

2011

**Web 2.0 authoring tools in higher education:
new directions for assessment and
academic integrity**

Final Report

<http://web2assessmentresources.wikispaces.com>

Project Team:

Kathleen Gray, The University of Melbourne
Jenny Waycott, The University of Melbourne
Celia Thompson, The University of Melbourne
Rosemary Clerehan, Monash University
Judithe Sheard, Monash University
Margaret Hamilton, RMIT University
Joan Richardson, RMIT University

Report Authors:

Jenny Waycott
Kathleen Gray

Support for this project was provided by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council Ltd., an initiative of the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Learning and Teaching Council or the Australian Government.

This work is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Australia Licence. Under this Licence you are free to copy, distribute, display and perform the work and to make derivative works.

Attribution: You must attribute the work to the original authors and include the following statement: Support for the original work was provided by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council Ltd, an initiative of the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Noncommercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

Share Alike: If you alter, transform, or build on this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a licence identical to this one.

For any **reuse or distribution**, you must make clear to others the licence terms of this work. Any of these conditions can be waived if you obtain permission from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit

<<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/au/>> or send a letter to:

Creative Commons
543 Howard Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco California 94105
USA.

Requests and inquiries concerning these rights should be addressed to:

Office for Learning and Teaching
GPO Box 9880, Sydney NSW 2001
Location code N255EL10

or through learningandteaching@deewr.gov.au

2011

ISBN
978-0-642-78181-9 [PRINT]
978-0-642-78182-6 [PDF]
978-0-642-78183-3 [RTF]

Please cite as Waycott, J., & Gray, K. (2011). *Web 2.0 Authoring Tools in Higher Education: New Directions for Assessment and Academic Integrity. Final Report*. Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Contents

Contents	i
Executive Summary	1
1. About the Project	3
Aims and outcomes	3
Advancement of knowledge.....	4
2. Approach and Methodology	7
Project stages.....	7
Factors critical to success.....	10
Scope and limitations	11
3. Dissemination and Impact.....	13
Key project outcomes and dissemination.....	13
Dissemination strategy and implementation of outcomes	17
Project linkages	19
4. Evaluation	20
5. References	22
Acknowledgements.....	25
Appendices.....	27
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	27
Appendix B: Interview Protocol.....	37

Executive Summary

This report details the aims, outcomes, methodology and evaluation of the priority project “Web 2.0 Authoring Tools in Higher Education: New Directions for Assessment and Academic Integrity.”

This project was an interdisciplinary endeavour, undertaken by academics at The University of Melbourne, Monash University, and RMIT University. The project aimed to examine the challenges involved in assessing students’ web 2.0 activities in higher education, and to develop resources to support good practice in designing, implementing, marking and evaluating web 2.0 assignments.

The project is located at the forefront of a changing social and technical landscape, in which academics are being encouraged to implement web 2.0 technologies – also known as the “social web” – to support teaching and learning in higher education. Web 2.0 activities include blogging, microblogging, wiki writing, audio and video podcasting, social networking, and virtual world activities. While there has been great interest in the potential pedagogical benefits of using web 2.0 in higher education, and numerous case studies have been published illustrating specific educational uses of Web 2.0 tools, the issue of how to **assess** students’ web 2.0 activities has, until recently, been largely overlooked.

Assessment activities using web 2.0 tools can differ substantially from the sorts of assignments that students and staff may be used to. For instance, students may be required to publish regular blog posts using an informal or journalistic writing style, to create and use different types of media, or to co-author content in large-scale collaborations. The representation of student learning in web 2.0 activities in higher education raises both familiar and novel challenges for assessment and academic integrity, which are critical to resolve if university learning and teaching is to keep pace with trends in public and scholarly communication. This project has made an important contribution in this field by interrogating issues relating to academic standards and assessment and reporting practices in the context of using web 2.0 technologies for medium- to high-stakes summative assessment in higher education.

The project employed a participatory approach, which involved engaging with stakeholders across the Australian higher education sector and drawing on multiple perspectives in order to develop a meaningful set of resources to support Australian academics in the assessment of students’ web 2.0 activities. The project was conducted over three stages. In the first stage we aimed to provide an overview of current practice by surveying and interviewing over 60 academics who have used web 2.0 activities as part of assessment tasks in their university teaching. A key outcome from this stage of the project was a discussion paper summarising the survey and interview findings (see <http://web2assessmentroundtable.pbworks.com/f/ASW2A+Discussion+Paper.pdf>). The findings of the survey and interviews suggest that practice of web 2.0 activities in higher education was more limited than the educational commentary would suggest.

Stage Two involved collating issues and recommendations by initiating broad discussion about what constitutes good practice in the assessment of students’ web 2.0 activities. During this stage we established a reference group, comprising stakeholder representatives at the three partner universities, and an advisory group, including Australian and international academics with expertise in student learning, assessment, e-learning, and web 2.0 in higher education. A national roundtable event was held to enable members of the advisory group to meet and discuss the issues raised by this project. Drawing on these interdisciplinary and inter-university consultations, the project formulated a set of key technology, pedagogy and policy considerations to assist academics to reflect on approaches to the assessment of student web 2.0 activities.

During Stage Three of the project, these key considerations were used as the basis for a



semester-long exploration of web 2.0 assessment practices with staff and students in 17 different subject teaching and learning settings in 5 universities. The resulting in-depth case studies describe a variety of opportunities and challenges for constructive alignment, formative and peer assessment, student and staff workload, digital identity and security, academic writing and integrity. The findings from this project, including a range of resources for academics who wish to plan or review the assessment of their students' web 2.0 activities, are available from: <http://web2assessmentresources.wikispaces.com>



1. About the Project

Aims and outcomes

This ALTC Priority Project aimed to: 1) examine the challenges involved in assessing students' web 2.0 activities in higher education, and 2) develop resources to support good academic practice when lecturers undertake this novel form of assessment.

In recent years there has been growing interest in the use of web 2.0 activities to support university learning and teaching. Web 2.0 activities include blogging and microblogging, wiki writing, audio and video podcasting, social networking, and virtual world activities. Educational commentators have noted that these activities offer numerous potential benefits for learning in higher education. Using web 2.0 tools – also known as the “social web” – students can create, publish, and share content, collaborate in small or large groups, and critically review and comment on their peers' work. Web 2.0 activities appear to have the potential, then, to enable social constructivist approaches to learning and teaching, and to foster the development of generic skills, such as collaboration, writing, and critical analysis. A recent report from the UK noted:

e-Learning incorporating Web 2.0 offers the sense of being a contributing member of a leaning community, which is one of the hallmarks of higher education. [...] Learning that is active – by doing – undertaken within a community and based on individual's [sic] interests, is widely considered to be the most effective. Driven by process rather than content, such an approach helps students become self-directed and independent learners. Web 2.0 is well suited to serving and supporting this type of learning. (Melville, Allan, Crampton, Fothergill, Godfrey, Haloe et al, 2009, p. 8)

While there has been great interest in web 2.0 in higher education, and numerous case studies have been published illustrating specific educational uses of web 2.0 tools, the issue of how to **assess** students' web 2.0 activities has, until recently, been largely overlooked (see Gray, Thompson, Sheard, Clerehan & Hamilton, 2010, for a review). There has been little examination, for instance, of the challenges involved in assessing the work students create, or the activities they undertake, using social web technologies. Assessment activities using web 2.0 tools can differ substantially from the sorts of assignments that students and staff may be used to. For instance, students may be required to publish regular blog posts using an informal or journalistic writing style, to create and use different types of media, or to co-author content in large-scale collaborations (e.g., using a wiki to construct a new textbook in collaboration with the whole class – see Baltzersen, 2010, for an example).

When implementing web 2.0 assessment activities – particularly for medium- and high-stakes assessment – it is essential that educators are aware of the issues and challenges involved, and that they understand what constitutes good assessment practice in this context. This project aimed to address these issues by developing resources to support good academic practice in the assessment of students' web 2.0 (or social web) activities. (For convenience, the **Assessment of Student Web 2.0 Activities** is abbreviated throughout this report to **ASW2A**).



