



Cover Page

Researching Quality: What Does It Mean For Curriculum And Assessment In E-Learning Environments?

Catherine McLoughlin

Australian Catholic University

Canberra, ACT

c.mcloughlin@signadou.acu.edu.au

Researching Quality: What Does it Mean For Curriculum And Assessment in E-Learning Environments?

Catherine McLoughlin

Australian Catholic University

c. mcloughlin@signadou.acu.edu.au

Abstract

This paper addresses current definitions of quality in curriculum design and examines emerging expectations of what constitutes appropriate benchmarks for online delivery and assessment. While the quality agenda has been embraced by tertiary education institutions and policy makers and research continues to proliferate, many practitioners are seeking quality guidelines that can be applied to the curriculum design in relation to online environments. The last decade has seen the convergence of traditional distance education with on-campus modes of delivery and work-based training signalling new models of flexible delivery. In addition, demand driven education accentuates the learner's role and needs while the teacher has become a manager, mediator and motivator of student learning. Issues raised by national and international bodies and quality assurance agencies now seem to be addressing the same questions.

Keywords

Online environments, E-learning, higher education, quality

Introduction: the quality debate on technology integration

There can be little doubt that the issue of quality is at the forefront of educational planning, evaluation, student satisfaction and institutional change. Despite the centrality of concerns about quality, there is no unified vision of what constitutes quality in online delivery, no agreed criteria and few frameworks to guide the practitioner in adopting best practice strategies (Littler & Mahyuddin, 2001). In addition, myths abound as to how technology can be integrated successfully in schools and universities without incurring enormous costs. Technology may be seen as revolutionising education, but at a cost:

No single classroom teacher could now be a sufficient resource for a class of today's demanding net students. It will take teams of professionals to replace all the old customs (such as the one size fits all lecture) and tools, like study guides/textbooks. (cited in Ramsey, 2000.

More and more, quality is being equated with cost-effectiveness and the need to maintain a competitive edge. In this regard, there are several myths, some exemplified by the quotation above. The first assumption is that improving quality means adding resources and thereby increasing cost (Twigg, 2002). Improved quality in delivery means greater capital expenditure, more staff, better equipped libraries and computer labs. On the contrary, limiting budget expenditure is assumed to reduce quality as it implies larger staff-student ratios, more casual staff and less technological support. Few people in the educational world believe that it is possible to increase quality while reducing costs. A third mistaken assumption is that the integration of information and communications technologies may even undermine quality by replacing or supplanting the social and personal experience of learning. Many critics of ICT speak of its capacity to undermine social presence, signalling that the human element is primary and condition of student satisfaction (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). This paper presents an overview of current thinking on quality in online learning, and presents a framework of quality learning, curriculum and assessment based on pedagogical principles.

Guidelines and benchmarks

A number of reports and documents provide design guidelines and benchmarks for distance education environments. For example the Institute for Higher Education Policy (National Education Association, 2000) provide 24 benchmarks for course design, delivery and learning outcomes. In their report no specific recommendations are made except to suggest that intended learning outcomes are regularly reviewed to ensure clarity, consistent and appropriateness. Penn State University in association with Lincoln University (Innovations in Distance Education, 1999) have taken this a step further and promote that "where possible provide assessment and measurement techniques and options that capitalise on the unique characteristics and situations of the distance learner". Recommendations on assessment processes are as follows:

- Enable students to self-monitor progress
- Give regular feedback to students
- Support peer learning and assessment
- Design self-assessment practices.

These recommendations are in line with those of Berge et al (2000) who also suggest, with respect to online learning, that "wisdom might be served by using alternative forms of assessment of student understanding". One example they cite is the use a series of sequential exercises building upon one another throughout a semester, so that issues of security are less of a problem. However, in all the reports cited here, there is a dearth of pedagogical guidelines for practitioners. The *Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education* (1999), acknowledges that there are differences in the way assessment is conducted on campus that may not be appropriate for students studying in the off-campus mode, who have little contact with academic staff. In another study Warren & Rada (1999) address the issue of quality learning via computer-mediated communication. They define quality learning as going beyond the acquisition of facts to achieving a cognitive outcome, and fostering higher order thinking at the level of synthesis and evaluation of concepts.

Is quality a matter of design?

Others argue that no single design or perspective is adequate for the design of technology enhanced learning environments (Sfaard, 1998). The same message about multiplicity comes from Spector (2000) who notes "technology has yet to make significant

improvements in the quality of education by any reasonable measure" (p.243). Spector continues to argue that most failures can in fact be attributed to the belief that there is one best approach, one perfect theory or one final solution. The McKinnon Report (McKinnon et al 2000) provides a student satisfaction benchmark that monitors student ratings of their learning experience and overall satisfaction with assessment based on the Course Experience Questionnaire, (CEQ) administered when students have graduated. Data coming from the CEQ only measure satisfaction with existing assessment arrangements, but not do provide any indicators of quality beyond student satisfaction. Teachers and designers need a principled basis for designing new forms of assessment, closely aligned with instructional goals and utilising the interactive features of online technology (American Psychological Association, 1993). If we acknowledge that assessment drives student learning, it is likely that it will remain at the centre of the curriculum design process, and will be central in the student learning experience (Ramsden, 1992; Biggs, 1999).

We may conclude from this overview of the quality debate in online education that the notion of quality defined in terms of student satisfaction with assessment processes is important, yet few guidelines have been provided by academics on what practices to adopt when designing educative, authentic or valid assessment processes that are suited to distance education and online environments. Most often, quality issues are tied up with implementation, infrastructure and delivery of services to students and they provide a big picture view of the systems that need to be in place to enable assessment to be managed at an institutional level. Collis & Moonen (2001) propose a four-dimensional model that incorporates technology adoption, implementation, pedagogy and institutional planning that combine to influence the quality of teaching and learning that occurs.

