

## The 7<sup>th</sup> Annual EALTA Conference, The Hague 2010 – Evaluation Report

The feedback questionnaire 2010 followed the format and content from previous conferences. It was distributed during the conference and participants were reminded on several occasions to fill it in before leaving. The rate of return was considerably higher than the last few years (n=68). This is very positive, since responses and comments provide valuable feedback to the organizers and also substantial information for future conferences.

The results are reported by providing response numbers for each question and alternative given. The original questionnaire form is also used to summarize and exemplify some of the most frequent comments and some of the suggestions given.

The overall impression is that the vast majority of the participants were positive or very positive to different aspects of the conference. Comments given - some of which are quoted at the end of this report - were constructive and very useful for further planning of EALTA activities.

**A. Please, evaluate the quality of each of the following aspects of the conference by circling one of the assessment options:**

### 1. Organisation:

very good **49** | good **18** | not so good **1** | poor **0**

*- Very nice and friendly with attention to detail!*  
*- The two screens on each side was an excellent idea, but the front screen was a bit too low.*

### 2. Cost:

very reasonable **31** | reasonable **32** | expensive **3** | too expensive **0**

*- I'm always so delighted that the cost is so reasonable because it makes it an inclusive conference rather than an exclusive one where only people from "rich" institutions can attend. It would be really great if we could keep this up.*  
*- Very reasonable except for accommodation.*

### 3. Locality:

very good **47** | good **19** | not so good **2** | poor **0**

*- Practical and easy to have the conference and accommodation in the same place.*  
*- Very nice hotel and area but a bit far from city centre, and the other hotel.*

**4. Length of conference:**

too long **0** | quite long **3** | appropriate **63** | quite short **1** | too short **1**

**5. Length of presentations:**

too long **1** | quite long **1** | appropriate **55** | quite short **8** | too short **0**

- 20 minutes appropriate but bad that so many speakers took longer time.  
- Plenary presentations could have been 60 minutes long so that there had been more time for questions and discussion

**6. Number of presentations:**

much too many **0** | too many **4** | appropriate **57** | too few **7** | much too few **0**

**7. Quality of presentations:**

good **14** | mostly good **43** | mixed **10** | mostly poor **0** | poor **0**

- Good variety of topics, offered different perspectives on LTA.  
- Some excellent!  
- Some too dense; presenters should not READ! Sometimes less is more!  
- I think that the conference would be much more interesting if at least some of the presentations were about practical issues, sharing good practice etc. It is nice to hear about the studies and research, but after three days of questionnaires, think alouds, correlations etc. one wishes to hear sth like: "This is what we did when we had to test xy. We think it was successful. Over to you to judge and use."

**8. Opportunity for participation and discussion:**

More than enough **2** | appropriate **46** | too little **19**

- Appropriate if 20 min + 10 min Q & A would have been the actual case.  
- Ample opportunity outside of regular conference hours.

**9. Panel discussion**

*Not applicable*

**10. Posters**

good **21** | mostly good **22** | mixed **10** | mostly poor **1** | poor **0**

- Presenters were all very helpful & experts.  
- Would be better to leave the posters on for at least a whole day; Room a bit small.

## 11. Opportunity to learn

very much **25** | quite a lot **38** | not so much **2** | very little **0**

- Thanks to workshops, very very much! I really appreciate the “member-friendly” approach of EALTA; One of EALTA’s strongest sides is the spirit of sharing.

- Information on very diverse subjects. Knowledgeable speakers. Good opportunity to contact fellow language specialists if you feel so inclined.

## 12. Annual General Meeting:

very effective **11** | effective **30** | ineffective **0** | very ineffective **0**

### B. Please, read again the above mentioned 12 aspects of the conference and evaluate:

a. Which of the above aspects (1 to 12) was the best of the conference? (circle its number)

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	

b. Which of the above aspects (1 to 12) was the worst of the conference? (circle its number)

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	

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

definitely yes **48** | probably yes **16** | probably not **1** | definitely not **1**

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

- Too much to say, especially as I haven’t processed it all – but lots and lots!

- Some very interesting contributions relating to cross-disciplinary collaboration, e.g. with SLA research.

- New aspects of research methods.

- The importance of putting practice into a theoretical framework.

- Some aspects of classical test theory and about linking tests to the CEFR.

- New aspects into ways of cooperating among colleagues.

- That there are many people out there all striving for clarity and new tools in language assessment. Very inspiring!

- I like the fact that all forms of assessment are represented – classroom assessment to statistical issues. The breadth of assessment presented makes it impossible to mention anything in particular.

- This year had a stronger focus on assessment challenges in the classroom, not only on making good tests.

- *Depth and breadth of research is fascinating.*
- *That people coming from different backgrounds should learn to work together more frequently.*
- *That people are facing the same problems.*

*THE THREE KEYNOTE SPEAKERS GIVEN VERY POSITIVE RESPONSE.*

*A NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS MENTIONED.*

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

- *Reports of the SIG work; SIG meetings before conference, e.g. afternoon before reception; "Tables" with SIG info.*
- *More voices being heard, so the number of presentations should increase.*
- *Item-writer guidelines.*
- *To keep an open topic that enables presenters to give insights in multiple perspectives of LTA, e.g. classroom-based assessment.*
- *More posters and time to discuss them.*
- *More time for discussion.*
- *Pls BAN presenters reading their 'talks'. And if you do not dare to, pls ban reading their slides. Defeats the objects, makes it more difficult to follow...*
- *Ensure that speakers understand the time limits for presentations. They should not ignore the time warnings because it took time away from the discussion time; Stricter time-keeping.*
- *A greater focus on the use of tests by both teachers, authorities and test designers. For a good test to work, there need to be an understanding as of how to use the results to improve education and/or learning. We need good tests and we need to use them to benefit the students' learning.*
- *Stick to final session by a good keynote speaker like this year!*
- *Have some speakers come back and report on their ongoing research.*
- *Do not start at 9 o'clock with the very first presentation. Allow for 10-15 mins introduction and general 'settling down'.*
- *A mix of theoretical and practical presentations, not necessarily all about long-term investigations. Preferably CEFR themes.*

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

- *Testing/Assessing Writing; Reading; Language learning motivation*
- *Item writing; Item banking; Pre-testing*
- *More basic statistics; Item Response Theory*
- *Measurement and assessment theory*
- *Benchmarking; Standard setting*
- *Inter and intra rater reliability*

- *The CEFR and the ELP; Relating exams to the CEFR*
- *Comparability across languages*
- *Comparison of tests used in different countries at approx. the same level*
- *Language in use*
- *Affective factors in language testing*
- *Research methodology; Questionnaire development;*
- *How to write an article/thesis*
- *Demonstration of software*

**G . What is your opinion of parallel sessions?**

None needed **6** | too many **2** | appropriate number **38** | too few **12**

**Why?**

***No needed***

- *Shame to miss out on presentations.*

***Appropriate number***

- *It's always a trade off. Invariably, you end up wanting to go to two presentations which take place at the same time, so it's a good idea not to have too many – but the more there are, the more opportunities there are for people to present.*

***Too few***

- *Because parallel sessions give us the chance to be exposed to even more research and various topics.*
- *Could have more. Would give more opportunity for younger researchers to present.*

**F. Please indicate whether you are:**

language teacher **16** | teacher educator **13** | assessment professional **37** | university/college teacher **23** | researcher **16** | educational administrator **10** | other **2**