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What’s in this presentation?

Evaluation as professional development

Assessment as an evaluation instrument

Assessment as an evaluative tool that can be used as part of our professional development
The idea of evaluation revisited

“The idea of evaluation revisited

“Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the worth or merit of some object” (Trochim, 2006a)

Who’s evaluating what for whom?
Evaluation means different things…

Who’s evaluating what for whom?

My manager is evaluating my program (and me) for whatever (I pretend) I don’t exactly know.

I am evaluating my own program for…

• Myself (pedagogical effectiveness and professional development)
• My students (pedagogical effectiveness and educational accountability)
• My stakeholders and management (educational and administrative accountability)
What and how have we been evaluating?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of planning and evaluation</th>
<th>Logistics and administration</th>
<th>Coverage and outreach</th>
<th>Relevance to students’ needs and interests</th>
<th>Students’ reactions and perceived learning</th>
<th>Relevance of the learning and teaching to the learning outcomes</th>
<th>Students’ learning and skills development</th>
<th>Transferability of the knowledge and skills taught</th>
<th>Students’ application of the knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Relevance of the learning and teaching to their contexts</th>
<th>Long-term impacts of the learning and teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Is the administration and logistics of the program feasible, effective and sustainable?</td>
<td>Was the program accessible and equitable for students, and was it attended/accessed by students?</td>
<td>Was the program relevant to students’ needs and interests?</td>
<td>Did the students like the program and/or find it useful for their learning?</td>
<td>Is the program aligned with the learning outcomes?</td>
<td>Did the program achieve what was set out as the learning outcomes of the program?</td>
<td>How does the program contribute to students’ authentic learning experience outside the program?</td>
<td>Did students recognise the relevance of the skills learnt and apply in their authentic learning experience outside the program?</td>
<td>Is the program aligned with the course outcomes and attributes, such as Graduate Attributes?</td>
<td>How did the program impact on the students’ outcomes in the course, and beyond university?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The full size framework can be found at the end of this presentation.
An example…

An undergraduate unit run in a technical discipline to prepare the students for professional practice

Students are given at least six formative opportunities to deliver some sort of presentations in class throughout the semester

Two of the above are assessed mid-semester (individual) and at the end of the semester (group), however using the similar marking criteria
So what does this tell us? (Take 1)
So what does this tell us? (Take 2)
And what do we learn from it?

Varying narratives with varying evidence

Importance of evaluative thinking and process, not always the outcomes

Transforming the invisible *praxis* into visible *metis*

Breaking/dissolution of the traditional epistemic barriers
Conclusion

Evaluation as professional development, i.e. something that can be more central to our practice

Evaluative narratives with varying evidence – an important skill to develop further for the practitioners

Evaluation for research vs. professional practice???
# A Conceptual Framework for the Online Evaluation Toolkit (ver. 4.1) [2014]

Created by Leanne McCann and Noriaki Sato, as part of the Evaluation Project, Monash University Library, based on the Kirkpatrick’s model of evaluation, and adapted from the Rugby Team Impact Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of planning and evaluation</th>
<th>Content choice and organisation – What to teach</th>
<th>Teaching material and resources – What to use</th>
<th>Teaching environment and facilities – Where to teach</th>
<th>Teachers’ involvement – How to engage</th>
<th>Modality – How to deliver?</th>
<th>Assessment and feedback – How to measure?</th>
<th>The program as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics and administration</td>
<td>Was the content included available, accessible and equitable to students?</td>
<td>Was the provision of the teaching material and resources available?</td>
<td>Was the environment and facilities provided accessible and equitable?</td>
<td>Was the involvement of the teacher feasible, effective and sustainable?</td>
<td>Is the modality of learning and teaching sustainable in terms of delivery and administration for the practitioners?</td>
<td>Was the assessment available, accessible and equitable to everyone in class?</td>
<td>Was the program accessible and equitable for students, and was it attended/accessed by students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Coverage and outreach</td>
<td>Relevance to students’ needs and interests</td>
<td>Students’ reactions and perceived learning</td>
<td>Reliability of the learning and teaching to the learning outcomes</td>
<td>How did the content and sequencing address the learning outcomes?</td>
<td>How does the environment and facilities align with the learning outcomes?</td>
<td>How does each assessment task address the learning outcomes, and how do they generate feedback for students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Students’ learning and skills development</td>
<td>Students’ learning and skills development</td>
<td>Students’ application of the knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Transferability of the knowledge and skills taught</td>
<td>How did the content of, and apply the knowledge and skills included in the content, as articulated in the learning outcomes?</td>
<td>How does the environment and facilities support students’ learning, taking part of the students’ learning experience?</td>
<td>Did the program achieve what was set out as the learning outcomes of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Students’ learning and skills development</td>
<td>Students’ learning and skills development</td>
<td>Students’ application of the knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Relevance of the learning and teaching to their contexts</td>
<td>How are the teaching materials and resources aligned with the course outcomes and other attributes, such as Graduate Attributes?</td>
<td>How is the environment and facilities relevant and consistent with the course outcomes and other attributes, such as Graduate Attributes?</td>
<td>Is the program aligned with the course outcomes and attributes, such as Graduate Attributes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Students’ application of the knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Students’ application of the knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Relevance of the learning and teaching to their contexts</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>How did the specific content impact on the students’ outcomes in the course, and beyond university?</td>
<td>How is the involvement of, and apply the knowledge and skills learnt through the modality of learning and teaching in their authentic learning experience outside class?</td>
<td>How did the program impact on the students’ outcomes in the course, and beyond university?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The framework includes questions related to various aspects of the learning and teaching process, such as content provision, resource availability, environmental support, teacher engagement, modality, and feedback mechanisms.
- It assesses the alignment of the program with course outcomes and attributes, as well as the relevance of the skills learnt and applied in authentic learning environments.
- The framework emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to evaluation, considering both subjective and objective measures.
- It highlights the importance of feedback, both formative and summative, for continuous improvement and student engagement.

