

Evaluation Report of the 6th Annual EALTA Conference, Turku 2009

The feedback questionnaire followed the format and content of the previous questionnaires. It was placed in the conference bag and participants were reminded a couple of times to fill it in before leaving. The rate of return is relatively low ($n = 36$): it would probably have been higher if there had been more reminders of the importance of feedback to the Executive Committee and the future conference organizers. However, the response pattern is quite clear and the outcome resembles closely earlier reports. Thus we feel that the feedback provided probably is reasonably representative.

The results are reported by providing frequency distributions for each question where possible. Only brief comments are made on them, as the figures speak for themselves.

The feedback can be summarized as being predominantly positive or very positive. Several useful comments were written, providing valuable information for the association.

On behalf of the local organizing committee and EALTA we wish to thank all respondents for providing us with much appreciated feedback. All the comments have been recorded and will be consulted in further planning.

Q1 Organisation 1: very good | 2: good | 3: not so good | 4: poor

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 | 22 | 61,1 | 61,1 | 61,1 |
| 2 | 14 | 38,9 | 38,9 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The organization of the conference was rated as good or very good. There were several expressions of appreciation, which the organizers are happy to have received.

Q2 Cost 1: very reasonable | 2: reasonable | 3: expensive | 4: too expensive

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 1 | 21 | 58,3 | 58,3 | 61,1 |
| 2 | 13 | 36,1 | 36,1 | 97,2 |
| 3 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The cost of participation in the conference was considered reasonable or very reasonable.

Q3 Locality 1: very good | 2: good | 3: not so good | 4: poor

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 | 12 | 33,3 | 33,3 | 33,3 |
| 2 | 22 | 61,1 | 61,1 | 94,4 |
| 3 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The locality was also estimated good or very good.

Q4 Length of conference

1: too long | 2: quite long | 3: appropriate | 4: quite short | 5: too short

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 1 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 8,3 |
| 2 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 11,1 |
| 3 | 31 | 86,1 | 86,1 | 97,2 |
| 4 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The length of the conference was found appropriate.

Q5 Length of presentations:

1: too long | 2: quite long | 3: appropriate | 4: quite short | 5: too short

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 3 | 29 | 80,6 | 80,6 | 83,4 |
| 4 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 96,2 |
| 5 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The length of the presentations was predominantly found appropriate although a few found them to be on the short side.

Q6 Number of presentations

1: much too many | 2: too many | 3: appropriate | 4: too few | 5: much too few

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 2 | 6 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 19,4 |
| 3 | 27 | 75,0 | 75,0 | 94,4 |
| 4 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Also the number of presentations was predominantly considered appropriate.

Q7 Quality of presentations

1: good | 2: mostly good | 3: mixed | 4: mostly poor | 5: poor

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 1 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 16,7 |
| 2 | 23 | 63,9 | 63,9 | 80,6 |
| 3 | 7 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

While most respondents were pleased with the quality of the presentations some found them to be of mixed quality. No respondent found them to be poor.

Q8 Opportunity for participation and discussion

1: More than enough | 2: appropriate | 3: too little

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 2 | 29 | 80,6 | 80,6 | 83,3 |
| 3 | 6 | 16,7 | 16,7 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

On the whole, the respondents found that there were sufficient opportunities for participation and discussion.

Q9 Panel discussion

1: very interesting | 2: interesting | 3: not interesting | 4: waste of time

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 16 | 44,4 | 44,4 | 44,4 |
| 1 | 5 | 13,9 | 13,9 | 58,3 |
| 2 | 13 | 36,1 | 36,1 | 94,4 |
| 3 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 97,2 |
| 4 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

There were relatively few answers to this question, which was probably due to the scheduling of the event (at the end of the conference). The panel was considered interesting.

Q10 Posters

1: good | 2: mostly good | 3: mixed | 4: mostly poor | 5: poor

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 7 | 19,4 | 19,4 | 19,4 |
| 1 | 8 | 22,2 | 22,2 | 41,7 |
| 2 | 9 | 25,0 | 25,0 | 66,7 |
| 3 | 12 | 33,3 | 33,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

As before, the posters did not receive quite as good an assessment as the presentations. Poster presenters and presentations might benefit from more guidance, e.g. in the form of more specific instructions as to the contents, structure and appearance of the posters.

Q11 Opportunity to learn

1: very much | 2: quite a lot | 3: not so much | 4: very little

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 |
| 1 | 14 | 38,9 | 38,9 | 41,7 |
| 2 | 19 | 52,8 | 52,8 | 94,4 |
| 3 | 2 | 5,6 | 5,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

A very positive outcome is that participants reported having learned quite a lot or very much during the conference.

Q12 Annual General Meeting

1: very effective | 2: effective | 3: ineffective | 4: very ineffective

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 0 | 13 | 36,1 | 36,1 | 36,1 |
| 1 | 4 | 11,1 | 11,1 | 47,2 |
| 2 | 15 | 41,7 | 41,7 | 88,9 |
| 3 | 3 | 8,3 | 8,3 | 97,2 |
| 4 | 1 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

There were also relatively few answers to the question about the AGM. The rating was mostly positive.

Which of the above aspects (1 to 12) was the best at the conference? (Circle its number)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| <i>N</i> | 5 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 5 | 1 | - | - | 13 | - |

The opportunity to learn received the highest rating followed by the organization and the quality of the presentations.

Which of the above aspects (1 to 12) was the worst at the conference? (Circle its number)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| <i>N:</i> | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 3 |

There were few answers to this question, which is why no clear pattern emerges.

If money were no problem, would you attend the next annual conference?

1: definitely yes | 2: probably yes | 3: probably not | 4: definitely not

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 | 25 | 69,4 | 69,4 | 69,4 |
| 2 | 11 | 30,6 | 30,6 | 100,0 |
| Total | 36 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Another very positive outcome is the fact that all respondents would consider attending the next annual conference if the funding was in order.

D. What in particular did you learn at this conference?

A variety of points of learning were mentioned. Some of them referred to specific aspects of testing/assessment, others related to more general awareness raising of the challenges and possible solutions in testing and assessment.

E. What would you like to suggest for the next annual meeting and conference?

Suggestions included topics such as issues in comparative assessments, impact of the CEFR, more of the much appreciated workshops, and continuing the mixture of experienced and younger presenters.

F. Do you have any suggestions for (a) topic(s) of a pre- or post- conference workshop?

It was obvious that workshops dealing with various statistical questions would be generally appreciated. Other suggested topics were related to validation, computer-based testing/assessment, use of corpora in testing/assessment and item writing.

H. What is your opinion of parallel sessions?

There was a bit more views in favour of the two parallel sessions than for more of them. It might be worth considering three parallel sessions if there are many good proposals and ask for feedback about the experiment.