Specifically, in this project we aimed to achieve the following outcomes to:

- document current web 2.0 assessment practices, through a national survey and interviews with Australian academics who have undertaken summative assessment of student web 2.0 work
- provide a forum for broad discussion about assessment standards, practices and reporting issues with ASW2A, through a national roundtable event and through regular engagement with practitioners, experts, and project stakeholders
- develop a draft framework for good practice, based on multiple perspectives presented at the roundtable event, and drawing on findings from the survey and interviews
- conduct case studies to explore ASW2A in depth in different learning and teaching contexts
- develop resources to support good practice in ASW2A, including case study reports, examples, and materials to support staff development.

Advancement of knowledge

Prior to the commencement of this project, five project team members were involved in a joint effort to examine academic authorship conventions in the context of web 2.0 technologies in higher education (Gray, Thompson, Clerehan, Sheard & Hamilton, 2008). An extensive literature review revealed that published case studies of social web activities in higher education rarely contained detail about assessment practices (Gray, Thompson, Sheard, Clerehan & Hamilton, 2010). In addition, while educational commentators have offered numerous and sound pedagogical rationales for using social web technologies in higher education, they rarely offered guidelines on how best to assess students' web 2.0 activities (see Elliott, 2008, and Whitelock, 2010, for recent exceptions).

Furthermore, guides to good assessment practice in HE have typically overlooked the unique challenges and opportunities associated with assessing web 2.0 activities. When using web 2.0 technologies for university assignments, students may create work that challenges previously understood notions of academic standards, making it difficult for lecturers to apply good assessment and reporting practices. Some pointers to good practice can be found in existing general guides to assessment (such as James, McInnis and Devlin, 2002 and REAP, 2007) and guides for assessing group learning (such as Isaacs, 2002 and Race, 2001). However, these guidelines may be difficult to apply or may not apply at all to the assessment of student web 2.0 activities. More recent, specialised guides that have been developed to support online assessment or e-assessment (e.g. Crisp, 2007; JISC, 2007; Reeves, 2006) may set out some issues of relevance in ASW2A, and may recognise some of the in-principle challenges, but still lack details or exemplars of how to resolve these in practice.

The current project aimed to advance knowledge by addressing this gap and by focusing on the ALTC program priorities of **academic standards, assessment practices** and **reporting**. Incorporating web 2.0 activities in HE may challenge established understandings about academic authorship and integrity in higher education. If web 2.0 activities are being undertaken as part of medium- to high-stakes summative assessment, it is particularly important that questions about academic standards and assessment practices are interrogated, and that academics are provided with guidelines and resources to support good practice.

This project is timely, given the increasing prevalence of web 2.0 technologies, both within university learning and teaching settings and in the broader social context.



Importantly, web 2.0 technologies have been taken up in recent years in the civic, business and professional contexts for which universities educate students (e.g., Boulos, Maramba & Wheeler, 2006; Bughin, 2008; Burgess, Foth & Klaebe, 2006). In academic research circles too they are being adopted as supplements or even alternatives to conventional forms of scholarly publication and communication (see Pearce, Weller, Scanlon & Kinsley, 2011, for a review). Moreover, there is a growing list of web 2.0 tools aimed at expanding educational uses, both freestanding services such as *CiteULike*, *Edublogs*, *Serious Games* and *TeacherTube*, and within newer versions of university learning management systems such as *Blackboard* and *Moodle*.

Given this changing social and technical landscape, academics are being encouraged to implement web 2.0 activities to support learning and teaching in higher education in many disciplinary contexts (e.g. Alexander, 2006; Dalsgaard, 2006; Franklin and van Harmelen, 2007; Richardson, 2006). As noted above there is a clear link between social web activities and social constructivist theories of learning. The pedagogical rationales that have been advanced for using web 2.0 in HE include: to engage and empower students, to increase peer learning and creative expression, to develop literacy and communication skills, and to facilitate lifelong learning (e.g. Barnes and Tynan, 2007; Berlanga *et al.*, 2007; Brown and Adler, 2008; Drexler, Baralt and Dawson, 2008; Godwin, 2007; Lamb and McLoughlin, 2007, pp.6, 10; McLoughlin and Lee, 2007; Renner, 2006).

However, student web 2.0 authoring in higher education raises significant challenges for academic integrity and other aspects of educational quality in assessment (Anderson, 2007, pp.54-56; Dron, 2006; Elliott, 2007; *Horizon Report*, 2008, p.5; Nilsson, Ekloff and Ottosson, 2005; Roberts, 2007; Selwyn, 2007, p.7). Most of the advocates of web 2.0 in HE offer no guidance on how to conduct assessment that comes to grips with its unique features, its difference from previous forms of student “writing” and staff “marking” and its contextual baggage. Social web technologies enable students – and others – to produce continuous and dialogic forms of text. Web 2.0 activities are uniquely co-constructed, connected, continuous and mixed media by nature: they include commenting, editing, mashing, rating and tagging of content that is open to all participants. While the pedagogical affordances of web 2.0 in higher education can provide opportunities for enhancing students’ learning, they also impose challenges for both students and staff (see Waycott, Gray, Clerehan *et al.*, 2010, for a discussion of these issues).

Although the use of web 2.0 activities in higher education has been increasing, in many cases they are offered chiefly as preliminary tasks to core assessable work, for optional enrichment or for low-stakes assessment (i.e. formative and locally marked). According to recent research (Gray *et al.*, 2010) only a small number of staff and students, spread across institutions and disciplines, have reported their experience with web 2.0 activities for medium- or high-stakes assessment (i.e. where results are externally reviewed, determine student progression and affect the standing of the course). So, for academics wishing to implement or improve ASW2A substantially, there are few model assignments or examples of good assessment practice to draw on.

There are further contextual reasons why improving ASW2A practice is not straightforward: suggestions are scattered too widely across refereed and ephemeral literature, and may be tied too closely to individual educators’ innovations, to help an academic community or institution trying to embed systematic improvements. Technical or operational suggestions for improving ASW2A (e.g. Clark *et al.*, 2007; Downes, 2007) tend to be put forward without reference to any educational quality framework. Academics may encounter philosophical arguments against ASW2A, on the grounds that it is contrary to the spirit of the social web or of adult learning (e.g. Batson, 2007). Lastly, academics



may be surprised to find that many of their “Net Generation” students are not familiar with web 2.0 authoring forms (e.g. Kennedy *et al.*, 2009).

The current project builds on this previous research to advance knowledge by developing an understanding of the particular challenges and opportunities associated with assessing students’ social web activities. To achieve this we adopted a three-stage approach that involved: a) examining current practices, b) inviting broad discussion about the issues, and c) conducting in-depth case studies of web 2.0 practices in different HE teaching and learning settings. More detail about each of these stages is provided in the next section.



2. Approach and Methodology

Project stages

Throughout this project we employed a participatory approach, drawing on the experiences of academics who have conducted ASW2A, and inviting contributions and feedback from practitioners and policy-makers with expertise in e-learning and student assessment (see Waycott, Gray, Thompson *et al*, 2010, for more information about this approach).

The project was conducted in three stages. Each stage made a distinct contribution towards achieving the intended outcomes outlined above. At each stage we gained approval from the ethics committees in the participating universities to conduct the project activities. The project methods are outlined below.

Stage 1: Surveying current practice

During this stage, which was implemented in August to December 2009, we:

- conducted an online survey of Australian teaching academics who have undertaken ASW2A in subjects they have taught. The survey was advertised in national learning and teaching forums. In addition, we canvassed recent conference proceedings and journal publications to identify a number of academics who have used social web technologies in their teaching; we contacted these academics directly to invite them to participate in the survey. Respondents were asked to answer questions about one assignment they used in one subject. There were 64 respondents, of whom 53 completed all or most questions. A copy of the survey is provided in Appendix A. Further details about the respondents are provided in Tables 1 to 3, below.
- conducted telephone interviews with 22 of the survey respondents who had volunteered to take part in an interview. The interviews were semi-structured, focusing on details of practice and participants' perspectives on their use of social web technologies in teaching and learning. A copy of the interview protocol is provided in Appendix B.
- developed a discussion paper summarising the findings from the interviews and survey. This discussion paper is available on our resources wiki: <http://web2assessmentroundtable.pbworks.com/f/ASW2A+Discussion+Paper.pdf>

Table 1: Number of survey respondents from each field of study

Field of Study	Number of responses
Humanities / Society & Culture	16
Education	15
Information Technology	11
Medicine & Health	9
Management & Commerce	6
Other	3



Table 2: Types of Web 2.0 activities used by survey respondents*

Type of Web 2.0 activity	Number of responses
Wiki writing	32
Blogging/microblogging	31
Social networking	17
Audio/video podcasting	16
Virtual world activities	12
Social bookmarking	11

*Participants could provide more than one response to this question.

