



*ASSET Project number 585587-EPP-1-2017-1-IL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

**An external Evaluation Subcontractor Agreement for ASSET project no. 585587**

## **Evaluation Report of ASSET Consortium Meeting No 2 in Linz (Austria) November 12. - 14. 2018**

According to the Evaluation Subcontractor Agreement the evaluator prepares evaluation reports of each meeting based on the questionnaire and interviews, and submits them to ASSET coordinator in one month after the meeting.

### Tasks for each meeting incl Linz CM#2:

- a) Attending all sessions of the meeting.
  - b) Interviewing members of ASSET consortium representing different HEIs in Israel and Georgia to get qualitative data regarding the implementation of the project at the different HEIs.
  - c) Prepare an evaluation questionnaire (mainly quantitative) to assess the outcomes of each meeting.
- Both quantitative and qualitative data will be used to the report.

According to the ASSET Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) during the CM#2 the following progress was expected to monitor:

<b>Specific objectives</b>	<b>Indicators of progress</b>	<b>How indicators will be measured?</b>
1. To modernise CATs for previous Tempus/Erasmus+ funded courses in IL and GE by sharing ASSETS EU experts best practices.	1. The number of CATs developed for implementation in previous Tempus/ Erasmus+ courses	1. CAT teaching manuals disseminated to ASSET members via online platform 2 Participation lists, project documentation
<b>Outputs and outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators of progress</b>	<b>How indicators will be measured?</b>
WP1 Review and Analysis of selected courses and appropriate CATs towards WP2. Output (OP): Report on best practices in CATs from EU partners to adapt to IL&GE HEIs. Outcome (OC): Better positioning of HEIs for undertaking necessary changes in curriculum.	WP1. Number of CATs identified and selected for IL&GE HEI. Number equipment installed	WP1 project documentation

Concrete outcomes for CM#2 set by the project coordinator in her overview PPT were:

Each group presents its CAT: Outcomes: 6 Presentation - Monday;

Each group prepares a PLAN for a session for each CAT for the TT in IL and GE: expected outcome: 6 activity plan presentations - Tuesday;

Dissemination – summary and future plans - Wednesday;

Designing a plan for the TT sessions in IL and GE, HOW to report the peer mentorship - Wednesday.

## Observation of the Consortium Meeting

To assess the outcomes of the meeting the external evaluator monitored the following sessions during the CM#2:

### **Monday, November 12th, 2018**

9:30-10:00 Updates:

Achievements and current status of ASSET

Goals and expected outcomes of this meeting

Future plans

Plans and expected outcomes for today

Introducing ASSET external evaluation: Sulev Valdmaa

10:15–13:00 Group work

Group work: each group prepares for presenting its output

(expected outcome: presentation of its developed CATs limited to 30 min)

14:00–16:00 GROUP Presentations

Each group: presents its developed CATs 30 min + 15 min discussion

Presentations:

GROUP 1

GROUP 2

GROUP 3

GROUP 4

GROUP 5

Summation and plans for tomorrow

### **Tuesday, November 13th, 2018**

9:00–9:45 Introduction to Train the Trainers (TT) sessions

1. Designing the TT sessions in IL and GE

2. Plans and expected outcomes for today

Presentation

9:45-10:30 Group work

Group work: each group prepares a PLAN for a session for each CAT for the TT in IL and GE

(expected outcome: activity PLAN)

10:45-12:30 Group work - Continue

Continue: Group work: each group prepares a PLAN for a session for each CAT for the TT in IL and GE

(expected outcome: activity PLAN)

13:30–15:00 Presentations

Each group PRESENTS ITS PLAN for the TT session

GROUP 1

GROUP 2

GROUP 3

GROUP 4

GROUP 5

### **Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

9:00–9:30 Plans and expected outcomes for today

Presentation

9:30-10:30 Designing a plan for the TT sessions in IL and GE

10:45-11:30 - Continue Designing a plan for the TT sessions in IL and GE

Expected outcome: activity PLAN

11:45-13:00 Midterm report

Presentation

14:00–14:45 Dissemination: Achievements and plans

Presentation

14:45 - 16:30 Portal - updates Summation and plans for next meeting

### **Assessment of CM#2**

Following quantitative and qualitative evaluation of ASSET project CM#2 is based on evaluator's 8-pages memo formed in the result of the observation of the event-days November 12, 13 and 14 2018.

