify some of the main "gaps" in literature

- **An Assessment Construction Toolkit** (see tools, survey instruments)
  - include all relevant proformas—completed, as an example—in a single "booklet" with guidance on use, etc.
  - links given to the Word docs containing the blank proformas, survey instruments, etc. themselves so that users can customise to their own liking

- **Evaluation of Assessment Innovations**
  - cover the issues relating to "control or not to control?"; concept inventories; standard instruments for testing—will we ever have them?
  - synopsise the various validated survey instruments, especially those that may give insights to the effect of assessment on student behaviour
  - give examples of how instruments may be modified (and where this is justifiable) in particular situations

- **The Provision of Feedback in Computer-based Assessment**
  - brief literature survey (such as that I wrote already), giving evidence-based advice on construction of feedback
  - also include some new information on "feedback strategy"—e.g. identifying "types" of feedback and different forms of presentation, with advice on how to select the kind(s) of feedback to use and how-when to present it

- **Effective Design and Application of CBA Items**
  - survey the main item types (question styles) available in CBA and consider the suitability of the item type (question style) in relation to the item's didactic/diagnostic/summative purpose
  - consider how the variety of item types can make CBA more effective
  - consider task analysis principles and how this can inform the design of effective items
  - consider issues of sequencing? (e.g. LODAS—framework for sequencing material in learning objects)

Tools (subject of a briefing)

Mainly proformas to assist in inventorying, planning, checking.

Survey Instruments (subject of a briefing)

Want to collect instruments, summarise their uses/applicability, link to refs and examples of their implementation.

Might need permission to use.

OLAAF Group Workshops, Presentations, Publications

All of these should be made available.

Exemplars

Selections of CBA items from OLAAF that we think exemplify a particular problem/solution, etc.

OnLine Assessment And Feedback Conference

St Edmund Hall, Oxford

7th – 8th January 2004

Programme

Day 1: Wednesday 7th January 2004

11am	**Refreshments**	
11.15am	**Welcome** *Dr Richard Rayne, Birkbeck College*	JCR party room
11.30am	**THEME 1: Institution-wide Approaches to CBA** *Dr Les Jervis, University of Plymouth* *Gerry Lucas, Edgehill College of Higher Education* *Dr Tim Linsey, Kingston University* *Gavin Sim, University of Central Lancashire*	JCR party room
1pm	**Lunch**	**Wolfson Hall**
2.30pm	**Evaluation Strategies for CBA Initiatives** *Dr Joanna Bull, Eduology*	JCR party room
3.15pm	**Planning your Evaluation** *Birkbeck Team*	JCR party room
3.30pm	**Refreshments**	
4pm	**THEME 2: CBA for Formative Assessment** *Dr Karen Hudson-Edwards, Birkbeck College* *Dr Richard Freer-Hewish & Barbara Hallam, Birmingham University* *Dr Glenn Baggott, Birkbeck College* *Dr Alan Fielding, Manchester Metropolitan University* *Dr Peter Chevins, Keele University*	JCR party room
5.30pm	**Close**	
7pm	**Dinner**	**Old Dining Room**

Day 2: Thursday 8th January 2004

8 - 8.30am	**Breakfast**	**Wolfson Hall**
9am	**THEME 3: Linking CBA with Virtual Learning Environments** *Patrick Saintas, Brighton University* *Dr Darren Griffin, Brunel University* *Dr Chris Bax & Professor Christopher Branford White, London Metropolitan University* *Dr Alan Boyle & Dr Steve Millard, Liverpool University*	JCR party room
10.30am	**Refreshments**	
11am	**THEME 4: CBA to Support Professional Practice** *Dr Keith Adams, University of Ulster* *Dr John Potts, University of Wales College of Medicine* *Dr Stephen Tyreman, British School of Osteopathy* *Karen Tolley, Warwickshire College*	JCR party room
12.30pm	**Lunch**	**Wolfson Hall**
	Lunchtime Demonstration of TRIADS Question Shells *Ellen McCarthy, Birkbeck College*	JCR party room
2pm	**Partnerships for Success** *Dr Richard Rayne, Birkbeck College*	JCR party room
2.45pm	**Some Thoughts on the Future of CBA** *Professor Don Mackenzie, Centre for Interactive Assessment Development, University of Derby*	JCR party room
3.30pm	**Close** **(Refreshments)**	

OLAAF Conference Delegate List

Dr Keith	Adams	University of Ulster
Dr Glenn	Baggott	Birkbeck College
Dr Chris	Bax	London Metropolitan University
Dr Simon	Belt	University of Plymouth
Dr Alan	Boyle	University of Liverpool
Professor Christopher	Branford-White	London Metropolitan University
Dr Joanna	Bull	Eduology
Dr Peter	Chevins	Keele University
Dr Alan	Fielding	Manchester Metropolitan University
Dr Richard	Freer-Hewish	University of Birmingham
Dr Darren	Griffin	Brunel University
Ms Barbara	Hallam	University of Birmingham
Dr Karen	Hudson-Edwards	Birkbeck College
Dr Les	Jervis	University of Plymouth
Dr Loretta	Jervis	University of Plymouth
Dr Tim	Linsey	Kingston University
Mr Gerry	Lucas	Edge Hill College of Higher Education
Professor Don	Mackenzie	University of Derby
Dr Steve	Maw	LTSN Centre for Bioscience
Miss Ellen	McCarthy	Birkbeck College
Dr Steve	Millard	University of Liverpool
Ms Sharon	Potter	British School of Osteopathy
Dr John	Potts	University of Wales College of Medicine
Dr Dick	Rayne	Birkbeck College
Mr Patrick	Saintas	University of Brighton
Dr Alan	Seddon	Kingston University
Miss Kavita	Shah	Brunel University
Mr Gavin	Sim	University of Central Lancashire
Ms Karen	Tolly	Warwickshire College
Dr Stephen	Tyreman	British School of Osteopathy

OLAAF Project Team Meeting (Site Leaders)

Thursday 23rd September 2004
Room 540, Malet Street
1100 to 1300

Agenda

1. Introductory comments from the Project Director (1100)

2. Case Study Planning Session (1115)

   A Case Study Proforma and a Planner (next page) will be employed.

3. Assessment Resources (1210)

   Consideration will be given to the Assessment Construction Model and associated materials. Contributions by Project Members will be invited.

4. November Meeting [OLAAF 2] (1240)

   A preliminary timetable will be considered.

5. AOB

   Timing of the next meeting?