Table 3: Assessment weighting of survey respondents' assignments

How much the assignment is worth	Number of responses
01-10%	7
11-20%	11
21-30%	9
31-40%	6
41-50%	9
51-60%	2
61-70%	0
71-80%	3
81-90%	2
91-100%	4

Stage 2: Collating issues and recommendations

During this stage we:

- established a **reference group**, which comprised stakeholder representatives at the three partner universities and met quarterly to discuss the issues raised by this project. There were 16 members, including academics, educational developers, e-learning advisors, and students.
- established an **advisory group**, including academics from Australia and internationally with expertise in student learning, assessment, e-learning, and/or the use of social web technologies in university teaching. There were 30 active members of the advisory group, representing 18 universities across Australia, three institutions in the UK, and one university in New Zealand. Advisory group members primarily contributed to the project through participation in the roundtable event (see below).
- convened a national roundtable event. This one-day invitation-only event provided the opportunity for people with expertise, interest and experience in areas relevant to the project to come together to share experiences and ideas and discuss what constitutes good practice in ASW2A. Thirty-two participants attended the event, including four postgraduate students. International advisory group members participated remotely by contributing to the event wiki, which was used to share the written proceedings of the discussions as the event was taking place. The proceedings of the event can be viewed here: <http://web2assessmentroundtable.pbworks.com>.
- developed a draft framework for good practice in the assessment of student web 2.0 activities. This framework set out a series of checklists, based on: a) the affordances of web 2.0 for student learning; b) the processes of assessment; and c) assessment policy.



Stage 3: Field-testing improvements

During this stage, which took place in first semester 2010, we conducted 17 in-depth case studies across five universities to examine how participating lecturers assessed a specific assignment in which students were asked to use social web technologies. Information about these case studies is summarised in the table below.

Table 4: Summary of case studies

Web 2.0 Activity	Subject/Discipline	Level of Study	% of subject mark
Blogging	Cultural Studies	Undergraduate	30%
	Cinema Studies	Undergraduate	30%
	Criminal Law	Postgraduate	20%
	Media Studies	Postgraduate	40%
	Information Management	Postgraduate	40%
Social bookmarking	Education	Postgraduate	70%
Social networking	Languages	Undergraduate	16%
Video sharing	Business	Postgraduate	25%
	Economics	Postgraduate	20%
Photo sharing	Communication Design	Undergraduate	60%
Virtual worlds	Languages	Undergraduate	10%
Wiki writing	Accounting	Postgraduate	25%
	Education	Postgraduate	100%
	Information Technology A	Postgraduate	20%
	Information Technology B	Undergraduate	10%
	Languages	Undergraduate	15%
	Science	Undergraduate/Postgraduate	40%

For each case study, project team members met with the participating lecturers at regular points throughout the semester, using the draft framework for good practice to guide the discussions. Through this process we aimed to gain a thorough understanding of ASW2A across the assessment cycle, from designing and implementing the assignment, to marking students' work, reporting back to students, and evaluating the assignment (Bloxham & Boyd, 2007; Rust, O'Donovan & Price, 2005).

For each case study we also collected relevant materials and examples (such as instructions to students and assessment rubrics). Where possible, we conducted observations of classroom and assessment practices. Each case study was managed by one project team member who was responsible for meeting with participating lecturers and taking extensive field notes about the case.

At the end of the semester, participating lecturers were invited to take part in a focus group discussion. Three staff focus group sessions were held; in total 18 lecturers took part.



Students who were enrolled in the case study subjects were also invited to take part in a focus group discussion. In total, 20 students participated in one of six student focus group sessions. The student focus group discussions provided insight into students' experiences of using social web technologies in their assessment tasks. Student and staff contributions to the focus groups have been used to provide multiple perspectives to enrich the resources developed from this project.

A final fourth stage of the project was the dissemination stage, which involved distilling the outcomes from the project and using these to develop a suite of resources to support good academic practice in AS2WA. Further details about the project dissemination are provided in [Section 3](#) below.

Factors critical to success

The participatory approach used in this project was critical to its success. By drawing on the varied perspectives of multiple participants, we ensured the resources created are relevant to, and informed by, the experiences of educators across the Australian higher education sector. To achieve this participatory approach we: 1) documented the experiences of a broad sample of Australian academics; 2) engaged experts, practitioners, and other stakeholders to contribute to the project outcomes through the reference group, advisory group, and roundtable activities; and 3) enabled participating lecturers to engage in reflective practice while undertaking the 17 case studies.

We employed a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches to implementing change, drawing on the experiences of those working “on the ground”, as well as those working in management and advisory roles. In addition, we took into account macro-level decisions and information, such as institutional policy regulations. Policy issues were a key concern in the draft good practice framework and have been the focus of discussions with case study participants and reference group members. We anticipate that the participatory approach we've adopted, and the combination of bottom-up and top-down perspectives included in this project will ensure its broad impact across the Australian higher education sector.

Reference group members were actively involved in providing constructive advice on the project progress and supporting the implementation of the project outcomes in each of the partner universities. Having stakeholder representatives engaged in the project in this way was a critical factor contributing to its success: reference group members could champion and disseminate information about the project via various committees in their respective universities and through their management and e-learning advisory roles.

The 17 case studies provided an opportunity to examine ASW2A in different teaching and learning contexts. The case studies covered a range of web 2.0 technologies and examined various medium- to high-stakes assessment tasks in different disciplines. This variety means the case study reports provide numerous unique exemplars of web 2.0 assessment practices, adding to the richness of the project resources.

A further factor that was critical to the project success was the method of conducting the case studies over the course of a whole semester and interviewing lecturers at various points to capture details about the whole of the assessment cycle. The project resources, therefore, include information about not only designing web 2.0 assessment tasks, but also managing the assignment, providing feedback to students, marking the assignment, and evaluating it.



The lecturers who participated in the case studies were enthusiastic about the opportunity to reflect on their own academic practices and to talk about how they did assessment. In this way, the case studies provided an opportunity for lecturers to open the “black box” of assessment. In the focus group sessions, some participants commented on the benefits of this reflective practice:

I think that being involved in something like this gives you an opportunity to step back and look at what you're doing, through an outsider's lens. In many ways our discussions with you and some of the questions you were asking gave us something to think about. There was perhaps a little bit of tinkering that could be done around the edges. I think that was really useful for us. We tend to use our intuition a lot with this type of thing. To actually have to sit down and explain to someone and justify what we're doing and why we think it's working – it reinforced for us that we were on the right track. (Academic 1)

I separated the technology from the assessment and I think the basics around good assessment practice are still the same principles. What new technology does is just make you review things and think about it differently in terms of implementation ... We wanted to review our process because, you know, we're putting ourselves out there. We're still not there, but we're putting ourselves out there to trial things [and] that leads to review. (Academic 10)

Scope and limitations

Factors that impeded the project's success included the challenges associated with conducting an ambitious project – in which we hoped to achieve a number of important outcomes – on a limited timeline and budget. However, these challenges were overcome and we achieved all of the stated objectives. Nevertheless, the project raised a number of issues – and large amounts of data - that we would have liked to explore in more depth, if time had been available. The challenges we encountered, as summarised below, suggest that there is much scope for future work to further develop the findings and outcomes from this project.

