

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG
DISTRIBUTIVE LEADERSHIP PROJECT:
2007 ASSESSMENT ROUNDTABLE
EVALUATION REPORT (N=25)

APA citation for this report: University of Wollongong (2007). *University of Wollongong, Distributive Leadership Project: 2007 assessment roundtable evaluation report*. Wollongong: University of Wollongong.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The assessment roundtable met my expectations	40% (10)	48% (12)	8% (2)	4% (1)	
The sessions were useful in facilitating discussion on a range of issues to do with assessment of learning within universities	64% (16)	28% (7)	8% (2)		
Time was managed effectively	60% (15)	36% (9)	4% (1)		
The contributions of the participants was facilitated effectively ¹	60% (15)	28% (7)	4% (1)	4% (1)	

How useful were each of the sessions?

Session	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very ineffective
Keynote: <i>Great designs: What should assessment do?</i> Presented by David Boud.	60% (15)	32% (8)	8% (2)		
Group 1: Project presentations	76% (19)	24% (6)			
Group 2: Project presentations	76% (19)	24% (6)			
Poster presentations ²	32% (8)	28% (7)	32% (8)		
Identification and synthesis of key challenges for assessment in Century 21	32% (8)	56% (14)	8% (2)	4% (1)	
Small group discussion of the challenges and questions arising out of the Keynote and project presentations	52% (13)	40% (10)	4% (1)	4% (1)	
Sharing the outcomes – Report back by each of the discussion groups	56% (14)	40% (10)		4% (1)	
Future directions ³	20% (5)	40% (10)	12% (3)		4% (1)

What aspects of the roundtable were you most satisfied with or did you find most useful?

- Meeting others in similar situations.

¹ 1 respondent did not answer this question (i.e. 4% of the cohort)

² 2 respondents did not rate this session (i.e. 8% of the cohort)

³ 6 respondents did not rate this session (i.e. 24% of the cohort)

- Hearing about developments, initiatives at other universities.
- Sharing across disciplines – shared issues.
- Group presentations.
- The stepping back in examples to see patterns and underlying questions and issues.
- The details of the projects – especially the ways they seem to fit together.
- Keynote, short presentations, discussion.
- All useful, relevant, well organised.
- Sharing ideas, discussion of issues and potential solutions and networking.
- Project presentations.
- Small and large group discussions.
- The discussion on the range of assessment related perspectives was revitalising. The opportunity for such involvement is the type of professional development that underscores change.
- Group discussions when these were well facilitated and managed.
- Presentations from inspiring people – some more useful than others but this is a subjective issue.
- Interesting presentations especially David Boud.
- The individual presentations by each scholar/fellow.
- The entire session was exciting, energetic and vibrant. A great credit to the organisers and a good 'promotion' of the Carrick Institute, if all projects are as dynamic as this – WOW!!
- Opportunity to meet others interested in assessment.
- Listening to diverse range of perspectives.
- Participation and meeting others; networking.
- I really appreciated the words of wisdom from senior academics and policy makers (such as Erica McWilliam). I really need some of that political and experiential nous that is available from people who understand how higher education and the schools and disciplines really work.
- Small group feedback.
- Hearing details of all the projects and sharing my project with others.
- Feedback on the whole project.
- Ideas for the future.
- To hear the other scholars updates on their project.
- Good to have time to reflect on assessment.
- Getting people together.
- Meeting people and talking in groups and individually.

- So pleased everyone engaged – scholars/fellows and “expert” invitees. Particularly appreciated David Boud’s insights (from small group discussions).

What aspects of the roundtable do you believe could have been improved? How might these aspects have been improved?

- Time was very compressed.
- Presentations were rushed.
- Big picture ‘assessment’ issues eg culture changes, relevant assessment etc – issues very similar but broad – not necessarily an aspect to be ‘improved’ learnt on observation. Perhaps an explanation that I am unsure about whether my expectations were met.
- The focus was often wider than ‘assessment’ and therefore I wasn’t sure where we were going in discussion. This isn’t necessarily a bad thing.
- A session on specific assessment tasks or suites of tasks as illustrations and reference points for discussion.
- Shorter presentation – many were too rushed.
- A greater focus on assessment; too many general issues were brought into the discussions.
- Small group discussions needed to be in separate space. Difficult to maintain the discussion over general room noise for the full hour.
- Briefing small group discussion facilitators so they kept to task.
- Too many presentations (each too short).
- Limited opportunity to move beyond feedback of group discussions to discussion of complexities.
- Can’t think of any.
- Opportunity for scholars to get direct feedback. Perhaps question time after each presentation. Also comments and peer review.
- As often happens some presentations target the tight time frame that they have been allocated. Sadly they seem relatively immune to the signals and hints from their fellow presenters and the time keeper. Perhaps all presenters should have been required to “rehearse” their presentation and encouraged to reduce the amount of content that they are attempting to deliver.
- More time for presentations and networking.
- Little too much packed into the day.
- More opportunity for discussion/feedback on our individual project – future directions related to these and possible collaborations. I don’t know how – there hasn’t been time for this in the one day program.

Will you consider collaborating with participants you have met at the Roundtable? If so, what forms of collaboration would you consider?

- Yes. Perhaps in relation to graduate attributes (development of, embedding of) and curriculum issues – eg integrated curriculum.
- Yes, especially in relation to graduate qualities.
- Yes – conversation, action research.
- Yes, cross faculty, cross institutional
- Yes. Share ideas, benchmark, work in a joint project.
- Yes. Graduate attribute (GA) embedding; development of skills that demonstrate GA achievement; explicit communication of the learning path to achieve GA progressively through a degree ...
- Yes. Further discussion and refinement of several aspects of teaching/learning is important especially progressing professional development in assessment and its relationship to graduate qualities/attributes.
- Yes – further contact/discussion or collaboration on issues of common interest.
- Yes. Investigate approached to reflective practice in same discipline across institutions.
- Yes for sure – cross Tasman projects.
- Yes! “Perhaps” consider putting in a cross-institutional Carrick Grant or at least comparing notes on strategies being employed.
- Yes. I will collaborate with fellows and scholars of the cascade institutions. Just meeting face to face and exchange business cards is a good start. In addition I have met at least one person with whom I would share resources. Perhaps I can see a future collaboration grant with two of these organisations.
- Yes – collaborative projects. Speaking (as suggested by Rebecca)
- Networking has been minimally possible and meant I have briefly met with 1 or 2 people who at least now know of me and my work.
- Yes, joint work with others.
- Yes – strongly.
- Yes possible Grant.
- Yes – possibility of cross-disciplinary collaboration – as well as intra-disciplinary – on topics of common interest in assessment.

Any further comments.

- Could I please have a copy of David’s PowerPoint from his presentation?
- Well done all.
- Well done.
- Possibly some time spent on description of examples of well designed assessments for specific situations (eg practicum etc) that speakers worked in – rather than assuming that all participants understood what they are and their benefits.

- Academics need to have a sound understanding of the theories/models/strategies that are foundational to assessment. This is the pre-requisite to moving assessment from a measurement of outcomes to understanding of learning as appropriate to participating and contributing to real world contexts.
- How do we move forward?
- Well done to all organisers and all presenters. I learned a lot and feel energised.
- The day ran very smoothly. I'd like to see program expanded to recognise other staff within school/uni to 'get on board'. Logistically I don't know how that would happen – but should be explored.
- It was great to see the fellows and scholars work together as a team. I was concerned that we may have tried to cram too much into one day, but in the end it seemed that the day was well paced.
- Thank you.