Planning Your OLAAF Case Study

The aim of this exercise is to begin identify and/or articulate the elements that will comprise your Case Study. It will probably be useful to spend a few minutes working alone think about the questions and your responses to them. After this, we will work in groups to help us refine our initial thoughts.

It is not intended that we complete this effort today, but at least that we leave the meeting with a better idea of what we intend to produce as a case study. We will return to this planner at the forthcoming OLAAF Conference (TBA, but aiming for mid-late November).

The Planner

Some indicative questions are given below. You may wish to modify or add to these according to the "shape" of your planned study. A FAST/OLAAF Case Study Format description and proforma has been provided separately. It may be useful to refer to this document as you work.

1. What problem/pedagogic issue(s) have you identified that are to be addressed in the case study?
2. What changes (generally) in your teaching/assessment do you propose (or have you undertaken already) to address this (these) problem(s)?
3. What CBA will be produced (or has been produced) that you hope will contribute to the changes identified in Q2?
4. Please describe briefly the distinctive features of your CBA, e.g. how it engages with the learning outcomes, what question styles were employed, how the mix of styles was rationalised, etc. The OLAAF Assessment Construction Resources will be of assistance here.
5. How will (or was) the CBA be "inserted" into the module so to ensure that it has (had) the intended impact on student study behaviour/learning? (e.g. How will/did you ensure that students make (made) use of the CBA in a timely manner, or even at all? If purely formative, will (or did) they take it seriously? Will (did) the CBA come at a time such that students may benefit from its formative purposes? etc.)
6. What barriers may you encounter (or have you encountered) in implementing the CBA? In what ways can these be dealt with?
7. What evidence would convince you (and others, we hope!) that your innovation has produced a useful outcome?
8. How do you intend to (or have you) collect(ed) evidence of impact? (e.g. surveys/questionnaires, collation of grades, etc.)
9. Can you propose an indicative title for your case study? (see the Case Study Proforma for some notes on this)
10. What assistance could OLAAF provide toward the completion of your study?

ONLINE ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK (OLAAF)

MINUTES OF THE OLAAF STEERING GROUP MEETING
Birkbeck College
23 September 2004

Members Present

Professor D Moss (Chairman)
Dr A Abakuks
Dr G Baggott
Dr C Bax
Professor C Branford-White
Dr J Gill
Dr D Griffin
Dr B Hallam
Dr L Jervis
Mr P Leffek
Professor D Mackenzie
Dr P Martin
Dr S Maw
Dr C McKenna
Dr J Ramsay
Dr R Rayne
Mr P Saintas

In attendance: Ms S Cutter

Apologies for absence were received from:
Dr K Hudson-Edwards
Dr J Potts

CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES

The **Minutes of the last meeting** were confirmed and signed. (20)

ANNUAL REPORT TO HEFCE

Overview by Project Director

The Project Director reported that there had been a great deal of activity for OLAAF in the past year. The project had passed the initial stage of planning and was now at the stage of implementation which would contribute to the distribution of resources to HE institutions. Authored computer based tests were being tested and the results would be used to influence practice in the final year. Institutions were at varying stages in the process, e.g. authored computer based tests had already been incorporated into Birkbeck modules whereas other institutions had started working with these more recently. A summary of activities from each institution would be included in the final version of the annual report to HEFCE.

It was reported that Dr Griffin would be leaving Brunel University, which would be discontinued as a test site, to join the University of Kent where he would continue his research. Kavita Shah, who had been conducting an evaluative study of users of CBA, had left the project in December 2003. Julia Stephenson had joined the project and the role had shifted to the authoring of CBA. Dr Griffin was working in collaboration with Dr Ingrouille of Birkbeck College and the Birkbeck OLAAF team to author assessments in genetics. It was felt that these changes would be beneficial to the project.

Barbara Hallam reported that there had been a shift from civil engineering to physiotherapy at the University of Birmingham. The existing material for civil engineering would continue to be used but would not be developed any further.

As a result of the departure of Jenny Philips as Project Manager in December 2003, Dr Richard Rayne had combined the roles of Project Director and Project Manager. The group was grateful to Jenny for her hard work in the first year of the project.

Caroline Pellet-Many had joined the Project at the end of March 2004. She has since received training in TRIADS authoring and has undertaken specifically to author CBAs on geochemistry in collaboration with Birkbeck Earth Sciences. Having a second CBA author on the Birkbeck team had enabled Ellen Howey to specialise in more creative approaches in authoring. This appointment also had permitted the Birkbeck team to better support other participants who rely on Birkbeck for CBA authoring.

(21)

Dissemination Strategy

It was noted that dissemination was a major remit of the Project and represented one of its greatest challenges. Networks should be formed and members should feel that they are contributing to something worthwhile. So far fifteen universities were represented.

It was reported by Dr Martin (OLAAF's Senior Advisor from the HE Academy) how well the project was progressing. The commitment of members and wide scale collaboration had been noted. The sheer volume of activity was impressive. A trade-off between broad, but relatively superficial engagement with interested HE institutions versus a more focused engagement with fewer institutions was identified and discussed. It was felt that engaging with fewer institutions but at a deeper level may be a more desirable course.

Contacts abroad were encouraged in the long term. It was reported that the academic Dr Paul McGrath was enthusiastic about passing on details to his colleagues at Newcastle University, Australia. Prof Branford-White suggested it could be valuable to collaborate with groups at Imperial College who have ongoing collaborations with European partners in the area of computer-based learning and assessment. Dr Jervis indicated he had had some preliminary discussions with members of the Imperial group. Dr Rayne indicated that his recent association with the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) may lead to productive collaborations.

A number of conferences were suggested for disseminating information and a list of possibilities would be produced.

A major output of the project, a collection of "Assessment Construction Resources" was progressing well. The broad agenda of these would be a series of documents ("OLAAF Briefings") that directed users to high-quality existing resources and research, and would provide the project's work as exemplars that could be adopted or modified by others.

The second OLAAF conference would be held in London in November. The Assessment Construction Resources would be partly built by then and the group would be working on how the model could be improved and put into practice. The first of these CBA authoring tools should be available for general use by the end of the year as a set of polished products. However, the hope was that these tools would be a "community product", informed by contributions of others who are carrying out similar work. As such, selected tools would be released for trial and comment as soon as possible, rather than waiting for them to be complete.