During the CM#2 the external evaluator questioned project coordinator, Concept Map tool developers, University of Cork representative, Linz University representatives and Tallinn University representatives to clarify the questions that rose during the monitoring of CM#2 meetings and to clarify some backgrounds and reasons of the processes taken place and developed so far. Two questions were formed to everybody's written answer by November 25 2018.

### **Quantitative summary of the observation**

#### The meetings on the seminar-days

Evaluator participated on every meeting of each seminar day.

The seminar days followed the schedule that was uploaded in advance to the project Portal.

Evaluator counted in the beginning of the session of Monday November 12 43 persons, on Tuesday November 13 44 persons and on Wednesday November 14 43 participants.

The exact number of the participants is fixed on the participants' list that were filled daily and are uploaded on ASSET portal.

Evaluator also visited all the separately held thematic workshops. All the estimated workshops took place and followed the estimated formats.

Open Badges - 10 people in the work-group,

Concept Map - 5 people in the work-group,

Critical Friend - 10 people in the work-group,

Reflective Diary and Peer Assessment - 6 people in the work-group,

Soft Skills - 9 people in the work-group.

Evaluator's conclusion is that **the format of the seminar was in all of quantitative elements in total well kept** - the plenary sessions and workshops were held in accordance with the schedule.

#### Deliverables and outputs

Linz seminar was devoted to the demonstration of and discussion about agreed and selected for developing on Cork CM#1 Formative Assessment Tools.

On CM#1 were formed four work-groups that decided to create six different Formative Assessment Tools:

- Open Digital Badges,
- Critical Friend Approach,
- Group (Peer) Assessment,

- Soft Skills Assessment,
- Concept Map (CoMa),
- Group Reflective Diary.

All the mentioned above Tools were in their essence presented on the November 12 sessions by the work-groups. In addition to the decision made on CM#1 in Cork to form four work-groups, one additional group was formed in the run of the process of developing the tools additionally. So factually there are five different work-groups developing six Formative Assessment Tools.

All the Tools were before the CM#2 in advance also uploaded to the project Website for review. In a quantity the estimated number of deliverables was in preparation to CM#2 accomplished.

The schedule of CM#2 foresaw presenting on the plenary sessions the results of the work done during the Consortium Meeting in the working-groups. All the working-groups presented their results of development work that was done in the CM#2 group-work sessions.

The division of the goal of the two-folded group-works:

- to elaborate the six Formative Assessment Tools in their current stage  
and

- to design Train the Trainers (TT) workshops about the usage of the six Tools that will be held in Israeli and Georgian HEIs in 2019

was well followed by the participants and the estimated processes took by observation place.

Evaluator's conclusion is that **all the expected deliverables were prepared and presented on the CM#2 in quantities foreseen by the project goals, expectations and measures.**

### **Qualitative summary of the observation**

#### Project management and leadership

External evaluator wants to thank the project coordinator Ms Dorit Alt for the excellent conducting the entire CM#2. The working-days were planned by their content and timing in a most optimal way, the time-keeping and schedule-following throughout the three-days event was professional. The guidance in the progress of the three meeting days by the project coordinator was supportive and sufficient.

All the necessary data about the CM#2 like participants' lists and evaluation sheets was collected. The encouragement of participants to the discussions and sharing by the project manager were used in a professional way. Brought out above qualitative side of the guidance guaranteed to the CM#2 event working and creative atmosphere.

#### Participation and contribution of the Consortium members

Followed by the external evaluator workshops demonstrated all the consortium members' devotedness to their tasks and expected outcomes.

Five different work-groups worked on the contents of the deliverables during the meeting days.

