

5th EALTA Conference, Athens, Greece, 6-8 May 2008

Pre-conference Colloquium: Standard setting research and its relevance to the CEFR

FEEDBACK Summary

<p>1. Did you receive all the necessary information (pre-colloquium materials, timetable, information about the venue, etc.) about the Colloquium prior to the event?</p>	<p>YES: 33 PARTIALLY: 1 NO: 1 MEAN:</p>
<p>Comments/recommendations: <i>It was very useful that the presenters had to send our presentations in advance. Do this in the future as well. Apart from the last minute change of programme. But that wasn't a problem. Would it be possible to have a list of participants? It could help the contacts further. All correspondence was sent to my co presenters I have missed a list of participants at the start.</i></p>	
<p>2. Did you find the room and facilities satisfactory?</p>	<p>YES: 31 PARTIALLY: 4 NO: MEAN:</p>
<p>Comments/recommendations: <i>Somewhat warm and stuffy AC a problem – too cold at times Location from conference hotel very accessible and convenient Accoustics were not quite as good as expected Accoustics and ac could have been a bit better Check accoustic and ventilation for future workshops A bit warm. Some accoustical problems Poor accoustics but manageable. Accoustics were problematic Sometimes it was difficult to hear what people were saying Two microphones would had helped Not the lunch/break area : smokers</i></p>	
<p>3. Did you like the format of the Colloquium as a whole?</p>	<p>YES: 35 PARTIALLY: NO: MEAN:</p>
<p>Comments/recommendations: <i>Very much. Discussants were great to get the best out of presentations. Extremely valuable 20 mins presentation + 40 mins discussion get good parametres for discussion. The experts invited get the quality of the discussion, both leading to insightful experiences. The balance between presentation time + discussion enabled benefitting from the latter and made it rich experience. It was very useful as we could participate in the discussions as much as possible. There was enough time to discuss, which is usually not the case at other conferences. The format worked very well I really liked it. Very useful presentation-discussion format.</i></p>	

4. Did you find the presentations relevant and of good quality?	YES: 32 PARTIALLY: 2 NO: 1 MEAN:
---	---

Would you single out a presentation in particular? Why?

*The Bilkent case, because of its comprehensiveness and serious work, involving many people (even teachers in next phase)
All deserved prize, but for my context, the ones that were most useful were: 1 Karmen, 2 Jayanti, 3 Elif and Carole, Cathy Mark's for laying the lucid foundations. Jamie and Tomoki's elaborating first attempts of solid implementation
No, because despite the differences in knowledge and expertise, each presentation is unique in terms of sharing local experience.
They were all relevant and very insightful. Investigating the relationship between the EIKEN tests and the CEFR: very clear, useful to my own context, and results from last year's pre-conference event.
They were all very good.
No. All stimulated interesting discussion with many participants joining in.
Very varying – obviously- but overall interesting, demonstrating widely different approaches, and contexts (I was personally interested in the Japanese and Greek presentations)
A number barely focussed explicitly on standard setting at all.
Karambalos and Downey. They kept to the theme, showed different ways of standard setting and showed the validity of what they arrived at.
It was the variety, with some examples of mistake and some of best practice
They all complemented each other.*

5. Do you consider the time limits for the discussions appropriate?	YES: 35 PARTIALLY: NO: MEAN:
---	---------------------------------------

Comments/recommendations:

*Neus also kept it to the limit, which was very good.
Initially I thought it would be too long but in practice it worked very well
20 mins + 40 mins worked very well
As a presenter, I felt the timing given was appropriate. As a participant I was happy with the discussion time limit as I know that if a comment was to be made there would be adequate time for a possible answer or a road to pursue.
Presentations could be a bit longer, then presentations could provide more info and discussions could be more exciting
Participants were controlled in the length of their input. Our chair person did a good job in controlling the discussion
Very much. Very useful.*

6. Do you consider the time allocations of the Colloquium per day appropriate?	YES: 34 PARTIALLY: 1 NO: MEAN:
--	---

Comments/recommendations:

*Leaving at about 4.30 is about right. Staying any longer would have drifted
Very good planning. Two hours – break, two hours – break, finishing at 16:30. Great!!
Certainly not longer
It was very good that the days were not too long.
More discussion on the last day, perhaps with a session focused on future directions would have been good.*

7. Do you consider the length of the Colloquium appropriate?	YES: 34 PARTIALLY: 1 NO: MEAN:
--	---

Comments/recommendations:

*Long enough to go into depth- much longer would be too exhausting to maintain the necessary levels of concentration
But others who can't be away from their jobs for a week may wish to have it a bit shorter
Certainly not longer*

8. Was this Colloquium as a whole useful to you? Why? Why not?	YES: 35 PARTIALLY: NO: MEAN:
--	---------------------------------------

