

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG
DISTRIBUTIVE LEADERSHIP PROJECT:
2008 ASSESSMENT ROUNDTABLE
EVALUATION SUMMARY (N=44)

APA citation for this report: University of Wollongong (2008). *University of Wollongong, Distributive Leadership Project: 2008 assessment roundtable evaluation report*. Wollongong: University of Wollongong.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
The assessment roundtable met my expectations	24 (55%)	15 (34%)				5 (11%)
The sessions were useful in facilitating discussion on a range of issues to do with assessment of learning within universities	28 (64%)	11 (25%)				5 (11%)
There were adequate opportunities for me to contribute	29 (66%)	10 (23%)				5 (11%)
Time was managed effectively	31 (71%)	8 (18%)				5 (11%)
The contributions of the participants was facilitated effectively	25 (57%)	14 (32%)				5 (11%)

How useful were each of the sessions?

Session	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very ineffective	No Response
World Café – 1 st presentation	34 (77%)	8 (18%)				2 (5%)
World Café – 2 nd presentation	31 (71%)	11 (25%)				2 (5%)

Comments:

- Worked extremely well. Very valuable.
- Very open lively interaction – some very good ideas.
- Seemed to work but I wasn't in a group.
- This was a great way for setting the scene for the rest of the day. The discussion was lively and active. I was a little intimidated by the knowledge expertise at the table.
- Great way to get issues out – doesn't limit the discussion questions worked really well.
- Lots of good ideas – standpoints were valuable – not unrelenting idea/issue – ability to apply to particular units.
- Brilliant! Interactive, refreshing!
- Excellent forum for discussion. Good timing avoiding stagnation.
- Very interesting discussion and well processed.
- It is difficult to get academics to focus on a task in such a short time because they just don't get the opportunity to discuss teaching and learning and assessment much so – a bit drifty.

- Questions were very general and the movement between questions meant that the outcomes were predictable motherhood statements.
- Really good engagement. Great ideas. I will use this technique with staff in departments. Excellent!
- Could do with a synthesis after second session.
- The topics were well chosen.
- Very useful session – good discussion great ice breaker. Reaffirming in many instances.
- Excellent session – engaging, focussed and worthwhile.
- 2nd session tended to be repetitive of first – possibly a more controversial second question would have gone further.
- I will use if with policy students.
- Good discussion and some useable outcomes.
- Very useful. It allowed different perspectives to be made explicit.
- First session got a little off track from “assessment’ per se, but did come up wit clear themes, second session produced definite strategies.
- I like this formula
- An excellent process in pooling ideas together. A collaborative event which should lead to excellent outcomes.
- Affective ice breaker and opportunity to doucs on the key themes for the day.
- A great way to meet different people and generate ideas. Facilitation was terrific.
- A good fun exercise that was equally about meeting other people as well as identifying the issues Maybe that was one of the objectives? I think I will change my rating
- These served as bonding sessions – sharing issues and solutions – friendly with laughter. I don’t think they achieved much more than this.
- I tend to judge by ideas that I have not previously encountered. Solid value.
- Bit difficult to get agreement on first question which made second question difficult to address. Stimulating conversation however.
- Well facilitated – lots of knowledgeable people with interesting things to say.
- This was a great way of generating discussion and sharing ideas. It also ‘exposed’ the Scholars to a wide audience and allowed them to develop and display their skills in group facilitation.

Session	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very ineffective	No Response
Poster presentations	18 (41%)	18 (41%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)		4 (9%)

Comments:

- Generated good discussions and networking opportunities.
- I had some good discussions with invitees.
- Hmmmm – not sure. Hard to measure how useful it was to others who only need the posters.
- This appeared to be a great way to get individual feedback in the projects. It was a bit noisy though to chat about your project with influential delegates.
- Posters were made a bit early to include much data. Ended up taking about generalities.
- Did not get much feedback, though perhaps silence is consent? Did get some feedback which was reasonable – to some extent I was tested but not as much as I had hoped.
- People tended to stand around talking about other matters and not move on to other posters – didn’t get as many through as would have liked.