On the **first day** Monday November 12 the task was given to the groups by the project coordinator in accordance with the event schedule to prepare a presentation about the Tool(s) developed by the group.

(Group No 3 developed two tools.) Deadline for developing of the Tools was August 10 2018. The Tools were forwarded by the work-groups to the project coordinator in time, she uploaded all the six deliverables to the ASSET project Portal on September 28 2018.

All the groups fulfilled on November 12 their task and presentations about the essence of six different Formative Assessment Tools were made on the plenary meeting by five groups. The presentations of the work-groups were carried out professionally. PPT-s, Youtube resources and quotations/addressing to the webpages with additional sources were introduced to the Consortium members. Each presentation was followed by the discussion on the basis of questions and answers on the topic of concrete Tool just introduced. The questions and remarks were carried out following the future task of each participant of the project to be equipped with the knowledge to introduce not only the Tool developed with one's participation, but all six tools.

Evaluator's conclusion is, that **all the six Tools were introduced to project participants on Monday November 12 in an appropriate way and with sufficient depth.** No additional recommendations or remarks on the quality of that day procedures.

#### Course Assessment Tools (CAT)

In CM#1 Framework Plan for ASSET was designed General Framework Plan for summarizing existing CAT and/ or planning for new CATs for courses included:

- A short rationale (1 page) for using the assessment tools/ methodologies (one or two tools)
- Theoretical background (1-2 pages)
- The methodology / tool description
- Target audience (e.g., undergraduate, graduate)
- Learning environment (e.g., PBL, VaKE - provide a description of the learning environment)
- How the tool/s can be adapted to the participants' needs (IL + GE)
- Challenges and advantages of using the tool/s
- Face validity or peer review: Gather some descriptive data from your colleagues (faculty members) regarding the feasibility of the tools (what do they think of it? would they consider using it? what can be the challenges? how can it be adapted to their needs?).
- Reflectively describe the group work process.
- References

All six tools were uploaded to the ASSET Portal in the Internet in advance. Checking each Tool the evaluator found the following content patterns developed and the following estimated patterns missing or more weakly represented in the frame/needs of current project:

**Open Digital Badges** - 23 pages, developed by 11 persons.

Represented: rationale, tool description, theoretical background, how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, challenges and advantages of using the tool, references.

Missing or weakly present: learning environments, target audience, peer review, work group process.

**Critical Friend Approach** - 23 pages, developed by 8 persons.

Represented: rationale and theoretical and practical aspects, target audience, methodology, tool introduction, how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, challenges and advantages of using the tool, learning environments, peer review, references.

Missing or weakly present: work process.

**Group (Peer) Assessment** - 15 pages, developed by 8 persons.

Represented: rationale, theoretical background, learning environments, references  
 Missing or weakly present: challenges and advantages of using the tool, target audience, peer review, how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, work process.

**Soft Skills Assessment** - 19 pages, developed by 9 persons.

Represented: rationale, theoretical background, learning environments, tool description, challenges of using the tool, references.

Missing or weakly present: advantages of using the tool, target audience, peer review, how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, work process.

**Concept Map (CoMa)** - 18 pages, developed by 4 persons.

Represented: rationale, theoretical background, tool description, challenges and advantages of using the tool, references.

Missing or weakly present: target audience, learning environments, how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, peer review, work process.

**Group Reflective Diary** - 16 pages, developed by 8 persons.

Represented: rationale, theoretical background, learning environments, how the tool/s can be adapted to the participants' needs, tool description, challenges of using the tool references.

Missing or weakly present: target audience, advantages of using the tool, peer review, work process.

As a fact all the tools are good in their theoretical and explanatory. Each of them contains good rationale, overview of theoretical background, tool as a such explanatory part and list of references.

As a fact, as it comes out from the tool development analysis above, not all of the work groups paid equal attention to the given for development of the content and format of the tools. Five tools do miss the clear characteristics of the target audience. Three tools do miss the learning environments. Also challenges and advantages of using the tool, advice how the tool can be adapted to the participants' needs, peer review and work process itself in the group are written into the tools in an insufficient level of elaboration.