We amassed large volumes of data and it was difficult, and time-consuming, to synthesise our findings to create a useful and accessible resource for the higher education sector. The surveys, interviews, 17 case studies, and student and staff focus groups together created an abundance of rich data. A thorough analysis of the data was not possible in the timeframe of this project, although initial analyses were conducted and data extracts are included in the project resources (see also Waycott, Gray, Thompson *et al*, 2010 and Waycott, Gray, Clerehan *et al*, 2010 for a summary of the initial interview data analyses). At the time of writing, further work was ongoing to disseminate the project findings through additional scholarly publications.

While the variety of the 17 case studies added to the richness of the resources, as noted above, the different teaching and learning contexts and various web 2.0 technologies used meant that it was difficult to create a coherent and systematic way of reporting the case studies. We wanted to ensure that each case study report would be accessible to readers but also provide in-depth information about each unique case. We achieved this balance by creating structured templates for the case study reports on the resources wiki.

In addition, the varied ways in which web 2.0 technologies have been used mean that it is difficult to make generalisations about good practice in ASW2A. Further work may be needed to identify the unique challenges and opportunities associated with different types of web 2.0 activities and in different teaching and learning contexts. Our resources go some way towards achieving this, given that the case



studies cover a variety of teaching and learning contexts and web 2.0 tools.

Because this project focused on the assessment of students' web 2.0 activities, we were only able to peripherally address the many other relevant issues associated with the use of web 2.0 tools in higher education (e.g., managing student collaboration, student engagement, student learning, implementation planning, and staff development). This project has revealed that there is much scope for further work in this area. In particular, many of the lecturers involved in this project expressed an interest in learning about how students feel about using web 2.0 tools in university assignments. While we included students in our roundtable event, and held focus group discussions with 20 students, this project primarily focused on **lecturers'** assessment practices. The students we spoke to were eager to share their experiences, providing valuable information that sometimes differed from lecturers' perspectives. It became clear, therefore, that there is much scope for further work examining **students'** perspectives.



3. Dissemination and Impact

Key project outcomes and dissemination

The main outcomes from this project include: a) online resources, b) workshops and seminars, and c) scholarly publications. The project outcomes were widely disseminated across the Australian and international higher education sector, through notices in professional newsletters, attendance at national and international conferences, and via the professional networks established during this project (i.e., through engagement with the advisory and reference group members). A description of the key outcomes, and information about where the project materials are available, is provided below.

Online resources

The primary outcome from this project is a suite of resources designed to support academics who are using or plan to use social web technologies in their teaching and, specifically, conducting summative assessment of students' social web activities. We compiled these resources in a publicly available wiki, which is accessible here:

- <http://web2assessmentresources.wikispaces.com>

The full table of contents of the wiki is reproduced in Table 5, below. Section 4 of the wiki, "**Further Resources**" links to additional project materials, including scholarly publications. Additionally, we made arrangements to send out copies of a printed version of the resources wiki to teaching and learning directors at each Australian university.

Throughout this project we maintained a project blog, which was used to disseminate information about project progress. This is available at:

- <http://web2assessment.blogspot.com>

The written proceedings of the national roundtable event, which was held during Stage Two of the project, are also publicly available:

- <http://web2assessmentroundtable.pbworks.com>



Table 5: Resources Wiki Table of Contents

1. Introduction
1.1. About Academic Assessment
1.2. About the Social Web
1.3. Aspects and Affordances of the Social Web for Assessing Student Learning
1.4. Assessment and Academic Policy Considerations in Using the Social Web to Assess Student Learning
1.5. Academic Integrity Considerations in Using the Social Web to Assess Student Learning
2. Case Studies
2.1. Using blogging for assessment in a Cultural Studies subject
2.2. Using blogging for assessment in a Cinema Studies subject
2.3. Using blogging for assessment in a Media Studies subject
2.4. Using blogging for assessment in an Information Management subject
2.5. Using blogging in a Criminal Law subject
2.6. Using various Web 2.0 tools in an Education subject
2.7. Using social networking for assessment in a Languages subject
2.8. Using photo sharing for assessment in a Communication Design subject
2.9. Using vodcasting for assessment in an Economics subject
2.10. Using vodcasting for assessment in a Business subject
2.11. Using virtual worlds for assessment in a Languages subject
2.12. Using wiki writing for assessment in an Accounting subject
2.13. Using wiki writing for assessment in an Education subject
2.14. Using wiki writing for assessment in a Science subject
2.15. Using wiki writing for assessment in an Information Technology subject (A)
2.16. Using wiki writing for assessment in an Information Technology Subject (B)
2.17. Using wiki writing for assessment in a Languages subject
3. Checklists
3.1. Perspectives on designing and preparing Web 2.0 assessment
3.2. Perspectives on introducing and supporting Web 2.0 assessment
3.3. Perspectives on marking and reporting Web 2.0 assessment
3.4. Perspectives on reviewing and improving Web 2.0 assessment
4. Further Resources

Workshops and seminars

We conducted professional development workshops at the following events:

- **Reshaping Higher Education: HERDSA 2010**, 6-9 July, Melbourne
<http://conference.herdsa.org.au/2010/program/workshop1.html>
- **Assessment, Sustainability, Diversity and Innovation: ATN Assessment Conference 2010**, 18-19 November, Sydney
<http://www.iml.uts.edu.au/pdfs/Hamilton.pdf>
- **Curriculum, Technology, and Transformation for an Unknown Future: Ascilite 2010**, 5-8 December, Sydney
http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/Wshops/Waycott_P88_Workshop_proforma.pdf



- **RMIT Teaching and Learning Workshop**, 26 November, Melbourne

In addition, project team members presented the following seminars:

- *The assessment of students' Web 2.0 activities: Findings from an ALTC project.* Presentation by Kathleen Gray and Jenny Waycott for the **Transforming Assessment Webinar Series**, 26th May 2010.
http://www.transformingassessment.com/events_26_may_2010.php
- *Students' use of Web 2.0 tools in higher education: Good practice in assessment and academic integrity.* Presentation by Kathleen Gray and Jenny Waycott for the **Australian Learning and Teaching Council Health Sciences seminar series**, Medical Education Unit, The University of Melbourne, 30th June 2010.
- *Web 2.0 as a new assessment option: What are the possibilities and what are the challenges?* Presentation by Rosemary Clerehan and Judy Sheard at the **Higher Education Information Technology Summit**, Melbourne, 25th October 2010.
- *Transforming assessment in higher education: A participatory approach to the development of a good practice framework for assessing student learning through social web technologies.* Presentation by Jenny Waycott and Celia Thompson at the **Ascilite conference**, Sydney, 6th December 2010.
- *Web 2.0 Authoring Tools in Higher Education: New Directions for Assessment and Academic Integrity.* Presentation by Judy Sheard at the **Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Education, Panel session on successful higher education projects**, Monash University, 10th February 2011.
- *Working with wikis: collaboration, authorship and assessment in higher education.* Presentation by Celia Thompson and Matthew Absalom at **Global Learn Asia Pacific 2011: Global Conference on Learning and Technology**, Melbourne, March 28 - April 1 2011.
- *Using the social web/web 2.0 to assess students' learning: How could you? Why would you?* Presentation by Kathleen Gray at the **Provost's Summit 2011 – Reshaping eLearning: Charting New Courses with Digital Technologies**, The University of Melbourne, 22nd July 2011.