It was suggested that the group may be able apply to HEFCE for transferability funds to continue project work for a short period after its end in September 2005. This money could be used for dissemination. The sum awarded could not exceed 10% of the initial grant. Dr Martin would let members know whether transferability bids would be invited by HEFCE.

(22)

External Project Evaluation

It was reported that two parallel strands of evaluation activity were being used. The first—external assessment evaluation—covered particular outputs of the project, including selected examples of assessments authored by the project, end-user evaluations, and OLAAF publications. The second, "external project evaluation" considered issues such as the working practices of the project, whether it is functioning and disseminating in productive ways, etc.

The Project Director reported with regret the death of Dr Joanna Bull, who was set to act as the External Project Evaluator. The Project Director hoped to make a replacement soon. It was thought that the External Project Evaluator would contribute by attending the second OLAAF conference where members would look for guidance and constructive criticism. The evaluator would then visit four to six months later which would enable time for members to rectify the problems.

(23)

External Assessment Evaluation (2nd Report)

The Project Director was unable to present the finished report due to the ill health of the evaluator Dr O Hare and it was thought doubtful whether a report would be submitted before the annual report to HEFCE was completed. Dr O Hare's comments on assessing assessment had been submitted and the Project Evaluation Strategy had been agreed as a reasonable strategy.

(24)

Year 3 Activity Plan

Target dates would be completed and dissemination items incorporated and coordinated. OLAAF was contributing to the project Formative Assessment in Science Teaching (FAST), a collaboration between Open University and Sheffield Hallam University, through the sharing of survey instruments and by co-sponsoring national conferences in December 2004 and June 2005.

It was reported that a date for the next OLAAF conference in November would soon be fixed and it was likely to be held on a Friday and Saturday.

(25)

Financial Report

It was noted that in Year 1 and Year 2 the project had spent less than the allocated budget due mainly to staff costs being much lower than anticipated. This had occurred owing to delays in appointees taking up their posts. In addition, some funds earmarked for Dissemination had been deliberately withheld in Year 2 so as to re-allocate these to costly essential events in Year 3 (e.g. the OLAAF conference and the national conferences in Dec 2004 and June 2005). Consequently, in Year 3 there would be an overspend which would balance the figures.

It was advised by Dr Martin that the reasons for the underspend be listed and future plans for spending to redress this made clear. It was possible that a quarterly payment would be suspended to regulate the influx of funds into the project.

It was reported that at present the Annual Report to HEFCE was at the draft stage. The same template would be used as last year and as advised by Steering Group members a concise front page summary would be produced.

The Chair of the Steering Group thanked Dr Rayne for his hard work.

(26)

Report on the OLAAF Project Team Meeting

The OLAAF Project team (the Birkbeck team + Site Leaders) had held a meeting preceding the Steering Meeting. Members had worked on plans for the case studies that would form the main record of their contributions to the OLAAF project and which would serve as exemplars of innovative practice in assessment. Some time was also devoted to planning the OLAAF Briefings which will contain useful information for those who may want to adopt CBA. Productive discussion of other components of OLAAF's "Assessment Construction Resources" was undertaken.

Dr Jervis from the University of Plymouth gave a short presentation to the Steering Group illustrating some of the work he and his group at Plymouth are undertaking under the auspices of OLAAF. His particular focus is on "problem solving" in science. He currently uses a range of "traditional" approaches, including lectures, laboratory work (using a problem-based learning approach), etc., but aims, through OLAAF, to incorporate carefully constructed CBA into the mix. An important aim would be to use CBA to ensure that students attained the broad knowledge base (akin to an "expert") required to effectively attack and solve novel problems. It was felt that a huge amount of staff time would be saved and that staff would be able to concentrate efforts on those aspects of teaching that could not be effectively addressed by CBA.

(27)

Dates of future meetings.

Suggestions for when the next meeting should be held could be emailed to Dr Rayne. It was thought that this would be in March 2005.

(28)

The OnLine Assessment and Feedback Project

Appendix 7: Dissemination Strategy and Timeline

(Revised and Approved by Steering Committee, September 2004)
http://www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf/extras/dissemination-extra.pdf

Introduction

Dissemination is a key mission of the OLAAF project. We will utilise several channels of dissemination, both formal and informal, to engage our target audience. In addition to the dissemination activities identified in the timeline at the end of the document, we recognise the importance of day-to-day collaborative work and will also seek to exploit other opportunities as they arise. Our approach will be pragmatic, taking account of the following:

- by establishing collaborative relationships with interested practitioners, groups and networks, we will ensure that the disseminated outcomes of the project are relevant to the needs of the HE community;

- towards the end of the project, opportunities may arise to embed principles and strategies of assessment developed by OLAAF into the strategic plans of participating institutions. To give a timeline for this potential dissemination outcome is impossible, but we will monitor such possibilities throughout the project;

- national developments in HE during the course of the project will certainly influence our dissemination strategy (for example the likely establishment of the Higher Education Academy) and we will adopt a flexible approach to make the most of new opportunities that may arise.

This dissemination strategy will be reviewed regularly by the project team, at Steering Group meetings, and as part of the External Project Evaluation. Changes will be made where necessary to ensure that the plans remain both relevant and achievable.

Primary audience

We feel that two groups represent the main targets of OLAAF dissemination activities:

- Teaching and Support staff in Higher Education with an interest in computer based assessment, both current and future users, particularly within Science-related subject areas

- Staff and educational developers in Higher Education, particularly those with responsibility for E-learning

Establishing Networks

- **Formation of Site Groups at partner institutions**
  Depending on the institution, to include technical, academic and support staff, facilitated by a site leader. Site leaders will also be the main link for the project with relevant decision-makers at each institution.

- **Establishment of an OLAAF Interest Group**
  Composed of both TRIADS and non-TRIADS users in other institutions, this group will receive support from the project, participate in activities including the OLAAF conferences, and contribute to the outcomes through submission of case studies, evaluation of draft materials, etc.

Dissemination at Partner and Interest Group Sites (OLAAF Network) will be supported by:

Institutional Learning and Teaching Networks at Partner and Interest Group sites
Including participation in relevant institutional events, links with websites, newsletter articles.

Steering Group Meetings
Terms of Reference and Membership are found at the end of this document. Meetings will take place twice a year.

Workshops
At OLAAF Network sites for awareness, development, implementation and embedding of outcomes.

Use of Hosted Project Management Web Site
Using a product called "Basecamp", we will keep track of project milestones, to-dos, etc. and to keep archives of meetings, etc. All of this will be accessible to OLAAF project members via password protected log-in.