The absence of handling of the issues of learning environments and characteristics of target audiences are worth to consider of further elaboration in the project, as those components are fundamental for guiding implementation of the tools in the learning process in the Israeli and Georgian HEIs. Other missing elements are in the opinion of evaluator for project participants' decision how important they are from the point of view of practical necessity and success of the project.

During the CM#2 afternoon sessions the participants while presenting their Tools covered some points that were missing in the written materials.

Two critical points were brought up by the participants themselves what evaluator also had noticed:

1. The tools **Critical Friend Approach** and **Peer Assessment** are very similar.  
 In addition - in evaluator's mind also the tool **Soft Skills** is somewhat similar to the previous two.
2. If to run 160 students' classroom then it is very difficult to apply the tool **Reflective Diary** in those "crowded" conditions.
3. In the project documentation attention should be paid to the usage of terminology.

### Conclusions of the seminar day 1:

- the developed 6 tools need more deep explanation about how they differ from each other,
- the tool descriptions need to explain what kind of outcomes they assess in the learning process,
- the tool descriptions need to be added clearer recommendations in what circumstances/causes to use one or another of them.

It was also mentioned by the participants that from the other hand similarity of some tools gives to the users a wonderful chance to decide which of those tools use in a concrete case.

In evaluator's mind it could be useful to think about those critical points listed above while the tools will be further elaborated and developed.

During the day cooperative and educative atmosphere was felt.

### Train the Trainers (TT)

On the **second seminar day** the project participants had a task to work out a plan how to build up the workshops in Israel and Georgia for presenting the six Formative Assessment Tools worked out in the project.

The following work-groups were formed:

**Concept Map** - 5 people in the work-group

**Digital Badges** - 8 people in the work-group

**Critical Friend** - 11 people in the work-group

**Peer Assessment** - 7 people in the work-group

**Soft Skills** - 10 people participating in the work-group

Evaluator did not identify any group dealing with the tool **Reflective Diary**.

After the group presentations evaluator got an impression that the offered six Tools seem to become the Learning Environments themselves. One should be creative in identifying them as Formative Assessment Tools. This conclusion is in accordance with the first day observation, which brought out the fact that the developed so far tools are just strong in their theoretical contents and weaker in the descriptions and explanations how to use the tools in the practical learning process as Formative Assessment Tools.

During the group presentations was pointed out that the planned Teach the Teachers (TT) workshops have a danger to take a form of simple Tool explanation sessions. As a fact the Tools have to be designed as Formative Tools to assess the learners' leaning process.

Group discussion after the presentations about how the tools should be taught to the users in Israel and Georgia brought up the need to formalize the format of trainings as at the present moment all the presentations were a bit different by their format and construction. **Evaluator agrees with the suggestion to pay attention to the fact that in conclusion the TT planning sessions left several open ends to improve the training format and also content.**

**All six tools incl. Reflective Diary need equal attention in their improvement process.**

On Tuesday afternoon quality assurance session took place. 1-2 members from each institution attended the session. The outcomes of the session were:

1. Evaluation questionnaire for Train the Trainer session – finalized,
2. Evaluation questionnaire for peer training (in GE and IL ins) – finalized,
3. Evaluation questionnaire for teachers – regarding the pilot phase– finalized,
4. Evaluation questionnaire for student– regarding the pilot phase–not finalized.

#### **Conclusions of the seminar day 2:**

- **the discussions in the work groups led the developers themselves to the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the project outcomes in their current stage,**
- **in professional discussions several ideas and practical steps that should be taken to improve the Formative Assessment Tools and the Teach the Teachers sessions were phrased and agreed,**
- **the self reflection of the work groups led to the conclusions that a formalized format for all of the TT sessions should be worked out and the content of each Tool needs further improvement to guarantee the expected quality of TT sessions.**

#### **CM#2 third day**

Conclusion making sessions.