Scholarly publications

We produced the following scholarly publications from this project:

- Gray, K., Thompson, C., Sheard, J., Clerehan, R. & Hamilton, M. (2010). Students as Web 2.0 authors: Implications for assessment design and conduct. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(1), 105-122. Available at: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26/gray.pdf>
- Gray, K., Waycott, J., Clerehan, R., Hamilton, M., Richardson, J., Sheard, J., Thompson, C. (in press). Worth it? Findings from a study of how academics assess students' Web 2.0 activities. Accepted for publication in *Research in Learning Technology*
- Thompson, C., & Absalom, M. (2011). Working with wikis: collaboration, authorship and assessment in higher education. Paper presented at: *Global Learn Asia Pacific 2011: Global Conference on Learning and Technology*, March 28 - April 1, Melbourne, Australia. Available at: <http://web2assessmentresources.wikispaces.com/file/view/AACE2011ConfProceedings.pdf>



- Waycott, J., Gray, K., Clerehan, R., Hamilton, M., Richardson, J., Sheard, J., & Thompson, C. (2010). Implications for academic integrity of using web 2.0 for teaching, learning and assessment in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 6(2), 8-18. Special Issue: Digital technologies and educational integrity. Available at: <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/699/527>
- Waycott, J., Gray, K., Thompson, C., Sheard, J., Clerehan, R., Richardson, J., & Hamilton, M. (2010). Transforming assessment in higher education: A participatory approach to the development of a good practice framework for assessing student learning through social web technologies. In C.H. Steel, M.J. Keppell, P. Gerbic & S. Housego (Eds.), *Curriculum, technology & transformation for an unknown future. Proceedings ascilite Sydney 2010* (pp.1040-1050). Available at: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Waycott-full.pdf>

A further outcome from this project is a special issue on “Assessing students’ Web 2.0 activities in higher education”, published in the Australasian Journal of Educational Technology. Three of the papers in this special issue report on case studies that were conducted for this project, co-authored with the lecturers who participated in the case studies:

- Davies, A., Pantzopoulos, K., & Gray, K. (2011). Emphasising assessment ‘as’ learning by assessing wiki writing assignments collaboratively and publicly online. In J. Waycott & J. Sheard (Eds), *Assessing students’ Web 2.0 activities in higher education. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5). <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/davies.html>
- Grant, S., & Clerehan, R. (2011). Finding the discipline: Assessing student activity in Second Life. In J. Waycott & J. Sheard (Eds), *Assessing students’ Web 2.0 activities in higher education. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5). <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/grant.html>
- Terrell, J., Richardson, J., & Hamilton, M. (2011). Using Web 2.0 to teach Web 2.0 – a case study in aligning teaching, learning and assessment with professional practice. In J. Waycott & J. Sheard (Eds), *Assessing students’ Web 2.0 activities in higher education. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5). <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/terrell.html>

The editorial for this special issue is available here:

- Waycott, J. & Sheard, J. (2011). Editorial 27(5): Preface to the Special Issue. In J. Waycott & J. Sheard (Eds), *Assessing students’ Web 2.0 activities in higher education. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5), <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/editorial27-5.html>.



Dissemination strategy and implementation of outcomes

In this section we describe in more detail the dissemination strategy used in this project and provide an analysis of the extent to which the approach and outcomes from this project are amenable to implementation in a variety of institutions or locations. Throughout this project we adopted a multi-faceted approach to dissemination. We aimed to ensure that the key lessons and approaches from this project are broadly amenable to implementation by adopting the following strategies: a) engaging extensively with project participants and stakeholders, b) promoting scholarly discourse and good practice in ASW2A, and c) disseminating a suite of online resources for the higher education sector.

Below, we review each of these strategies and describe how the project outcomes can be implemented across disciplinary and institutional contexts.

Engaging with project participants and stakeholders

This project adopted a participatory approach which involved sharing project outcomes through engagement with the reference group, advisory group, and case study participants. Reference group members met quarterly to review the project outcomes and provide feedback on project progress. Several members took the opportunity to “champion” the project within their universities, taking the project outcomes to university board meetings, or sharing the project resources with colleagues. In addition, one of the partner universities (Monash) included information about this project in its Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Education program, and there are plans for a similar dissemination strategy to be adopted in the other partner universities.

Advisory group members were able to contribute to the project outcomes through their participation at the national roundtable event and through regular email communications. In particular, members were invited to review a draft version of the resources wiki and were given the opportunity to be actively involved in the dissemination of this resource through their professional networks.

The semester-long case study projects provided participating lecturers with the opportunity to be closely involved in the project activities and to take an active role in the dissemination of the project outcomes. The reflective practice approach that we adopted created an opportunity for participants to talk about their assessment practices and share their lessons learnt with colleagues, opening up the “black box” of assessment (Hattie, 2009). The multidisciplinary nature of this project, and the broad coverage of web 2.0 technologies and teaching contexts in the 17 case studies, mean that the outcomes from this project are relevant to academics across the Australian (and international) higher education sector.

Promoting scholarly discourse and good practice in ASW2A

We set out to promote scholarly dissemination of our project outcomes through publications in peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings. At the time of writing we had published two journal papers and two conference papers, with four additional journal articles accepted for publication and several further scholarly papers in progress. In addition, by editing a special issue of a journal devoted to the central theme of this project – i.e., assessment of students’ web 2.0 activities – we sought to promote and engage in academic discourse about the issues raised by this project.

Furthermore, we adopted the approaches recommended in the ALTC dissemination strategy by promoting the key lessons from this project through interactive professional development workshops and through numerous seminar presentations.



We held seminars and workshops at international conferences, as well as at internal faculty and university events, engaging with a diverse range of participants.

Disseminating a suite of online resources

We chose to produce the main outcome from this project – a suite of resources to support good practice in ASW2A – on a publicly available wiki site. This has a number of advantages in ensuring that our outcomes are amenable to implementation in a variety of institutions and locations. The wiki includes written resources, such as the case study reports, that users can read online or download. In addition, the wiki contains several further resources that are available for academics in Australia and internationally to access and use, making the outcomes from this project highly accessible and open to further implementation. These resources can be used, for example, to:

- support e-learning managers in conducting professional development activities
- provide teaching academics with guidance and examples on how to conduct web 2.0 assessment
- enable others interested in this issue to conduct further research, using our approach and research instruments.

The resources include:

- examples of assessment rubrics, course materials, and other assessment artefacts.
- scenario descriptions (fictionalised accounts of web 2.0 assessment challenges, drawn from our case studies) that can be used as the basis for professional development workshop activities.
- workshop and presentation slides that can be re-used in other institutions for professional development workshops. These slides are also available on the website **Slideshare** (<http://www.slideshare.net>).
- a link to the project social bookmarking group on the website **Citeulike** (<http://www.citeulike.org>). This provides a list of recommended readings, which others can add to if they wish.
- the survey instrument used in the first stage of this project.

Importantly, the wiki was designed to be collaborative and readers were invited to contribute their comments and feedback by using the “**discussion**” tab on the wiki. Initially a draft version of the wiki was released to the higher education sector, with an invitation for readers to review and provide feedback on the resources. Although few users have taken up this invitation, the wiki attracted significant interest in the sector. We received positive feedback, in the form of emails from readers, stating:

I came across Web2AssessmentResources last week and was immediately impressed with the sophisticated use of the wiki especially in relation to navigation, and accessibility and searchability of content. All significant signs of a well constructed learning design with intentional pedagogical-technology fit.



The website is very good in that nice and simple, clear, well structured with useful principles, case studies and resources. I like the idea of including academic and student quotes!

The statistics revealed that, as of early August 2011, 5,340 visitors had been to the site since it was made public in February 2011.

Project linkages

Throughout this project we actively sought to develop linkages with others working on similar ALTC projects, and with academics who have contributed to scholarly discourse about web 2.0 and assessment in higher education. These linkages were primarily developed through the advisory group. Professor Geoffrey Crisp and Professor Matthew Allen, who have both worked on related ALTC projects, were members of our advisory group and attended our Roundtable event. In addition, we gave a presentation for Geoffrey Crisp's Transforming Assessment webinar series, which was one of the key outcomes from his ALTC fellowship.

We also invited international academics to join our advisory group. Those who accepted our invitation included Bobby Elliott from the Scottish Qualifications Authority, who was instrumental in initiating international debate about the opportunities and challenges associated with assessing students' web 2.0 activities (see Elliott, 2008). The advisory group also included Tom Franklin, an international authority on web 2.0 and learning, and author of a major report for the UK's Joint Information Systems Committee (Franklin & van Harmelen, 2007). In addition, other leading international academics, who have published seminal papers in the fields of student learning, assessment, and educational technology, were involved in the advisory group (see, for example, Dalsgaard, 2006; Kirkwood & Price, 2008)

Through engagement with our case study participants and reference group members we developed strong interdisciplinary collaborative partnerships. These were perhaps most actively developed by engaging the case study participants as co-researchers and co-authors of the case studies. In this way, the case studies became not only an opportunity for project team members to field-test and examine our understandings of good practice in ASW2A, but also for participants to engage in scholarship of teaching and learning activities. Participants were invited to contribute to the case study reports that are included in the resources wiki, and were given the opportunity to co-author scholarly articles about their experiences of web 2.0 assessment. By mid-2011, four of these case studies had been accepted in peer-reviewed publications. Further work was undertaken to encourage other case study participants to publish papers about their scholarship of teaching and learning activities. In this way, we aimed to promote broad dissemination of the case study findings, and to promote strong collaborative partnerships between project team members and case study participants.