OLAAF Annual Conferences
Two-day focused events bringing together all members of the OLAAF Network to report experiences, consolidate ideas, and plan future directions

Learning and Teaching Support Networks (Bioscience, Health Science, LTSN-01)
Links from LTSN websites, inclusion in e-bulletins, attendance and presentation at events, articles in newsletters, organisation of joint events.

Assessment Project Network
Active participation, including symposiums at international conferences, and joint publications

Publicity

- **Quarterly newsletter**
  Distributed by email to interested parties in the wider community, identified through networks and website.

- **OLAAF Website** www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf
  Regularly updated with project news and outcomes as they develop. The website is registered with several search engines and links from key referring sites are being sought. It has been designed to allow a high level of accessibility and usability.

- **OLAAF Flyer and Poster**
  Containing details of the project for distribution at events

- **Regular articles in relevant publications**
  e.g. Institutional newsletters, bulletins, etc, LTSN publications, NCT Bulletin, Exchange

Scholarly Activities

- **National Conferences**
  Attendance and workshops at national/international conferences (e.g. CAA, ALT-C, EARLI events, etc.)

- **Papers in Journals**
  Targeted to subject practitioners.

- **Chapter in Book**
  (Subject to acceptance) Chapter in Kogan Page book: Innovating in Assessment

Dissemination Timeline

This timeline that makes note of key, predictable dissemination opportunities and events. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, but indicative of *planned* dissemination. Our annual reports will include complete lists of dissemination activities undertaken over their respective reporting periods.

2002		
OLAAF Web site live; follows W3C guidelines	Dec 02	✓
OLAAF Web Log (online discussion forum) live	Dec 02	✓
Awareness presentations at LTSN and other relevant events	Oct 02	✓

2003		
Articles in relevant publications (ongoing)	2003-2005	
OLAAF Web Log (online discussion forum) live	Dec 02	✓
Awareness presentations at LTSN and other relevant events	Oct 02	✓
1st Steering Group Meeting	29 Jan 03	✓
Site Leaders establish Site Groups; facilitated by Site Leaders	Apr 03	✓
1st OLAAF email newsletter	May 03	✓
Set up links with Learning and Teaching Support Networks	May 03	✓
OLAAF Flyer and Posters produced	June 03	✓
OLAAF Interest Group established	July 03	✓
Workshops at OLAAF Network sites	Summer-Autumn 03	✓
CAA Conference (attendance and OLAAF flyer in delegate pack)	8-9 Jul 03	✓
2nd OLAAF email newsletter	Aug 03	✓
ALT-C Conference (attendance and OLAAF flyer in delegate pack)	8-10 Sep 03	✓
2nd Steering Group Meeting	17 Sep 03	✓
3rd OLAAF email newsletter	Nov 03	✓
Workshops at Interest Group sites on implementation of project	Winter 03	✓

2004		
Papers in targeted journals (ongoing)	2004-2005	
OLAAF 1 Annual Conference	7-8 Jan 04	✓
EARLI conference (Bergen) presentation	Jun 04	✓
CAA Conference presentations (x2)	Jul 04	✓
4th OLAAF email newsletter	Sep 04	✓
3rd Steering Group Meeting	Sep 04	✓
LTSN Bioscience Event: 'Assessment for Learning' (at Sheffield-Hallam)	Oct 04	✓
OLAAF 2 Annual Conference	Nov 04	
5th OLAAF email newsletter	Nov 04	
National event: 'Assessment in Science Teaching: Technological Solutions?' (to be held in Loughborough)	Dec 04	

2005		
Alpha stage release of resource materials	Jan 05	
6th OLAAF email newsletter	Feb 05	
4th Steering Group Meeting	May 05	
7th OLAAF email newsletter	May 05	
Release version of resource materials	Jun 05	
National event: 'The Science Learning and Teaching Conference' (tentative title; at Warwick University)	Jun 05	
CAA Conference	Jul 05	
Innovating in Assessment book published	Sep 05 (TBC)	
5th Steering Group Meeting	Sep 05	
'Improving Student Learning' with Assessment Project Network	Sep 05 (TBC)	
8th OLAAF email newsletter	Sep 05	

OLAAF Steering Group Terms of Reference

Strategic Role:

- To agree and monitor the strategic targets of the OLAAF project
- To receive reports on the progress of the project and generate and consider ideas for future development
- To advise on and approve project outputs
- To provide specialist advice and guidance
- To maximise potential for implementation and embedding of OLAAF outcomes at institutional level
- To support dissemination of OLAAF through own networks
- To actively promote the OLAAF project at institutional and national level

Administrative Role:

- To sign-off any agreed changes to the project plan
- To monitor the budget and approve any proposed changes to budget
- To consider and sign off annual progress reports for submission to the NCT
- To consider and sign off evaluation reports

OLAAF Steering Group Membership

Dr Andris Abakuks, Statistical Advisor, Birkbeck College
Dr Glenn Baggott, Site Leader, Birkbeck College, Biological and Chemical Sciences
Professor Chris Branford-White, Site Leader, University of North London
Dr Richard Freer-Hewish, Site Leader, University of Birmingham
Dr Jas Gill, Director, Central Computing Services, Birkbeck College
Dr Darren Griffin, Site Leader, University of Kent
Dr Karen Hudson-Edwards, Site Leader, Birkbeck College, Earth Sciences
Dr Les Jervis, Site Leader, University of Plymouth
Peter Leffek, Teaching and Learning Technology Officer, Birkbeck College (TBC)
Professor Don Mackenzie, Centre for Interactive Assessment Development (CIAD), University of Derby
Dr Kate Mackenzie-Davey, Evaluation Advisor, Birkbeck College
Dr Colleen McKenna, Educational Advisor, University College London
Professor David Moss, Pro-Vice Master for C&IT, Birkbeck **(Chair)**
Mark Pimm, Accessibility Advisor, Birkbeck College, Student Disability Co-ordinator
Dr John Potts, Site Leader, University of Wales College of Medicine
Dr Richard Rayne, Project Director, Birkbeck College
Mr Patrick Saintas, Site Leader, University of Brighton
Dr Steve Maw, LTSN Bioscience Subject Centre Representative

Document composed by Dr Richard Rayne and Dr Glenn Baggott, Birkbeck, University of London
(contributions from Jenny Phillips and the OLAAF Site Leaders)

For more information about the OLAAF project, see http://www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf/

The OnLine Assessment and Feedback Project

Appendix 8: Project Evaluation Strategy

(Revised August 2004)

http://www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf/extras/evaluation-extra.pdf

PLEASE NOTE that this strategy document does not address issues relating to the form and content of student evaluations of computer-based assessments produced through OLAAF activities. Information about this will be found in the descriptions of Case Studies undertaken by OLAAF participants.