**Figures:**
- Diagrams and flowcharts illustrating the conceptual framework and its components.
- Tables and matrices for data collection and analysis.
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# A Summary of Selected Methods for Practical Evaluation of the Teaching and Learning Program (Ver. 1.0) [2014]

Created by Leanne McCann and Noriaki Sato, as part of the Evaluation Project, Monash University Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of evaluation</th>
<th>Aspects of evaluation</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Advantages (✓) and disadvantages (✗)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All                  | All listed below      | Qualitative | Unobtrusive methods | Structured observation and questions/feedback | ✓ Personal and rich information unobtainable from other means 
✗ Not consistent 
✗ Not representative of all students/staff 
✗ Often participants are not anonymous 
✗ Requires the teacher to be experienced to maximise the benefit |
| Infrastructure       | Effectiveness and efficiency of infrastructure | Quantitative | Structured monitoring of statistics | Usage, access and attendance statistics | ✓ Participants can be anonymous 
✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✓ Utilised effectively as supporting evidence for other data 
✗ Depends on the integrity of data collection 
✗ Prone to misinterpretation and misrepresentation without appropriate contexts |
| Perception           | Satisfaction on the program | Quantitative | Survey | Questionnaire | ✓ Participants can be anonymous 
✓ Easy to manage and administer 
✗ Need a full or very high completion rate 
✗ Generally low incentive for completion, especially with other surveys conducted separately 
✗ Results potentially influenced by the participants’ moods and other circumstantial factors 
✉ Timing of submission may also affect the results – Cf. engagement vs. perceived learning 
✖ Impact not assessable |
|                      | Confidence level and perceived learning at the end of the program | Quantitative | Survey | Questionnaire | ✓ Participants can be anonymous 
✓ Easily manageable and administered 
✗ Need a full or very high completion rate at both submissions 
✗ Generally low incentive for completion, especially with other surveys conducted separately 
✗ Results potentially influenced by the participants’ moods and other circumstantial factors 
✗ Timing of submission may also affect the results – Cf. engagement vs. perceived learning |
|                      | The program’s impact on confidence and perceived learning | Quantitative | Pre- and post-surveys | Questionnaires | ✓ Participants can be anonymous 
✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✗ Need a full or very high completion rate at both submissions 
✗ Generally low incentive for completion, especially with other surveys conducted separately 
✗ Results potentially influenced by the participants’ moods and other circumstantial factors 
✗ Timing of submission may also affect the results – Cf. engagement vs. perceived learning |
|                      | All of the above three aspects in regards to perception | Qualitative | Survey | Questionnaire | ✓ Participants can be anonymous 
✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✗ Need a full or very high completion rate at both submissions 
✗ Generally low incentive for completion, especially with other surveys conducted separately; hence not representative of all students/staff 
✗ Results potentially influenced by the participants’ moods and other circumstantial factors 
✗ Timing of submission may also affect the results – Cf. engagement vs. perceived learning |
| Learning             | Level of competence at the end of the program | Quantitative | Summative assessment task | Test/in-class task and activity | ✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✓ Generally high incentive for completion as an assessment task 
✿ Assessor may need training 
✘ Requires a considered approach to devising rubrics/criteria/MCQs 
❄ Impact not assessable |
|                      | Impact on students’ learning | Quantitative | Diagnostic task followed by summative assessment task | Tests/in-class tasks and activities | ✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✓ Generally high incentive for completion as part of the program 
✿ Involves a considered approach to the designing of these tasks and feedback mechanisms 
✿ May require the teacher’s familiarity with the concept 
❄ The purpose of the diagnostics needs to be communicated well to students 
✘ Timing of administration needs to be considered 
❄ External variables need to be considered depending on the length and frequency of the program |
| Behaviour            | Level of application at the end of the program | Quantitative | Formative assessment task | Assignment task/in-class task and activity | ✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✓ Generally high incentive for completion, especially as an assessment task 
✿ Involves a considered approach to the designing of these tasks and feedback mechanisms 
✿ Assessor may need training 
❄ Marking needs to be consistent using the rubrics/criteria/descriptors 
❄ External variables need to be considered |
|                      | Impact on students’ ability to apply the learnt content | Quantitative | Pre- and post-formative assessment tasks | Assignment tasks/in-class tasks and activities | ✓ Relatively easy to manage and administer 
✓ Generally high incentive for completion, especially as an assessment task 
✿ Involves a considered approach to the designing of these tasks and feedback mechanisms 
✿ Assessor may need training 
❄ Marking needs to be consistent using the same rubrics/criteria/descriptors 
❄ External variables need to be considered |