During the discussions the participants brought up the following critical issues that are relevant to the project success:

- 1) Issue of terminology - for instance the Consortium needs to decide and clarify what is Classroom Assessment Technique in the means of current project. It seems that the term is used differently from the generally recognised meaning.
- 2) The question was raised also what is the difference between CAT as Classroom Assessment Tool and CAT as Course Assessment Tool?
- 3) ASSET has to show what it does different from what is already existing on the field of Assessment.
- 4) There is lot of literature on the field, but the Consortium is not using it sufficiently. ASSET needs to develop tools that matter to the indicated in the ASSET goals.

By the agenda of that meeting-day in the afternoon there was planned a session "Dissemination: Achievements and plans". According to the WP4 in the Project description (DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION 15-10-2017 - 15-10-2020) as a goal No 5 "several sessions will take place during the three years of project". Due to date 14-10-2020 dissemination through internal meetings, seminars and workshops should take place. The third day in general and the last session especially were activities of character of dissemination through internal meeting. The evaluator identified that part of the Linz meeting as a true preparation for dissemination of the project deliverables on future workshops and faculty training in IL and GE by partner NGOs.

**External evaluator hereby recommends project coordinator to take the risen on the final day of the seminar questions and open-ends into account and to organise their analysis by the work groups before the delivering of the plans of Teach the Teachers sessions.**

At the end of the seminar took place Project meeting evaluation in electronic form. The participants filled up the questionnaires containing:

- assessment of meeting preparation,
- assessment of the content aspects and quality of the meeting procedures,
- assessment of project management.

### Conclusions of the seminar day 3:

- the open discussions brought out several unsolved (like terminology-related) or newly identified (uniqueness and specificity of the ASSET outcomes) issues about the work done on the development of Formative Assessment Tools,
- the consortium expressed willingness and enthusiasm in elaborating the developed project outcomes,
- concrete tasks, goals and timelines for the next steps were established by the project coordinator.

### Interviewing of work-groups by the Evaluator

On CM#1 in Cork during Preparation WP1 course assessment tools (CATs) were mapped by filling the task: "EU partners and GE, IL teams will collect common course assessment tools in their institutions".

The groups decided to create six CATs link to teaching manuals. Actually seven can be identified:

1. Game-based Learning (Gamification),
2. Evidence-based Practice (EBP),
3. Project-based Learning (PjBL),
4. Case-based Learning,
5. Problem-based Learning (PBL),
6. Work-based Learning,
7. Value and Knowledge Education (VaKE).

Two questions formed by the evaluator to work-groups' written answer by November 25 2018 were:

1. Name/list please, what does your Formative Assessment Tool assess?
2. Give please one example of a Learning Environment where and how your tool can be used?

Those questions were initiated by the reflections of the participants in the afternoon session of the seminar day 2 when the groups made their presentations of the TT session plans. Evaluator had the same critical findings that were expressed by the project participants, because that he wanted to assist the groups in analysing their deliverables strenghts and weaknesses.

The written answers from the groups were forwarded to the evaluator on December 01 (group 2 "Critical Friend", group 3 "Peer (Group) Assessment" and "Reflective Diary", group 4 "Soft-skills", group 5 "Concept Map"). Answers related to "Open Digital Badges" from group 1 are missing.

The excerpts copied from the delivered to the evaluator answers:

- assessment of the following skills/processes/knowledge in the learning process
- and the following Learning Environments where the tools can be used were mentioned.

Group number / Tool	Name/list please, what does your Formative Assessment Tool assess?	Give please one example of a Learning Environment where and how your tool can be used?
1 Digital Badges	-	-
2 Critical Friend Approach	Reflectiveness-analytical, critical, metacognitive thinking and self and pear evaluation. Collaboration-mutual assistance, delegating responsibility. Respect for different opinions. Trust-based relationships. Readiness to study	Critical Friend Approach is generic. This can be integrated into any subject course. Its application is efficient for any XB ( <u>problem based</u> , <u>project based</u> , inquiry based, <u>case based</u> , etc.) learning environment.