- Hard to get around all the posters.
- Well organised interesting.
- A speed dating approach might have helped. Could only get to talk to one or two as the others were corralled.
- I would like to have had an overview of the themes and how the projects fitted in.
- Good to have direct discussions.
- Good networking opportunity.
- Didn't get to read them in detail – spent my time talking to a small number of very interesting people. Session great, posters not my main focus.
- Good for networking and a chance to talk to scholars about their work but numbers certainly made some of this discussion difficult.
- Good informal way for scholars to discuss ideas.
- Hard to engage with all presenters logistically.
- Gave us a wide view of novel approaches.
- I find it difficult to engage in poster presentations – too much info and not enough time to explore in depth. I'd rather prefer a brief introduction followed by time to read posters in smaller time slots.
- Some posters a little too detailed to absorb, but conversations with presenters, etc were valuable.
- Well organised. Lots of opportunities to ask questions. Leaders enthusiastic and willing to discover and elaborate on their research projects.
- Very good opportunity to chat to the Scholars about their projects.
- Interesting.
- Probably a bit cramped trying to chat near posters while being confined by the tables. But great to talk to project heads.
- Two or three very, very new to me – excellent.
- A number of posters facilitated a manageable activity for number of participants and time. Got to talk in depth on topics of interest.
- It was great to be able to survey a lot of project before forming thematic groups.
- This provided a great opportunity to talk to particular Scholars and often interested roundtable participants. It is great to be able to ask the Scholars particular questions and sharing ideas.

Session	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very ineffective	No Response
Thematic group discussions – 1 st presentation	24 (55%)	15 (34%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)		2 (5%)
Thematic group discussions – 2 nd presentation	23 (52%)	14 (32%)	2 (5%)			5 (11%)

Comments:

- Best discussion in the smaller 2nd presentation.
- This was fantastic! So many great ideas discussed. Great to hear about the experience of others.
- Lots of fun!
- It was well run and interactive.
- Really should have had separate rooms – and more structured opportunities for contribution.
- Be careful to avoid dominating contributors.

- Groups a bit large and tasks a little bit park
- Well planned and useful.
- Both the hypothetical and the analysing of an existing subject outline were very useful.
- Found timing a bit long – repetition of discussion.
- These were more focussed on real issues related to assessment.
- Innovative, productive, engaging.
- Good discussions – not sure about any consensus. This was made much clearer at plenary.
- 2nd presentation: the facilitator and one person dominated.
- Difficulty of 3 large groups in one room noise level made participation in group discussion difficult. Groups with a ‘stimulation task’ seemed to generate discussion better.
- Good sessions.
- This stimulated useful discussion especially for scholars I would expect.
- Difficult to do in 1 room – some groups very noisy. Alignment well done with concrete activities and participation.
- 1. Sustainable assessment: questions for discussion were set forth but not run through methodically therefore discussion strayed/got bogged down a bit. 2. Cultural and attitudinal factors: Outstandingly done – excellent scenarios and ideas well-captured by scribe.
- ‘Circle’ formula didn’t work so well in this room I felt people were a bit too spread out.
- Extremely well lead. Lots of ideas relating to assessment explored.
- Preferred the interactive approach used by the ‘alignment’ team.
- Role play was very engaging and gave me many useful ideas to take back to my university.
- The alignment discussion was anecdotal as opposed to evidence based. This is only a minor criticism as both discussions were good value.
- Difficult to hear in the size of the group (1st Group).
- Some good discussion strategies for assessment at an institutional and program level.
- As for World café - Bit difficult to get agreement on question. Stimulating conversation however.
- Good input from everyone in the group.
- Both of mine were engaging, interesting, authentic and very hard work. They made my brain hurt!!! It might have been good to have had separate rooms as, at times, it was hard to hear or think.

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

- World café! Poster sessions. Discussion – focussed. Much better than having “presentations”.
- Benefited from the diverse ideas shared by invitees.
- Good sharing of roles and responsibilities. Much talk and involvement in discussions (by guests) great job – Alison, Steve, Liz, Matt and Lizzie for summaries.
- Format was a great way of developing ideas as opposed to show and tell.
- Practice my scholarship skills. Provide ‘culmination’ to project.
- Validation of teaching practices. Modelled good teaching – interactive participation. Not crudely ideological (for most part) eg “exams are bad full stop. Examiners are bad people.” Validation of my research project aims and methods.
- Meeting like minded academics from other institutions.
- The 10 commandments, catching up with Holly ☺
- Found it emphasised interactions so much.
- Cohesion of group and enthusiasm.