Purpose

- To provide developmental feedback on progress, and inform changes to project processes and outputs.
- To satisfy the funding council and supporting institutions that we are implementing the project to an agreed plan.
- To draw together learning points in a format accessible to future projects.

Stakeholders

a) Funding Council
b) Steering Group Members
c) Project Team Members
d) Interest Groups Members
e) Students on the modules involved
f) Other staff involved at participating institutions: e.g. in Central ICT or Educational Development
g) Supporting discipline groups: LTSN Bioscience, LTSN Generic Centre

This document represents REVISION 2 of the OLAAF Evaluation Strategy. It was prepared in August 2004 and was approved by the OLAAF Steering Group in September 2004.

An accounting of the changes since revision 1 is given on pages 11 and 12.

Stakeholder questions and criteria

		Funding Council	Steering Group	Project Team	Interest Groups	Students	Other staff	Discipline groups
1	**Is the project moving forward at a reasonable pace towards the achievement of its agreed outcomes?**	x	x	x	x			
	Criteria The project is progressing steadily and milestones are being reached. Where major adjustments to the project plan have been necessary, they have been made in consultation with the project team, steering group and funding council representative.							
	Evaluation Activity External Project Evaluation							
2	**Is the project being effectively managed? Is the project team functioning productively?**	x	x	x	x			
	Criteria Work is allocated and monitored effectively, the budget is accurately monitored, and reporting meets funding council criteria. Members of the project team feel informed and involved, and there is productive collaboration between members of the project team.							
	Evaluation Activity External Project Evaluation							
3	**Has the project stimulated computer-based assessment and feedback (CBAF) efforts within the OLAAF Network (i.e. at Partner Sites and Interest Group)?**	x	x	x	x		x	
	Criteria Evidence that OLAAF has stimulated CBAF activity at Network sites. Current users are continuing to develop their work, new users are becoming active, and potential users have been identified.							
	Evaluation Activity Final Internal Evaluation; Post-project Survey							
4	**Have the assessments produced as part of the OLAAF project been designed to prioritise student learning?**	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	Criteria Assessments have been constructed according to principles outlined in the Assessment Construction Resources and Context Analysis. Evaluation of the assessments suggests that the impact of CBAF on student learning is positive.							
	Evaluation Activity External Assessment Evaluation; End User Evaluations							

Continued next page…

5	**Are the resource materials produced by the OLAAF project of high quality and do users find the materials useful? Are the materials accessible?**	**x**	**x**	**x**	**x**		**x**	**x**
	Criteria The materials are well-researched and evidence-based where possible. The resources address an identified gap in available information on CBAF and therefore provide a key service to users. Feedback on the resource materials from both academic and support staff is positive; uptake of materials by staff occurs at participating institutions and beyond. Accessibility is prioritised as far as possible throughout the project (web site, printed materials, question authoring advice).							
	Evaluation Activity Final Internal Evaluation; End User Evaluations; External Assessment Evaluation							
6	**Are the outcomes of the OLAAF project being effectively disseminated?**	**x**	**x**	**x**	**x**		**x**	**x**
	Criteria An appropriate and effective dissemination plan is in place. Dissemination materials and events are perceived by participants to be constructive and promote their engagement in the project.							
	Evaluation Activity External Project Evaluation; Post-project Survey							

External Project Evaluation (To Be Named)

1 Question: Is the project moving forward at a reasonable pace towards the achievement of its agreed outcomes?

Criteria

The project is progressing steadily and milestones are being reached. Where major adjustments to the project plan have been necessary, they have been made in consultation with the project team, steering group and funding council representative.

Data sources and collection techniques

Project Plan
Quarterly and Annual reports to NCT, including details of changes to plan
Steering Group Minutes
External Assessment Evaluations

2 Question: Is the project being effectively managed? Is the project team functioning productively?

Criteria

Work is allocated and monitored effectively, the budget is accurately monitored, and reporting meets funding council criteria. Members of the project team feel informed and involved, and there is productive collaboration between members of the project team.

Data sources and collection techniques

Quarterly and Annual reports to NCT, including details of changes to plan
Steering Group Minutes, including Budget reporting
Minutes from meetings with NCT coordinator (if any)
Descriptions of collaborative work (provided by Project Director or via surveys)
Interviews with/surveys of key team members and participants

6 Question: Are the outcomes of the OLAAF project being effectively disseminated?

Criteria

An appropriate and effective dissemination plan is in place. Dissemination materials and events are perceived by participants to be constructive and promote their engagement in the project.

Question also a focus of:

Post-project Survey

Data sources and collection techniques

Project Dissemination Strategy
Log of dissemination activities: events, publications, etc.
Web site usage
End User Evaluations
Final Internal Project Evaluation
Attendance at OLAAF events and/or conferences (e.g. OLAAF 2 in Nov 04) – opportunity to interview other participants

External Project Evaluation Schedule (Tentative*)

Nov 2004	
1.5 days at BBK for OLAAF Conference 2	
2.0 days data collection and write-up	
Alternative: 1 day at 'Using technology for effective and efficient assessment', 1st December, Burleigh Court, Loughborough (co-sponsored by OLAAF)	
Focus	Developmental
Report	Recommendations on dissemination Recommendations on delivery of outputs through to end of project
Report to SG (March 2005)	

June/July 2005	
Follow-up to Nov 2004 evaluation. May require 1 day at BBK or may be conducted via phone or email.	
1 day write-up	
2 days at “Science Teaching & Learning” conference, Warwick (27-28 June 2005)	
Focus	Overview of whole project, continuation
Report	Recommendations on continuation Learning points for future projects
Report to SG (Sep 2005)	

*Will need to be agreed when a replacement External Evaluator is found.

External Assessment Evaluation (David O'Hare, CIAD/Derby)

4 Question: Have the assessments produced as part of the OLAAF project been designed to prioritise student learning?

Criteria

Assessments have been constructed according to principles outlined in the Assessment Construction Resources and Context Analysis; Evaluation of the assessments suggests that the impact of CBAF on student learning is positive.