Comments/recommendations:

I really enjoyed the colloquium and every bit of it!!! Hugely informative and it confirmed that what I have started doing is the right thing. I found the experience of sharing the discussions that took place, and the room during coffee breaks, and lunch very beneficial and enriching. I have learnt so much, was able to ask "stupid" questions, got a lot of relevant input, know better how to go on... This colloquium was a fabulous success!!! The quality of the discussion was very high. It put my presentation into a broader context of CEFR linking, which is very welcome, since it can feel quite isolated. Helped me understand the problems and ways forward of standard setting processes. Extremely useful as I learned a lot of what has been done and is being done in this area and the kinds of difficulties people have had. It was very useful to learn about other experiences about standard setting. Common problems became very clear. I learnt a lot. Helped confirm and develop understanding of theory and practical aspects of ss. I became even more aware of the importance of ss issues. Important to my motivation in my job. Reckase's figure and overall report. We could get very useful information and can use those for our further research. Learnt from others' experiences. Had a chance to hear opposing ideas of the discussants. Very useful comments for future standard setting and how to improve. Very much; several perspectives.

9. What were the most important new things that you learned during the colloquium?

I could not mention all I learned!! I realise the importance of such professional meetings, of this horizontal cooperation in Europe. Once concrete point I learned: the importance of separating the evaluation of item difficulties and the judgement of performances. How to start, or better how much I need to learn. It's like standing in front of a huge tunnel, not yet seeing the light or the exit but having a strong feeling it is there. I somehow "validated" my intuitions/thinking about what I try to do in my educational context (University context) is the right direction about other subject matter issued. I knew little about CEFR before the colloquium. I am now at list familiar with the book. Aspects of training for judges and the various knock on effects. The range of projects. Awareness of problems – shared – That the role of empirical validation will change and in general to learn more about different views of the importance of psychometrics in this field. My concerns about alignment, standard setting, etc. are also shared by other participants irrespective of the context. This was comforting. Need for training (and for getting enough feedback for the judges); Mark's scheme for standard setting; terminology inconsistencies: what is meant by what. Too much to enumerate. I learned a huge amount. It confirmed that the initial calibration is only the first stage and there is a lot more to do. There are very many ways to go about this and there is plenty of support from other institutions. The many projects that are taking place around Europe and possibilities of establishing networks to collaborate to solve common problems. I can't say I learned anything entirely new, but a few aspects that have been worrying me were highlighted and gave me hope that they will be paid more attention: the quality /validity of tests/ the interpretation of CEFR levels by different cultures. Procedure of standard setting; all the idea of the colloquium itself. Mark Reckase's presentation. The wide variety of perceptions, actions and conclusions. Different experiences leading to the same aim! – Importance of training. A clearer idea how to organise the ss procedure, the importance of judge training and a lot of others. I got ideas for new research angles and valuable feedback. I was reminded the importance of stating the evidence of test quality and of quality of ss procedures. Unfortunately I missed last year's workshop, but gained insight into ss and realised that many organisations are facing the same problems that we are. What really stood out was that the appropriate ss method has to be chosen for the test to be standardised. That even the experts have problems (we are all human) to solve!! We were able to receive important feedback on what we had done. Projects are often done in isolation, which means that decisions are made by consulting the literature, etc. Here we were able to interact and learn from a variety of direct feedback and sources. Honestly, everybody suffers from ss!! More detail about standard setting and the diagram presented by Mark. Some of the bottlenecks that others also experience. Need for more valid judgements: more data!! The US side of the picture. Other methods. Importance of training judges. The application of the ss methods and the problems. Ways to tackle with them.

10 . What aspects of the colloquium could be improved if any?

It was perfect!!

Suggested topic for next pre-workshop: training. Thank you so much!

Maybe a sound system to help when person's speak soft!

Having parallel colloquiums made the choice difficult. I would have also liked attending "classroom assessment"

I cannot see what can be improved but I would sincerely recommend that you organize it next year as well with the topic of training (all the details Felly mentioned) or any other relevant topic

It was good as it was!! Many thanks indeed!

Will there be a summary posted on the website? This would be very usefu

I don't think it can be improved on much. Thank you very much for organising the event!!

I would have appreciated the papers in advance but maybe that was not at all "part of the deal" Great job!!

The meeting room a bit too hot.

A mic for the speakers would be nice

I liked it!!

Nothing to say. All was very good!! THANK YOU.

In retrospect things can always be done better. But as with the worksop in 2007, it was well organised, well run and VERY VERY USEFUL

Not really, it was well-organised.

Outline the role of the discussants in more detail. "Force" them to give formal presentations at the beginning, during and after.

Very much liked the 20+40 min. structure. I cannot think of another way to structure it.

Nothing really. Thank you very much.