- Networking.
- Tasks were provocative.
- Networking, exchange of ideas/strategies.
- Opportunity to talk to others. Morning discussions.
- Clever planning, which avoided a common trap with such days of descriptive presentations AND also avoided the equally common 'talk-fest' of forums.
- Focused strategies.
- As usual, network, discussion common issues and varied approaches. Sharing – knowledge exchange.
- The afternoon sessions around themes led to an effective discussion of critical issues.
- It really was excellent in total. You have 7-8 hours in which to achieve something – you can't change the world. It was splendid.
- Great chance to meet folks who are stimulated and stimulating. Really good to be involved and interactive.
- Again topics and scenarios were well selected.
- World café however all group discussion sessions were useful and interesting.
- Networking.
- Engaging with a range of different ideas but with a high level of commonality of issues.
- The discussion of issues of amusement and possible approaches that could be useful in my university.
- Discussion alignment.
- Really was participating and engaging, rather than just a series of presentations. Ran to time!
- Highly interactive process and spirit of generosity.
- Able to share our understandings.
- Opportunity to meet the Scholars. Overall discussion on hot topics, practices.
- Diversity of participants was great for gathering different perspectives.
- Meeting and speaking with the Scholars. Learning about the projects. Speaking with a group of "like-minded" academics in a collegial manner about common problems and solutions. There should be more of it!
- Meeting people; new terms and concepts in assessment (new to me); consolidated.
- Identification of common concerns. Organisation was well done.
- Presentations, posters or comments that identified innovative approaches.
- National perspectives. Range of individual perspectives - ADU and disciplinary academics.
- Social interaction over the breaks. Interaction in the thematic groups.
- This is difficult because it was all SO GOOD. World café – great, poster session – very useful, thematic activities – a great way of getting people thinking and talking. Gave me great ideas.

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

- All good.
- It was a challenge to capture all the ideas – not sure how to do this better.
- Perhaps we could have run some sort of closing activity to capture some of participants takeaway – learning.
- The opportunity to discuss issues with the 'experts' and those with significantly more experience.

- My role as emcee was actually a constraint to networking opportunities – the only time I had for this was the poster session.
- A list of participants – did not get name of participant who said really good things and left early! I wonder weather participants would have wanted to hear more about the projects – but I shall leave it up to them because I am biased!
- Scholars' wrap up of themes was a little long winded, if I have to nit-pick.
- Just space issues – a little cramped during posters and noisy during theme groups.
- The thematic groups were a little large for good discussion.
- None. All very good.
- Would like themes explored/defined more explicitly/ specifically – they did tend to merge in thematic group discussion.
- The café needed a more specific focus. The change of tables led to a diffusion of issues rather than a deeper discussion.
- Better management of one group.
- Probably to have breakout areas for group discussions. Focus for discussion eg activity on question worked well when used and could have been used across all sessions.
- Some more provocative questions to begin.
- All okay.
- Break out rooms for the discussions.
- Perhaps more information given in advance of what would be the expectations of invitees and what would be the anticipated outcomes from the event.
- 'Circle' formula for thematic group discussions didn't work so well in this room I felt people were a bit too spread out.
- Perhaps provide everyone with a list of participants and contact details.
- I don't think I would alter the format at all!
- Occasionally groups too large to hear clearly.
- My key observation is that the ALTC had already supported innovative assessment projects so the ideas are those: it's the dissemination and embedding process that are critical.
- Would have liked some generalisations (e.g. through input – brief) of finding from this project beyond individual projects and process advice on what has been learned from cross-institutional project.
- To receive a copy of the outcomes of the sessions discussions – perhaps a not taker in each session and the summary sent to the participants – (mentioned at the last session, so ok).
- Different rooms for the noisy activities.

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

- Yes. But not sure yet how.
- Yes – would like to keep in touch with Scholars re joint projects, visits to other universities.
- Yes I have a few key people I would like to target – for the wisdom they may have in the areas I am seeking.
- Noise in main room.
- Yes – would like to expand current studies.
- Find out more information.
- Yes. Circulate papers to colleagues at La Trobe University and possibly elsewhere.
- Publications, workshops.

- YES – They are a highly vibrant group of motivated individuals who will be tomorrow’s leaders in higher education, without any doubt.
- Yes – developing examples together for improving assessment practices.
- Yes – grants, ongoing discussion.
- Yes – email, conferences.
- Yes, emailing info to and fro various participants.
- Yes, collaborative research on teaching and learning.
- Yes – Using Ana Maria’s model to assist graduate qualities.
- Yes – made very useful connections with people involved in policy-related issues.
- Yes – joint research and development.
- Yes x 2.
- Yes. I am happy to be involved in an ongoing dialogue on issues that are important to the leadership group members.
- In a light collegial way to build up collaborative funded project opportunities – because we are talking trans – Tas so across the ditch! I feel delighted to be involved with the project at all – and have met many wonderful people in a collegial setting.
- Yes, would like to stay in touch with future rounds of the Distributive Leadership Project.
- Yes, not sure.
- Have used earlier meeting and will use this one also to form a network for exchange of ideas and expertise.
- Yes, collaborative ALTC projects.
- Networking with participants in terms of their specific areas of expertise.
- Yes, sharing research, resources, ideas.
- Yes – interested in work on aligning learning outcomes with graduate attributes and assessment.
- Grant applications and possibility of informal networking and “sound-boarding”
- Yes – got some good ideas and asked for info already.
- Yes groups could present their projects within other universities
- Possibly – no concrete opportunities emerged but I’d be interested to see if any cross-institutional projects emerge.
- If the opportunity presented itself yes!
- Lotte Latukefu and I (and another colleague) have already discussed an assessment of group music-making project.
- Possibly – but probably not on a project as such because I am already sufficiently committed.
- Yes, have met people today that have helped in networking and proceeding with our own entry into this ALTC project – next phase.
- Looking at possible links for own ALTC project.
- Yes – not really sure.
- Yes – writing grant applications to carry out more leadership projects. Collaborating on writing conference papers or journal articles. Visits by one of the Scholars to my campus.