Also a focus of:

End User Evaluations

Data sources and collection techniques

End-User Evaluations (assessments)
Computer-based assessments produced by project team

5 Question: Are the resource materials produced by the OLAAF project of high quality and do users find the materials useful? Are the materials accessible?

Criteria

The materials are well-researched and evidence-based where possible. The resources address an identified gap in available information on CBAF and therefore provide a key service to users. Feedback on the resource materials from both academic and support staff is positive; uptake of materials by staff occurs at participating institutions and beyond. Accessibility is prioritised as far as possible throughout the project (web site, printed materials, question authoring advice).

Also a focus of:

Internal Evaluation; End User Evaluations

Data sources and collection techniques

End-User Evaluations (materials) (includes Assessment Construction Resources Peer Review, when available)
Final Internal Evaluation (includes data on usage of materials, when available)

External Assessment Evaluation Schedule

August 2003	
1 day + 1 day at BBK	
1 day write-up	
Focus	Field Biology Assessments and evaluation Other assessments currently under development Context Analysis Tool and ACR End User Evaluations
Report	Recommendations to improve assessments Recommendations to develop ACR

August 2004	
1.5 days + 1 day at BBK	
1.5 day write-up	
Focus	Assessments delivered and evaluated to date Developments made to ACR in response to previous evaluation End User Evaluations
Report	Recommendations to improve assessments Recommendations to develop ACR

August 2005	
1.5 day + 1 day at BBK	
1.5 day write-up	
Focus	Embedding of CBAFs within modules Final version of ACR Final Internal Evaluation End User Evaluations
Report	Conclusions on utility, accessibility and quality of resources Conclusions on the effectiveness of the assessments in enhancing student learning. Recommendations for final resource CD

Final Internal Project Evaluation (OLAAF Project Team)

3 Question: Has the project stimulated computer-based assessment and feedback (CBAF) efforts within the OLAAF Network (i.e. at Partner Sites and Interest Group)?

Criteria

Evidence that OLAAF has stimulated CBAF activity at Network sites. Current users are continuing to develop their work, new users are becoming active, and potential users have been identified.

Question also a focus of:

Post-project Survey

Data sources and collection techniques

July 2005: Collate information from all network sites:
- Number of continuing users
- Number of new users
- Number of assessments developed
- Number of assessments delivered and to how many students
- Planned future developments

5 Question: Are the resource materials produced by the OLAAF project of high quality and do users find the materials useful? Are the materials accessible?

Criteria

The materials are well-researched and evidence-based where possible. The resources address an identified gap in available information on CBAF and therefore provide a key service to users. Feedback on the resource materials from both academic and support staff is positive; uptake of materials by staff occurs at participating institutions and beyond. Accessibility is prioritised as far as possible throughout the project (web site, printed materials, question authoring advice).

Question also a focus of:

External Assessment Evaluation; End User Evaluations

Data sources and collection techniques

End-User Evaluations (materials) (including Assessment Construction Resources Peer Review)
Data on usage of materials

Final Internal Project Evaluation Schedule

July 2005
ACR Peer Review data to be collected from ca. October 2004. To request other data from Sites from Spring 2005; collate and report in July 2005.

End User Evaluations

4 Question: Have the assessments produced as part of the OLAAF project been designed to prioritise student learning?

Criteria

Assessments have been constructed according to principles outlined in the Assessment Construction Resources; Evaluation of the assessments suggests that the impact of CBAF on student learning is positive.

Question also a focus of:

External Assessment Evaluation

Data sources and collection techniques

Feedback (surveys, focus groups) from student users of CBAF
Reports from teachers who have used the CBAF in their modules

5 Question: Are the resource materials produced by the OLAAF project of high quality and do users find the materials useful? Are the materials accessible?

Criteria

The materials are well-researched and evidence-based where possible. The resources address an identified gap in available information on CBAF and therefore provide a key service to users. Feedback on the resource materials from both academic and support staff is positive; uptake of materials by staff occurs at participating institutions and beyond. Accessibility is prioritised as far as possible throughout the project (web site, printed materials, question authoring advice).

Question also a focus of:

Internal Evaluation; External Assessment Evaluation

Data sources and collection techniques

External Assessment Evaluation Reports
Assessment Construction Resources Peer Review (by users external to the OLAAF project)

End User Evaluation Schedule

June 2005
ACR Peer Review data to be collected from ca. October 2004. Request other data from Sites in Spring 2005; collate June 2005 to permit the results to feed into External Assessment Evaluation (August 2005) and External Evaluation (July 2005)

Post-project Survey

3 Question: Has the project stimulated computer-based assessment and feedback (CBAF) efforts within the OLAAF Network (i.e. at Partner Sites and Interest Group)?

Criteria

Evidence that OLAAF has stimulated CBAF activity at Network sites. Current users are continuing to develop their work, new users are becoming active, and potential users have been identified.

Question also a focus of:

Internal Evaluation

Data sources and collection techniques

Survey of staff views
Web site data
Feedback and enquiries to web site

6 Question: Are the outcomes of the OLAAF project being effectively disseminated?

Criteria

An appropriate and effective dissemination plan is in place. Dissemination materials and events are perceived by participants to be constructive and promote their engagement in the project.

Question also a focus of:

External Project Evaluation

Data sources and collection techniques

Survey of staff views
Web site usage
Feedback and enquiries to web site

Reports

A post-project survey on the utility of the Resource CD and website.

Post-project Survey Schedule

August 2006
Circulate questionnaires in Spring/summer 2006. Collate and prepare report in August 2006.

Revisions to Evaluation Strategy/Plan

Owing to the various impediments encountered (loss of Project Manager; change in Brunel situation—so some planned evaluation activities cannot take place; loss of External Evaluator), a number of minor alterations have been made to the Evaluation Strategy.

A revised strategy document was prepared in August 2004. It was presented to the Steering Group in September 2004 and approved. Below, changes with respect to the original Evaluation Strategy are noted.

Internal Evaluation

In short, all activities previously termed "Internal Evaluation"—except one—have been removed from this revision. The exception is the "Final Internal Evaluation". This is described further below.

In the previous version, one class of evaluation was dubbed "Internal Evaluation". These evaluations were staged to occur at appropriate intervals throughout the project (usually preceding other evaluation activities and/or prior to Steering Group meetings). To minimise bureaucratic effort involved in producing bespoke reports on these ongoing evaluative activities, we have considered our Quarterly Reports to HEFCE to perform the function of these "Internal Evaluations". The Quarterly Reports are not explicitly described in this strategy document, but are assumed to be one of the data sources available for any of the defined evaluation activities. Thus, the term "internal evaluation" has been removed from this revision of the strategy.