	novelty self-awareness and self-confidence.	
3 Peer Assessment and Reflective Diaries	<p>Builds on a natural process of development from early life (learning from others); Students gain a more sophisticated understanding of the gaps in their learning and gain a better grasp of the learning process;</p> <p>Peer assessment enhances conversation around the assessment process;</p> <p>Promotes students' writing skills, including clarification, reviewing and editing;</p> <p>Reduces the power imbalance between teacher and students;</p> <p>Promotes ability of students to give and receive feedback, an important part of work contexts; Emphasizes that assessment is part of learning (mistakes are opportunities rather than failures).</p>	<p>Peer assessment and reflective diaries are appropriate methods to promote learning in learner-centered courses in HEIs fostering students' participation and learning activities. Thus, these methods are in particular fruitful, to be used in various learning environments employed by GE and IL HEIs, such as: <u>Problem-based learning (PBL)</u>, <u>Project-based learning (PjBL)</u>, and <u>Value and Knowledge Education (VaKE)</u>.</p>
4 Soft Skills	<p>Formative assessment tool develops and measures a range of soft skills: personal, social and emotional that underlie academic and life success.</p> <p>More specifically, it enables developing and measuring emotional self-awareness, self-regulation, assertiveness, stress-tolerance, empathy, collaboration, growth mindset, flexibility, and grit and perseverance.</p>	<p>In <u>problem-based learning</u>, for example, the teacher chooses the skills that are most relevant to <u>working on a project</u>: for example: teamwork, independent learning, growth mindset etc. When introducing the problem, the teacher will discuss the skills most needed to succeed in working on the problem.</p>
5 Concept Map	<p>CoMa can be used for effective formative assessment for learning, since they: assess higher-order knowledge: comparison of a student map to a referent expert map identify strengths and weaknesses of students: evaluation of specific links in students' knowledge maps (in process); provide useful feedback: providing additional content, suggested by discrepancies between students and referent knowledge maps are user friendly for teachers (can be evaluated automatically and generate feedback automatically) and for students (are easily used to support learning).</p> <p>Comparison with Expert Map Students can compare their map with an</p>	<p>CoMa is highly relevant for constructivist learning environments. For example, <u>project-based learning</u>. In this learning, students are provided with opportunities to construct knowledge by solving real problems through asking and refining questions, designing and conducting investigations, gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information and data, drawing conclusions, and reporting findings. PjBL immerses students in a teamwork environment where they work in cooperation towards commonly agreed upon goals.</p>

	<p>„expert“ or other student maps in the course.</p> <p>Comparison at single time points or multiple intervals over time. Students have the chance to see their development. Instructors can identify typical students' misconceptions.</p> <p>Feedback on indicators: surface, matching, deep structure first approaches of computer created feedback exists focusing on different key figures. CoMa can be combined with peer feedback; can be used for discussions.</p>	
--	--	--

From the answers the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The work-groups have listed a range of different skills/processes/knowledge that developed by them Formative Assessment Tools are able to identify, evaluate and measure. In binding the Tools with the teaching manuals the answers are more uncertain. Namely - four Tools are bound with Project-based Learning, three with Problem-based Learning, one with Case-based learning, one with Value and Knowledge Education. None of the work-groups mentioned Game-based Learning, Evidence-based Practice and Work-based learning as an environment where their tool can be used.

Answering to those two questions do serve as a part of analysis for the work-groups in advancement in their needs and tasks that were brought out during the open discussions of seminar day 3 especially in mapping of the uniqueness and specificity of the ASSET outcomes.

**Evaluator's recommendation to the work-groups is to make use of their answers given to the two questions while the TT sessions are developed:**

- **the specificity of each worked out Formative Assessment Tool will be good to bring clearly out,**
- **clear and sufficient in content teaching about how to implement each worked out Formative Assessment Tool in variable Learning Environments could be intention.**

#### CM2 Assessment Report\*

37 participants completed on November 14 electronically seminar assessment form. The questionnaire contains containing:

- 7 questions about quality of the meeting preparation,
- 14 questions about the quality and content aspects of the seminar and meeting procedures,
- 5 questions about the project management.