4. Evaluation

We employed both formative and summative evaluation processes to assess our progress in this project. Formative evaluation was achieved through regular communication within the project team. In particular, the project leader and project manager conducted weekly informal meetings to discuss the progress of the project. In addition, members of the project team engaged in regular email and phone communication, as well as monthly face-to-face meetings, during which we reviewed progress and discussed the direction of the project. We also sought evaluative feedback and contributions from members of the advisory group and reference group. Their contributions to the project and, in particular their advice about the form and content of the online resources developed from the project, were greatly influential in shaping the project's outcomes. In addition, we conducted regular evaluations of external events, including the professional development workshops and seminar presentations.

During Stage Three of the project we commissioned an external evaluation of the project. The evaluation focused on assessing the impact of the project. Professor Alex Radloff conducted a survey and interviews with project participants (advisory group, reference group, and case study participants) to ascertain the extent to which participants believed the project had contributed to improving ASW2A practices and standards in the Australian higher education sector.

An evaluation report summarised the key findings from this evaluation. The evaluation report noted that:

The project has made a positive contribution to date to increasing awareness of, knowledge about, and engagement in, good practice in the assessment of student Web 2.0 activities.

The evaluation report listed a number of recommendations, which are reproduced below. These relate to continued involvement of current project participants (Recommendations 1 and 2); further dissemination of information and resources (Recommendations 3 and 4); engagement of a wider range of academic staff (Recommendations 5 and 6); and extension of project activities (Recommendations, 7 and 8).

Recommendation 1

Maintain involvement of the project 'alumni' as a group using the momentum and good will generated by the positive experiences of participants to date.

Recommendation 2

Facilitate the establishment of same discipline mentoring relationships between project participants and others interested in using web 2.0 technologies.

Recommendation 3

Support further dissemination of project outcomes through maintenance and regular updating of the project blog on new ideas and emerging practices, and exploring other web 2.0 technologies to bring ideas and resources to the attention of potential new users.

Recommendation 4

Seek endorsement of the Good Practice Framework from relevant professional and accreditation bodies.



Recommendation 5

Adapt / promote project activities and resources for use as part of initial and continuing university academic staff development courses.

Recommendation 6

Engage relevant university leaders such as DVCs /PVCs Teaching and Learning in discussion about university policies and initiatives on assessment practices in relation to assessment of web 2.0 activities.

Recommendation 7

Develop detailed 'how to' guidelines aimed at novice users with specific advice, step by step instructions and actual case studies on how to develop assessment activities for use with different web 2.0 technologies.

Recommendation 8

Seek funding to continue / extend the current project with the aim of developing and piloting new assessment activities that explicitly reflect the participatory and collaborative nature of web 2.0 technologies.

These recommendations should be understood as tasks for the Australian higher education sector for the future. The implementation of these recommendations was beyond the scope of this project, given that it finished in September 2011 and that project team members were not available to pursue its extension.



5. References

- Alexander, B. (2006). Web 2.0: a new wave of innovation for teaching and learning? *EDUCAUSE Review*, 41(2), 32-44. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://connect.educause.edu/Library/EDUCAUSE+Review/Web20ANewWaveofInnovation/40615>
- Anderson, P. (2007, February). What is web 2.0? Ideas, technologies and implications for education. *JISC Technology & Standards Watch*. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/techwatch/tsw0701b.pdf>
- Baltzersen, R. K. (2010). Radical transparency: Open access as a key concept in wiki pedagogy. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(6), 791 – 809. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26/baltzersen.html>
- Barnes, C., & Tynan, B. (2007). The adventures of Miranda in the brave new world: learning in a Web 2.0 millennium. *ALT-J*, 15(3), 189-200. DOI: 10.1080/09687760701673568
- Batson, T. (2007, 12 December). The ePortfolio hijacked. *Campus Technology*. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.campustechnology.com/articles/56617/>
- Berlanga, A., Sloep, P., Brouns, F., Van Rosmalen, P., Bitter-Rijkema, M., & Koper, R. (2007). Functionality for learning networks: lessons learned from social web applications. Paper presented at e-Portfolio Conference, October 17-19, Maastricht, NL. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://hdl.handle.net/1820/1011>
- Boulos, M., Maramba, I., & Wheeler, S. (2006). Wikis, blogs and podcasts: a new generation of Web-based tools for virtual collaborative clinical practice and education. *BMC Medical Education*, 6(41). Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/1472-6920-6-41.pdf>
- Brown, J., & Adler, R. (2008). Minds on fire: open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 43(1), 16-32. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM0811.pdf>
- Bughin, J. (2008). The rise of enterprise 2.0. *Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 9(3), 251-259.
- Burgess, J., Foth, M., & Klaebe, H. (2006). Everyday creativity as civic engagement: a cultural citizenship view of new media. In *Proceedings Communications Policy & Research Forum*, Sydney. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00005056/01/5056_1.pdf
- Clark, D., Sampson, V., Weinberger, A., & Erkens, G. (2007). Analytic frameworks for assessing dialogic argumentation in online learning environments. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(3), 343-374.
- Crisp, G. (2007). *The e-Assessment Handbook*. London: Continuum.
- Dalsgaard, C. (2006). Social software: e-learning beyond learning management systems. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 2. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from http://www.eurodl.org/materials/contrib/2006/Christian_Dalsgaard.htm
- Downes, S. (2007, June 6). Open source assessment. Message posted to <http://halfanhour.blogspot.com/2007/06/open-source-assessment.html>
- Drexler, W., Baralt, A., & Dawson, K. (2008). The Teach Web 2.0 Consortium: A tool to promote educational social networking and Web 2.0 use among educators. *Education Media International*, 45(4), 271-283.
- Dron, J. (2006). The pleasures and perils of social software. In *Proceedings of the Higher Education Academy Information and Computer Sciences 7th Annual Conference*, Dublin, Ireland (pp. 127-131). Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from http://www.ics.heacademy.ac.uk/Events/HEADublin2006_V2/papers/Jon%20Dron%2024.pdf
- Elliott, B. (2007, March). *E-assessment: What is Web 2.0?* Glasgow: Scottish