One activity originally described as an "Internal Evaluation", however, differs substantially in form and content from these Quarterly Reports: the "**Final Internal Evaluation**". The Final Internal Evaluation (see p. 8) will assemble information that may indicate the impact of the project at the Partner Sites and Interest Group Sites. It will also include a report on Peer Review of the ACR that will indicate the quality of OLAAF's products. The data will be collated in June/July 2005. It will be included as part of the Final Report to HEFCE. A category, "Final Internal Evaluation", therefore remains in this revision of the document.

External Project Evaluation

There are no changes to the proposed methodology, data collection/sources, etc.

The schedule (p. 4) has necessarily been changed so that there is a single main evaluation to take place before the end of 2004. It is envisaged that the evaluator (to be named) will attend the 2nd OLAAF Conference in November where he/she will have an opportunity to meet all of the OLAAF members. A Report will be produced in time for the Spring 2005 Steering Group Meeting. A follow-up with the Evaluator would take place in early Summer 2005 to ensure that recommendations proposed in the Report had been followed through.

There are changes to the costs of the Evaluator resulting from the revisions: the overall cost will be less than that anticipated based on revision 1. The original budget was £5610; the current budget is for £3660. The reduction arises due to a lower estimated per diem charge by the evaluator and because there will be fewer total days devoted to attending OLAAF events.

External Assessment Evaluation

There are no changes to the proposed methodology, data collection/sources, etc.

The schedule (p. 4) has been changed so that the 2nd and 3rd evaluations both take place in August (of '04 and '05, respectively). This scheduling is more appropriate as it allows the evaluator to consider as much relevant information as possible.

There is an increase in the predicted cost. Having experience of the Aug 2003 evaluation and its time demands, we have re-calibrated the costings of Aug 2004 and Aug 2005 evaluations to reflect this. The original cost was £2630; the current budget is £3430 which is likely 10% above actual cost, including contingency funds.

The overall cost of BOTH evaluations is about £800 higher than was in the bid budget. We are able to cover this increase from contingency funds built in to the budget elsewhere.

End-User Evaluations

There have been minor changes here regarding some of the data sources and the timing of data collection so that the information will be available to feed into the revised schedules of the Assessment and Project Evaluations.

Post-Project Survey

No substantive changes. The collation of data and reporting has been moved to August (from July) to permit any input that might arise from the CAA Conference in 2006, which likely will be held in July.

Document composed by Dr Richard Rayne, Birkbeck, University of London
(contributions from Dr Glenn Baggott, Jenny Phillips Dave O'Hare, Joanna Bull).

For more information about the OLAAF project, see http://www.bbk.ac.uk/olaaf/

OLAAF Project External Assessment Evaluation

Dr Dave O'Hare, CIAD (University of Derby)

Date of visit: 20 August 2004 (scheduled)

Scope of Task and Materials Provided

Similar to last year's evaluation, based you your perusal of the supplied materials and on your discussions with us on the day of your visit, we would like to receive feedback relating to the following over-arching questions:

1. **Have the assessments designed as part of the OLAAF been project designed to prioritise student learning?**

   Criteria
   Assessments have been constructed according to principles outlined in the Assessment Construction Resources; evaluation of the assessments suggests that the impact of the CBAF on student learning is positive.

2. **Are the materials produced by the OLAAF project of high quality and do users find the materials useful? Are the materials accessible?**

   Criteria
   The materials are well-researched and evidence-based where possible. The resources address an identified gap in available information on CBAF and therefore provide a key service to users. Feedback on the resource materials from both academic and support staff is positive; uptake of materials by staff occurs at participating institutions and beyond. Accessibility is prioritised as far as possible throughout the project (web site, printed materials, question authoring advice).

More particularly, we would like you to focus on the following:

CD1: Statistics for Biologists

This CD contains the **feedback version of the Week 12 TRIADS test** and relevant static course materials. A (printed) **module schedule** is provided (it has each week's content on the front page); this should give you a view of the scope and structure of the module. In short, the Week 12 TRIADS test was a precursor to the unseen theory exam which was to be held about 2 months later (it was held in May 2004). The test you have on CD contains similar items and was supplied as a post-test tutorial. Also included (printed) is a **course description form** and the **handout** provided during the TRIADS test.

Key questions that we would ask you to consider:

Is the design of the TRIADS tutorial congruent with the assessment strategy for the module? Is its deployment likely to be effective in supporting student learning?

CD2: Field Biology

This CD contains all of the learning materials supplied to students on the *Field Biology* module. The **UNIT BOOKLET** under "Learning Resources" is a PDF containing sections describing the structure of the course and the schedule of assessment (and a lot more!).

For the most part, we would like to steer your attention to the **TUTORIALS**. (The Self-Tests have the same items, but contain no tutorial/feedback material.)

You may recall that last year one of your tasks was to examine the *Field Biology* materials. One of your recommendations was that the tutorials should indicate the learning outcomes; **choose** any of the tutorials to see that this has been done.

You will notice that many of the materials are marked as "NEW!". These labels have been placed to indicate materials that did not appear on the penultimate CD. (Students received one CD before the field course that contained some of the materials; they received this CD while they were on the field course.)

Select any of the tutorials that are NOT marked as "New". These have been substantially modified since last year. One notable addition: feedback contains references to sources of reading that may be consulted.

Key questions that we would ask you to consider:

Have we taken on board your recommendations from last year in the way you intended? Do the CBA materials on the CD represent useful learning activities, prioritised to promote student learning?

CD3: Geochemistry and Numeracy Tests

Two pieces, geology.exe and Question 10 Homework1.exe, contain TRIADS items "translated" from existing paper-based materials that have been used in Earth Sciences BSc programmes here at Birkbeck. (This explains the non-sequential numbering of the questions; the labels relate to items that appear in particular paper-based homework sets.) These will be deployed to students for the first time in the Autumn (2004). Some of the students will be undertaking a distance-learning programme in geology; others will undertake a "face-to-face" version of the same course. All of the course materials for both modes of delivery are supplied on CD. It is intended that the TRIADS materials will likewise be supplied this way.

Key questions that we would ask you to consider:

You will note that we have adopted a new screen layout and behaviour for these items. Could you comment on the utility and usability of these developments? Do you have any suggestions on use of alternative question styles that might be used for any of the items?