\* The Report is attached.

In average on the four-point scale the highest value 3,816 was given to the project management, 3,645 was given to the meeting preparation and the meeting itself in its various aspects received 3,613 points.

Most people agreed about the preparations of the meeting that the meeting schedule was given in time. At the same time the participants were most uncertain about what they were expected to deliver to the meeting. There was only one comment about that -

About the various aspects of the meeting itself the most uncertainty produces the project website (statements 11 and 13). Although the statement "I understand how to use the ASSET website for the financial and administrative procedures" (9 and 10) received the highest scores 14 people out of 37 did not reply to those statements at all. People strongly agreed that "The meeting objectives were clearly stated" and "The meeting encouraged open and clear communication."

Evaluation of the aspects of the management brought once again out the fact that people do hesitate most about website related issues. The highest score according to the evaluation was given to the statement "The coordinator communicates clearly and effectively". The final appears to be the guarantee of the success of the project.

### General Conclusions

**A)** According to the ASSET Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) during the CM#2 specific objective (*To modernise CATs for previous Tempus/Erasmus+ funded courses in IL and GE by sharing ASSETS EU experts best practices*) **has been accomplished.**

The planned outputs and outcomes (*The number of CATs developed for implementation in previous Tempus/ Erasmus+ courses*) **have been produced.**

Indicators **are measured** by the CAT teaching manuals disseminated to ASSET members via online platform and Participation lists, project documentation.

**B)** According to the ASSET Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) during the CM#2 expected outputs and outcomes (*WP1 Review and Analysis of selected courses and appropriate CATs towards WP2. Output (OP): Report on best practices in CATs from EU partners to adapt to IL&GE HEIs. Outcome (OC): Better positioning of HEIs for undertaking necessary changes in curriculum*) **are produced and are measurable** by WP1 project documentation.

Sulev Valdmaa

December 03 2018

ASSET external evaluator

## Replies and revisions made in line with external evaluator's report of CM#2

The comment	Revisions made	Comment
<p><b>p. 6</b> The absence of handling of the issues of learning environments and characteristics of target audiences are worth to consider of further elaboration in the project, as those components are fundamental for guiding implementation of the tools in the learning process in the Israeli and Georgian HEIs. Other missing elements are in the opinion of evaluator for project participants' decision how important they are from the point of view of practical necessity and success of the project.</p>	CoMA: learning environment section was added to the teacher manual and description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	<p>The following were marked optional for all groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If possible - pilot the tool in some institutions, and describe the result</li> <li>2. Face validity or peer review: Gather some descriptive data from your colleagues (faculty members) regarding the feasibility of the tools (what do they think of it? would they consider using it? what can be the challenges? how can it be adapted to their needs?).</li> <li>3. Reflectively describe the group work process.</li> </ol>
	Soft skill tool: learning environment section was added to the teacher manual and description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	
	Group peer assessment: description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	
	Group reflective diary: description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	
	Critical friend approach: learning environment section was added to the teacher manual and description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	
	OB: learning environment section was added to the teacher manual and description of target audience. Revised version was uploaded to the portal.	
<p><b>p.7</b> The tools <b>Critical Friend Approach</b> and <b>Peer Assessment</b> are very similar.</p>		<p>The differences between critical friend approach and the PA: in CFA, peer assessment is used to assess the critical feedback. In PA – the learning outcome- for example the project.</p>
<p>p.7 In addition - in evaluator's mind also the tool <b>Soft Skills</b> is somewhat similar to the previous two.</p>		<p>The soft skill tool is specifically designed to measure soft skills, while the others not.</p>
<p>p.7. If to run 160 students' classroom then it is very difficult to apply the tool <b>Reflective Diary</b> in those "crowded" conditions.</p>		<p>The developed tools is named – Group reflective diary, to allow large classes take part and use this tool in groups.</p>
<p>p. 7 Evaluator did not identify any group dealing with the tool <b>Reflective Diary</b>.</p>		<p>Group no. 3 deals with reflective diary and peer assessment</p>
<p>p.7 After the group presentations evaluator got an impression that the offered six Tools seem to become the Learning Environments themselves. One should be creative in identifying them as</p>		<p>As assessment cannot be separated from instruction and learning. For this reason, in shapes the learning environment. Nevertheless, in each teaching manual the learning environment has</p>