- Qualifications Authority. Web page. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/22941.html
- Elliott, B. (2008). *Assessment 2.0: Modernising assessment in the age of Web 2.0*. Glasgow: Scottish Qualifications Authority. Retrieved from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/461041/Assessment-20>
- Franklin, T., & van Harmelen, M. (2007). Web 2.0 for Content for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. JISC Report. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/digitalrepositories/web2-content-learning-and-teaching.pdf>
- Godwin, P. (2007). The Web 2.0 challenge to information literacy. Paper presented at *Inforum 2007: 13th Conference on Professional Information Resources*, Prague, May 22-24. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.inforum.cz/pdf/2007/godwin-peter.pdf>
- Gray, K., Thompson, C., Sheard, J., Clerehan, R. & Hamilton, M. (2010). Students as Web 2.0 authors: Implications for assessment design and conduct. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 26: 105-22. Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26/gray.html>
- Gray, K., Thompson, C., Sheard, J., Clerehan, R. & Hamilton, M. (2010). Students as Web 2.0 authors: Implications for assessment design and conduct. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 26: 105-22. Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26/gray.html>
- Gray, K., Waycott, J., Thompson, C., Clerehan, R., Sheard, J., Hamilton, M., & Richardson, J. (2011) *Using Social Web (Web 2.0) Activities for Student Assessment: Resources for University Learning and Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://web2assessmentresources.wikispaces.com>
- Hattie, J. (2009). The black box of tertiary assessment: An impending revolution. In *Tertiary Assessment & Higher Education Student Outcomes: Policy, Practice & Research* (pp. 259-275). Wellington, New Zealand: Ako Aotearoa.
- Horizon Report*. (2008). Stanford, California, USA: New Media Consortium / EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.nmc.org/pdf/2008-Horizon-Report.pdf>
- Isaacs, G. (2002). *Assessing Group Tasks*. Brisbane: The University of Queensland Teaching & Educational Development Institute. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/downloads/T&L_Assess_group_tasks.pdf
- James, R., McInnis, C., & Devlin, M. (2002). *Assessing Learning in Australian Universities: Ideas, Strategies and Resources for Quality in Assessment: Five Practical Guides*. The University of Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education / Australian Universities Teaching Committee. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from <http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/assessinglearning/03/index.html>
- JISC. (2007). *Effective Practice with e-Assessment: An Overview of Technologies, Policies and Practice in Further and Higher Education*. UK: HEFCE. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/themes/elearning/effpraceassess.pdf>
- Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., Bennett, S., Gray, K., Waycott, J., Judd, T., *et al* (2009). *Educating the Net Generation: A Handbook of Findings for Practice and Policy*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Kirkwood, A. and L. Price. (2008). Assessment and student learning: A fundamental relationship and the role of information and communication technologies. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Learning* 23, 5-16.
- Lamb, K., & McLaughlin, C. (2008). *e-Assessment 07/08 Training and Support Initiatives*. Edinburgh: JISC Regional Support Centres for Scotland. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from http://www.rsc-sw-scotland.ac.uk/eAssessment/docfiles/e-Assessment_Initiatives_2007-08.pdf
- McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. J. W. (2007). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 era. In ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. *Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007*. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/mcloughlin.pdf>



- Melville, D., Allan, C.I., Crampton, J., Fothergill, J., Godfrey, A., Harloe, M., et al (2009). *Higher Education in a Web 2.0 World: Report of an independent Committee of Inquiry into the impact on higher education of students' widespread use of Web 2.0 technologies*. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/generalpublications/2009/heweb2.aspx>
- Nillson, L., Eklof, A., & Ottosson, T. (2005, August). What's so original? The discourse on education and dishonesty in the wake of a technological revolution. Paper presented at *The 11th Biennial Conference of the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI)*, Nicosia, Cyprus. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from http://www.distans.hkr.se/ILLwebb/Earli_paper2005_whats_so_original_final.pdf
- Pearce, N., Weller, M., Scanlon, E., & Kinsley, S. (2011). Digital scholarship considered: How new technologies could transform academic work. *In Education*, 16(1). Retrieved from: <http://www.ineducation.ca/article/digital-scholarship-considered-how-new-technologies-could-transform-academic-work>
- Race, P. (2001). *A Briefing on Self, Peer and Group Assessment*. Assessment Series No. 9. UK: LTSN Generic Centre. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from <http://internt.iha.dk/paedagogik/seminarer/Chris%20Rust/ASS009PhilRace.pdf>
- REAP [ReEngineering Assessment Practices in Scottish Higher Education] Project. (2007). Assessment principles: some possible candidates. Web page. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from <http://www.reap.ac.uk/resourcesPrinciples.html>
- Reeves, T. (2006). How do you know they are learning? The importance of alignment in higher education. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 2(4), 294-309.
- Renner, W. (2006). E-learning 2.0: new frontier for student empowerment. Paper presented at *Edu-Com 2006*, 22-24 November, Nong Khai, Thailand. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://blogs.usyd.edu.au/elearning/elearning2.pdf>
- Richardson, W. (2006). *Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts, and Other Powerful Web Tools for Classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: Corwin Press.
- Roberts, E. (2007). Transforming digital content into learning. Presentation at *The Sixth Annual ECAR/HP Summer Symposium for Higher Education IT Executives*, 11-13 June, Boulder, Colorado. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://connect.educause.edu/Library/ECAR/TransformingDigitalContent/45012>
- Selwyn, N. (2007). Web 2.0 applications as alternative environments for informal learning - a critical review. Paper for *OECD-KERIS Expert Meeting - Session 6 - Alternative learning environments in practice: Using ICT to change impact and outcomes*. Retrieved 1 April, 2008 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/3/39458556.pdf>
- Waycott, J., Gray, K., Clerehan, R., Hamilton, M., Richardson, J., Sheard, J., & Thompson, C. (2010). Implications for academic integrity of using web 2.0 for teaching, learning and assessment in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 6(2), 8-18. Special Issue: Digital technologies and educational integrity. Available at: <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/699/527>
- Waycott, J., Gray, K., Thompson, C., Sheard, J., Clerehan, R., Richardson, J., & Hamilton, M. (2010). Transforming assessment in higher education: A participatory approach to the development of a good practice framework for assessing student learning through social web technologies. In C.H. Steel, M.J. Keppell, P. Gerbic & S. Housego (Eds.), *Curriculum, technology & transformation for an unknown future. Proceedings ascilite Sydney 2010* (pp.1040-1050). Available at: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Waycott-full.pdf>
- Whitlock, D. (2010). Activating assessment for learning: Are we on the way with web 2.0? In M. J. W. Lee, & C. McLoughlin (eds.) *Web 2.0-based-e-learning: Applying Social Informatics for Tertiary Teaching* (pp. 319-42). Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global.



Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the lecturers who responded to the survey we conducted during Stage One of the project.

In addition, we wish to acknowledge the contributions made by the following people, who were involved in this project as advisory group members, reference group members, or case study participants:

Matthew Absalom, The University of Melbourne
Michael Abulencia, RMIT University
Matthew Allen, Curtin University
Bill Anderson, University of Otago, New Zealand
Greg Battye, University of Canberra
Robyn Benson, Monash University
John Benwell, RMIT University
Marsha Berry, RMIT University
Tracey Bretag, University of South Australia
Jenny Buckworth, Charles Darwin University
Denise Chalmers, The University of Western Australia
Keith Comer, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Julian Cox, The University of New South Wales
Geoffrey Crisp, The University of Adelaide
Christian Dalsgaard, Aarhus University, Denmark
Ann Davies, Victoria University
Leitha Delves, The University of Western Australia
Marcia Devlin, Deakin University
Bobby Elliott, Scottish Qualifications Authority, UK
Jacqui Ewart, Griffith University
Cathy Farrell, Swinburne University of Technology
Glenn Finger, Griffith University
Tom Franklin, Franklin Consulting, UK
Merrilyn Goos, The University of Queensland
Scott Grant, Monash University
Terry Hallahan, RMIT University
Michael Henderson, Monash University
Ashley Holmes, Central Queensland University
Chris Hughes, The University of New South Wales
John Hurst, RMIT University
David Jones, Central Queensland University
Deb Jones, The University of Melbourne
Gregor Kennedy, The University of Melbourne
Shaun Khoo, The University of Melbourne
Marjorie Kibby, The University of Newcastle
Adrian Kirkwood, Open University, UK
George Kotsanas, Monash University
Ramon Lobato, The University of Melbourne
Mark Lee, Charles Sturt University
Warren McKeown, The University of Melbourne
Catherine McLoughlin, Australian Catholic University
Mari Morofushi, Monash University
Michael Nott, RMIT University
Lauren O'Dwyer, Monash University
Beverley Oliver, Curtin University
Kerry Pantzopoulos, Victoria University
Sarah Pasfield-Neofitou, Monash University



Jason Patten, RMIT University
Emma Read, RMIT University
Julianne Reid, RMIT University
Kaz Ross, University of Tasmania
Alison Ruth, Griffith University
Michele Ruyters, RMIT University
Royce Sadler, Griffith University
Gordon Sanson, Monash University
Mary Simpson, University of Otago, New Zealand
Robyn Spence-Brown, Monash University
Sandra Smith, RMIT University
Michael Smith, Monash University
Elizabeth Stewart, Swinburne University of Technology
John Terrell, RMIT University
Belinda Tynan, University of New England
Cristina Varsavsky, Monash University
Jenny Weight, RMIT University
Arthur Winzenried, Charles Sturt University
Katina Zammit, University of Western Sydney
Lynette Zeeng, Swinburne University of Technology



Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Your Use of Web 2.0 Technologies in Assessment

1. What types of Web 2.0 activities do students do in this assignment (Please select all that apply)?

	Blogging/microblogging
	Audio/video podcasting
	Social bookmarking
	Social networking
	Virtual world activities
	Wiki writing
	Not sure

2. What Web 2.0 software/sites do students use for this assignment? (e.g., Blackboard, Facebook, Moodle, Second Life, WordPress, MediaWiki) (Please state "not sure" if applicable)

--

3. Is it compulsory for students to do this assignment to pass the subject/unit of study?

	Yes
	No

4. When during the university study period (i.e., semester/session) are students expected to start the assignment?

	Beginning of study period
	Middle of study period
	End of study period

5. How long are students given to complete the assignment?



	1 day or less
	1 week or less
	1 month or less
	More than one month

6. How long do you estimate it takes students to complete this assignment?

	Less than one hour
	01-10 hours
	11-20 hours
	21-30 hours
	31-40 hours
	More than 40 hours

7. Where do students complete the assignment? (Select all that apply)

	On campus in class
	On campus but out of class
	Off campus while undertaking fieldwork or workplace learning
	Off campus elsewhere (e.g., at home during independent study time)
	Not sure

8. Whose IT resources (Internet connection, software, computer, other devices) do students use to complete this assignment? (Select all that apply)

	University resources/equipment
	Students' own resources/equipment
	Resources and equipment belonging to a third party (e.g., employer, friend)
	Not sure

9. What are the intended learning outcomes for this assignment? (select all that apply)

	Generic or graduate skills or attributes
	Foundation knowledge or skills



	preparatory to a discipline or profession
	Specialised knowledge or skills required in a discipline or profession

10. What are the steps/tasks that students have to undertake to complete this assignment?

Students have to ...

11. What criteria do students need to address in order to earn marks for this assignment?

Marks are awarded for ...

12. Are students provided with details of assessment criteria prior to undertaking the assignment?

	Yes
	No
	Not sure



13. Are students provided with an example of a completed assignment prior to undertaking this assignment?

	Yes
	No
	Not sure

14. How much does this assignment contribute towards students' overall mark for this unit of study?

	01-10%		51-60%
	11-20%		61-70%
	21-30%		71-80%
	31-40%		81-90%
	41-50%		91-100%

15. Please provide a brief description of the assignment as you would describe it to students.

16. Who marks the assignment? (select all that apply)

	Self-marked by the student/s responsible
	Marked by other students
	Marked by one staff member
	Marked by more than one staff member

17. If you are one of several markers, what steps are taken to brief other marker, including students who mark each other's work, BEFORE marking? (please state "none" or "not sure" where applicable)



--

18. If you are one of several markers, what steps are taken to debrief other markers, including students who mark each other's work, AFTER marking? (please state "none" or "no sure" where applicable)

--

19. Students' receive feedback of the following kinds... (select all that apply)

	Confirmation (i.e., confirmation that work is of acceptable standard)
	Correction (i.e., flagging of specific shortcomings with student work)
	Explanation (i.e., recommendations for bringing work up to standard)
	Diagnosis (i.e., analysis of what may have led to shortcomings or misconceptions in student work)
	Elaboration (i.e., supplementary information to extend understanding)
	Grades in the form of a number or letter

20. What techniques are used to mark the assignment? (select all that apply)

	Marked in stages
	Automated analysis or grading of student work
	Comments as well as marks provided
	Verification of identity of students submitting work
	Plagiarism checking tools used (e.g., Turnitin)
	Rubric used (i.e., guide to marks to be allocated against assessment criteria)
	Equal marks shared by everyone in a student group
	Blind marking (i.e., student work is de-identified)



21. The last time this assignment ran approximately what proportion of students achieved the following results?

	Percentage of students who earned distinction or above
	Percentage of students who earned pass or credit
	Percentage of students who failed
	Percentage of students who did not complete the assignment
	Not sure

22. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 neither agree nor disagree	4 agree	5 strongly agree	not sure or n/a
This assignment allows for exemption or credit in recognition of prior learning	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
This assignment provides for equitable assessment for students with a disability	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
This assignment encourages academic honesty and integrity	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Students are provided with timely feedback on marked work for this assignment	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Copies of students' marked work are kept on file at the university for an agreed period of time	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Students are provided with an extension of the due date for special consideration reasons	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Supplementary assessment is possible	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Copies of students' marked work are available if there is a need to deal with student appeals/complaints	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Students' moral rights and copyright in work they produce are protected	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Students are provided with access to IT services or equipment to complete this assignment	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
When undertaking this assignment, students' identity and privacy in online environments are safeguarded	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
In this assignment, guidelines on appropriate conduct and safeguards against inappropriate conduct in the use of IT facilities and services are in place	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA
Students whose work shows evidence of cheating or misconduct are formally disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	not sure/NA



23. What is the name of the unit of study (i.e., subject/course) in which students complete this assignment?

--

24. What is your role in this unit of study? (Select all that apply)

	Coordinator
	Lecturer
	Tutor
	Marker

25. What discipline or professional degree/s are students enrolled in when they complete this unit of study? (select all that apply)

	Agriculture, environmental and related studies
	Architecture and building
	Creative arts
	Education
	Engineering and related technologies
	Food, hospitality and personal services
	Health
	Humanities
	Information technology
	Management and commerce
	Natural and physical sciences
	Society and culture
	Not sure



26. At what level/s is this unit of study?

	Bachelor or honours degree
	Graduate certificate or diploma
	Masters degree
	Doctoral degree
	Not sure

27. When in the degree/s do students undertake this unit of study?

	Year 1 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Year 2 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Year 3 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Year 4 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Year 5 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Year 6 full-time (or part-time equivalent)
	Optional
	Not sure

28. Is this unit of study compulsory for all students enrolled in the degree/s?

	Yes, compulsory subject for all students
	No, elective subject for all students
	Compulsory for some students and elective for some
	Not sure



29. How many students were enrolled in this unit of study the last time it ran? (approximation is okay)

--

30. When did you first use this assignment in more or less its present form in this unit of study?

	Before 2005
	2005
	2006
	2007
	2008
	2009

31. What do you think is the most worthwhile aspect of this assignment?

--

32. What do you think is the most challenging aspect of this assignment?

--



33. Do you have any other comments about this assignment or the issues addressed in this survey?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.



Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Ethics approval number: HREC 0932125

Thank you very much for completing the online survey.

- Can you please give me a brief description of the assignment you described in the survey? (Technologies used, what students were expected to do, etc)
- What distinguishing features / particular functionalities of web 2.0 were most important for this assignment?
- What was the reason / trigger / impetus / inspiration for introducing this assignment?
- Can you tell me a bit about the main benefits or worthwhile aspects of this assignment (e.g., pedagogical benefits, administrative benefits, etc)?
- Can you tell me a bit about the main challenges involved in running and assessing this assignment?
- If you were running this assignment again, what specific changes would you like to make to the way this assignment works?
- What advice would you give to another academic who was thinking of using this approach to assessment with his / her students?
- What do students think / say about this assignment?
- What do colleagues think / say about this approach to assessment?
- Do you think this assignment would work with other teachers or student groups?
- We are trying to get an understanding of issues relating to academic standards, practices and reporting when using Web 2.0 technologies in assessment...
- Can you tell me more about the process of marking this assignment?
- Have any issues arisen with this assignment in terms of student copyright and/or plagiarism?
- Have there been any issues relating to student privacy and identity online?
- What happens to students' work after the assignment is completed (e.g., is it publicly available on the web)?
- Do you have any other comments about factors relating to academic standards, practices and reporting when running assignments like this one?





AUSTRALIAN
LEARNING
& TEACHING
COUNCIL



Promoting excellence in higher education

PO Box 2375 Strawberry Hills NSW 2012 Australia

Telephone 02 8667 8500 Facsimile 02 8667 8515

www.altc.edu.au

ABN 30 109 826 628