The third piece on this CD is a test designed for nursing students at University of Brighton. It is intended to provide the opportunity for practice in performing the calculations needed to deliver appropriate doses of drugs. It was piloted this year (2003-2004) and it is planned to deploy this again in the coming academic year. It has been delivered via the web.

Perhaps you can consider the overall structure of this tutorial/test and comment on the use of randomisation, etc.

On the day of the visit

In addition to discussing your responses to the above, we have a couple of new things to show you. We are developing tutorials/tests to support students (at Brunel and Birkbeck) in learning basics of **genetics**. Several templates are in development; we would like to show you one of these and perhaps brainstorm a little on others. We also have been working on assessments to be used at the **British School of Osteopathy**. Here, one of the goals is to design computer-based tutorials/tests in which students have to apply their knowledge to a particular case, capturing a patient history and making a diagnosis(es). We would like to discuss the approaches that one might take in creating such a tutorial/test, as we feel the current version has significant flaws.

Reporting

We will supply you with a copy of last year's report (see OHare_2003-Report_final.doc). It seems sensible to follow approximately the same format. We need to have the report in time to include it in the Annual Report which needs to be written before the next Steering Group meeting; this is likely to take place on 23 September 2004.

--Dick Rayne
OLAAF Project Director
13 August 2004

Appendix 10

OnLine Assessment and Feedback (OLAAF) Project Plan for Year 3

Phase 3* (Oct 2004 – Sep 2005)

Key Outcomes (milestones indicated by ∇)

- Prepare a Continuation Strategy.
- Develop materials for Resources CD derived from Partner and Target Sites' products.
  - case studies; question/assessment banks; image banks

	Who**	Start	Finish	✓
Project Team Activities				
• Embedding and student evaluation of refined CBAF's at sites (semesters 1 & 2, second iteration)	PD/ SL	Oct 04	Mar 05	
• Alpha-stage specification of Assessment Construction Resources (ACR) CD content ∇	PD/ SL	Nov 04	Mar 05	
• Processing of student evaluations	PD/ SL	Oct 04	Jun 05	
• Preparations for further publication	PD/ SL	Oct 04	Jun 05	
• Finalising continuation plans	PD/ SL		Jun 05	
• Final Annual Progress Report to NCT	PD		30 Sep 05	
Dissemination				
• OLAAF Interest Group				
○ Target and Partner Sites define CD content and structure (includes Case Studies)	IG	Nov 04	April 05	
○ National conference: OLAAF2 (London) ∇	PD / SL / IG		Nov 04	
• National event: "Assessment in Science Teaching: Technological Solutions?" (Loughborough). Co-sponsored by FAST, PPLATO and HE Academy Physical Sciences Centre	PD to organise		Dec 04	
• Beta stage ACR materials available on web site	PD / SL / IG	Jan 05	May 05	
• Report results at National "Science Learning and Teaching Conference" (Warwick), co-sponsored by OLAAF and other FDTL projects in conjunction with HE Academy Subject Centres	PD to organise		Jun 05	
• Report results at International CAA Conference	PD / SL / IG		Jul 05	
• Release version of Resource CD (ACR, Case Studies, CBAF exemplars) ∇	PD/ SL		Aug 05	

*"Phase 3" was originally defined in the Stage 2 OLAAF grant proposal. A preliminary version of this plan appeared in the Year 2 Annual Report. Some finish dates have been slightly modified herein to take account of circumstances and some of the activities have been slightly re-cast to more accurately reflect the nature of the activity and/or because of changes to our nomenclature of events, etc. Several new activities have been added.
**PD = Project Director; SL = Site Leaders; IG = Interest Group

Evaluation				
• External Evaluation: to evaluate project management; to assess the dissemination of the deliverables; to review the publication activities; to review the relationship between dissemination and continuation activities. Target: initiate evaluation by Dec 04; follow-up 3 to 6 months later.	To be Appointed	Dec 04	Jun 05	
• 2nd Internal Project Evaluation: to review delivery of outcomes and to finalise continuation plans (to be undertaken at Site Leader meeting)	PD /SL		May 05	
• 3rd External Assessment Evaluation: to assess the functionality of the final assessments; to evaluate the beta version of the Resources CD	D. O'Hare		Aug 05	
Steering Group				
• 4th meeting	SG		Mar 05	
• 5th meeting	SG		Sep 05	

Continuation Phase (beyond Sept 2005)

	Who*	Start	Finish	✓
Dissemination				
• Workshops by former Project Team and OLAAF Users	All			
• Website with up-to-date contacts	Hosted on Birkbeck Site			
• Publications	All			
Evaluation				
• Post-project survey of utility of Resource CD and website	PD		Jul 06	

**PD = Project Director; SL = Site Leaders; IG = Interest Group

Appendix 11: Planned and currently projected expenditure over the 3-year term of the OLAAF project

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Cumulative Totals		
	Original	**Current**	**Diff**	**Original**	**Current**	**Diff**	**Original**	**Current**	**Diff**	**Original Total**	**Current Total**	**Diff**
Staff	63990	51969	**12021**	76153	65866	**10287**	38413	60721	**-22308**	178556	178556	**0**
Travel/Subsistence	2700	2370	**330**	5800	3373	**2427**	5300	8119	**-2819**	13800	13803	**-62**
Dissemination	14050	8937*	**5113**	9300	5344	**3956**	8700	17769	**-9069**	32050	32050	**0**
Evaluation	700	840	**-140**	2800	1200	**1600**	2800	4262	**-1462**	6300	6302	**-2**
Equipment	9700	9635	**65**	0	0	**0**	0	0	**0**	9700	9635	**65**
Other Costs	4950	5205	**-255**	2500	2491	**9**	2100	1855	**245**	9550	9551	**-1**
Total	96090	78549	**17134**	96553	78274	**18279**	57313	92726	**-35413**	249956	249897	**0**

"Original" refers to the sum specified in the OLAAF Project bid. "Current" refers to the actual expenditure (year 1 and 2) or projected expenditure (year 3).
"Diff" is the difference between original and current; ***positive*** numbers represent an underspend ("surplus") relative to the budgeted sum, while ***negative*** numbers indicate an overspend. Despite changes to the ***rate*** of expenditure vs. the original plan, the cumulative difference is 0, indicating that the overall expenditure is unchanged.

*This was reported in Year 1 as 8530. The smaller figure was based on the financial statement obtained ca. 6 days before the report was finalised. A subsequent statement revealed the higher figure.