<p>Formative Assessment Tools. This conclusion is in accordance with the first day observation, which brought out the fact that the developed so far tools are just strong in their theoretical contents and weaker in the descriptions and explanations how to use the tools in the practical learning process as Formative Assessment Tools.</p>		<p>been separately narrated based on this comment,</p>
<p>pp. 7-8 Group discussion after the presentations about how the tools should be taught to the users in Israel and Georgia brought up the need to formalize the format of trainings as at the present moment all the presentations were a bit different by their format and construction. <b>Evaluator agrees with the suggestion to pay attention to the fact that in conclusion the TT planning sessions left several open ends to improve the training format and also content. All six tools incl. Reflective Diary need equal attention in their improvement process.</b></p>	<p>A form for the IL and GE Train the trainers WS was designed. Each group will fill out an identical form</p>	
<p>p. 8 1) Issue of terminology - for instance the Consortium needs to decide and clarify what is Classroom Assessment Technique in the means of current project. It seems that the term is used differently from the generally recognised meaning.</p>	<p>The term CAT was selected for this project as acronym for internal purposes and used in the proposal, the consortium will continue using the term to avoid misunderstandings. Additional materials that used the term will be brought to the members' attention and discussed in future activities such as dissemination (papers, presentation on scientific conferences).</p>	
<p>p. 8 2) The question was raised also what is the difference between CAT as Classroom Assessment Tool and CAT as Course Assessment Tool? 3) ASSET has to show what it does different from</p>		<p>Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) are generally simple, non-graded, anonymous, in-class activities designed to give teachers and students useful <u>feedback on the teaching-learning process as it is happening.</u></p>

<p>what is already existing on the field of Assessment.</p> <p>4) There is lot of literature on the field, but the Consortium is not using it sufficiently. ASSET needs to develop tools that matter to the indicated in the ASSET goals.</p>		<p>Aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide just-in-time feedback about the teaching-learning process</li> <li>• Provide information about student learning with less work than traditional assignments (tests, papers, etc.)</li> <li>• Encourage the view that teaching is an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation, and reflection</li> <li>• Help students become better monitors of their own learning</li> <li>• Help students feel less anonymous, even in large courses</li> <li>• Provide concrete evidence that the instructor cares about learning</li> </ul> <p>These tools include short tasks (described at 2-3 lines) the students need to anonymously perform and hand the teacher. In contrast, ASSET tools are multi-faceted, and lean on different theoretical frameworks.</p>
<p>p. 11</p> <p>From the answers the following conclusions can be drawn:</p> <p>1. The work-groups have listed a range of different skills/processes/knowledge that developed by them</p> <p>Formative Assessment Tools are able to identify, evaluate and measure. In binding the Tools with the teaching manuals the answers are more uncertain. Namely - four Tools are bound with Project-based Learning, three with Problem-based Learning, one with Case-based learning, one with Value and Knowledge Education. None of the work-groups mentioned Game-based Learning, Evidence-based Practice and Work-based learning</p>	<p>Examples of learning environments in which the tools can be used are now visible in all teacher manuals.</p>	<p>The tools are not exclusively bound to the learning environments mentioned, these are only examples.</p>

as an environment where their tool can be used.		
p.11 Most people agreed about the <u>preparations of the meeting</u> that the meeting schedule was given in time. At the same time the participants were most uncertain about what they were expected to deliver to the meeting.		Although only one participant shared this uncertainty, an effort should be made by the HEIs' managers to raise the participants awareness to the project's expectations.
Evaluation of the <u>aspects of the management</u> brought once again out the fact that people do hesitate most about website related issues.		This is due to the fact that part of them tick N/A as merely, as only few use the website for management and administrative issues.