In what ways do you think ideas from the roundtable might have an impact on assessment in tertiary education

- Heightened awareness. Publication of ideas – change.
- Cascading of ideas into faculty levels, across unis, eg policies, staff development.

- Start a groundswell of change. Reinforces important principles of good assessment in higher education.
- Yes – with joint research projects.
- Creating and expanding networks.
- Coordination and discussion.
- More consistency in approaches. More scientific approach.
- A practical input in the encouragement for people to share best practice.
- Awareness, engagement, collaboration. Let the wind of change blow!!
- Gee what a question! Lots of ways – but hard to predict.
- Exemplar and provide platform for “managing up” in institutions. Empowering enthusiastic academics.
- Set high level strategic objectives.
- Quite a few University administrators present indicates interest in change from those who can best enact it.
- Leadership development (multi level).
- Some consensus on problems and discussion of ways of addressing these could lead to improved communications/practice.
- If leadership group members have an effective depth of focus they will follow this through in practice in teaching and curriculum development.
- Need to take back the discussions to colleagues. We are the converters.
- More people on the same (quality) wavelength.
- Empower a wider group of academics to begin/continue culture change across at least participating universities.
- Synthesised insights of roundtable could be distributed to policy makers in higher education.
- To begin a domino effect throughout the system to gain high level support for new approaches to assessment.
- Build enthusiasm for championing.
- I will be using it in my school to review good assessment practices by my staff and have them presented to all staff for discussion and follow up, including possible implementation.
- Hopefully a review of current practice with action in universities to implement change.
- Raise profile of its significance across several institutions. Hope for future as current “Faculty Scholars” progress into more influential positions.
- Moving to community of good practice and sponsoring enthusiasm.
- Makes it more authentic.
- Capture feedback, discussion/debate points and forward to relevant university committees at the represented institutions.
- Examples of projects that could be shared or replicated in other sites. Policy ideas and how to implement these in other universities. Ideas for how to structure and deliver similar events in my own university.
- 1. Opens discussion; 2. Provides some information on existing projects useful in the development of good practice in assessment; 3. creates a college of interested stakeholders.
- Depends how we take them back to our institutions. UWS is working on alignment no so I'll take back further ideas on this. Generally institutions are open to ideas (such as today's) but implementing them at the grass root level can be tricky.
- Main idea here is how assessment agendas and good practice initiatives can be advanced through working with the ADES.
- Helpful shift to common terminology for common concepts. Safe environment in which some 'challengeable' ideas were challenged.
- The possibility of cross-institutional collaboration to encourage others to improve assessment?

- I thought the “strategic” theme group generated some great ideas about how a more positive culture might be created had loads of good ideas and I’d love to have Lizzie’s summary of this.

Any further comments.

- Great day! Very useful.
- I hope the roundtable will encourage continued dialogue a discussion to encourage change in assessment culture in higher education.
- Nothing but praise for the administration. It’s been a challenging road – new concepts, new methods – proving that change can be refreshing.
- Fantastic - I would give it a mark of 95% (as commensurate with perfection).
- So glad we kept it interactive. Excellent teamwork among the scholars.
- Extremely smoothly organised and confidently presented by Scholars.
- An excellent day. Enthusiastic participant. Fantastically well organised. Good to see such engagement and people talking about evidence based practice.
- Congratulations to the scholars on providing an interesting and stimulating day. Activities that involved participation was great. Good to see the collegiality and team work developed by the scholars.
- Thank you for the invitation; I would be interested in continuing to contribute to this area of teaching and learning.
- Enjoyed the variety of participation formats.
- A great day well done to the organisers and the Scholars.
- My key point here is that there should be more institutional case studies – across whole courses, at policy level, at a systems level. It was a great opportunity to network, share ideas around assessment etc.
- A stimulating, informative day – well worth the trip from Brisbane.
- The scholars have done a great job. They achieved alignment between the objectives of the assessment roundtable and the activities offered to the participants. I consider that this has been an authentic form of professional development for me. The whole “look” was VERY professional: name tags, PowerPoint slides, posters, correspondence – everything.