The OnLine Assessment and Feedback Project

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.

Copyright: The OLAAF Project, 2004

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/