Are there opportunities for improved teaching practices on the Web?

Information and communication technologies have the capacity to support a wide range of learning goals and are now integrated into teaching approaches of many higher educational institutions. Laurillard (1993) suggests that computer-based learning has a major role in promoting:

- self-directed learning and increased student autonomy;
- flexibility and diversity in assessment;
- increased information literacy, ensuring that graduate skills are in tune with those of employers; and
- increased productivity and efficiency in higher education.

Similarly, Alexander & McKenzie (1998) reviewed 104 projects relating to innovative technology adoption and found that students had improved attitudes to learning, improved access, and improved opportunities to interact and develop information literacy. However, opportunities for learning do not always translate into learning outcomes. Alexander & McKenzie also reviewed student perceptions of technology and the value of ICT for learning. The major findings were as follows:

- Student perceptions of technology are a major influence in their attitude and approach to learning. Will they earn extra marks for using technology? Will it be counted in their grades? In designing a course, this might mean evaluating student contributions to a bulletin board as part of the formal assessment process.
- Often students' experiences of working in groups is one of frustration, despite claims that technology is bringing about peer relationships and better communication.

- Students' prior experience of teaching and learning influences their acceptance of new learning approaches, whether these are with or without technology.
- Students do not feel that quantifiable learning gains are always achieved from technology use.

Given these results and the additional finding that ICT adoption did not bring about pedagogical change in the Alexander & McKinzie (1998) report, Collis & Moonen (2001) conclude that while learning gains cannot be proved, they still remain optimistic about technology integration. They contend "what can be claimed at a general level is that students experience new forms of learning, that instructors are making new types of contacts with their students and that that new resources and types of learning activities are occurring". Other researchers would say that what determines the educational value of ICT is how it is used in practice (Schacter, 1999). Whether these new learning activities have arisen out of new curriculum approaches and can lead to innovative assessment practices is a matter of importance to online educators and instructional designers.

Web-based learning: Does it mean new pedagogy?

The shift to student self-direction and autonomy means that students need to take more responsibility for their own learning, but many need assistance in achieving this skill. Shaffer & Resnick (1999), maintain that technology can be used to create authentic contexts for learning, and provide resources that give students opportunities number of areas:

- connectivity: to connect to the world outside the classroom, to research topics that would otherwise be inaccessible, to access experts and to engage in conversation with peers;
- authenticity: to demonstrate performance in authentic tasks and communicate events
- epistemological pluralism: to express and represent ideas in many different ways.

Applied to assessment, representational pluralism enabled by computer technology expands the range of channels available to students to demonstrate understanding (Gardner, 1993; Greeno, 1997). For example, instead of using narrowly defined learning outcomes tested by examinations, technology offers a total environment where real life skills, such as written and verbal communication, collaboration and team work can be assessed by giving learners multiple channels of expression, such as visualisation and multimedia. Thus, information technologies can change the quality of the learning experience, and can be used to create authentic environments for assessment.

Terms used to describe the impact of ICT in higher education are many: flexibility, learner centeredness, Rich Environments for Interactive Learning (REALs), anchored environments, mediated learning, cooperative learning and global classrooms (see Abbey, 2000) for a complete overview). Yet how many of these are *new designs* as opposed to just *new terms* for learning? Russell (1999) claims that despite all these innovations, no significant differences have emerged for learning outcomes in technology supported environments. While it is claimed that the Web does offer new opportunities for learning activities, assessment practices must be reframed and reconsidered as part of a holistic approach to curriculum design and pedagogy.

Collis & Moonen (2001) use the term *pedagogical reengineering* to describe the change in online pedagogy from one that is teacher centred to one that is focussed on learner activity. Pedagogical reengineering is based on the premise that courses are built up of components or units of instructional that are bound together in sequences or combinations. By

introducing technology and Web-based learning, these components can be changed and made more flexible and student centred, thus leading to course enhancement through the adoption of learner centred pedagogies and new forms of assessment.

Does Web-based learning also mean new conceptions of curriculum?

A key element in pedagogical reengineering is the use and application of media to teaching and learning scenarios where students are active participants and contribute actively by generating knowledge. By changing roles and by enabling students to make contributions towards learning resources, assessment also becomes more learner-centred and performance based. For example, in some activities students can post new URLs' to the course site so that others can share and critically evaluate them, and these resources become part of the learning activity (Oliver & McLoughlin, 2001). Similarly, the move towards peer assessment is an indicator of pedagogical extension via the Web, as online communication tools, shared workspaces and asynchronous dialogue make networked learning and assessment feasible. This participatory/contributions oriented approach to learning can be summarised as follows:

- Assessment activities recognise students as contributors
- Assessment activities involve opportunities for students to communicate, contribute to, and participate in an online community.
- Assessment activity reflects the status of students as contributors to course content, and creators of new knowledge products.

It is certainly the case that online technologies and Web-based learning have led to a reconceptualisation of learning, pedagogy and assessment. This is reflected in the various theories of learning, which emphasise learning activity, participation in communities of learning, engagement theory and the contributions-oriented student model proposed by Collis & Moonen (2001). Table 1 summarises the notion of the active, participatory student and its implications for pedagogy.

	Contributing student model (Collis & Moonen, 2001)	Participation oriented learning (Sfaard, 1998)	Engagement Theory (Kearsley, 1998)	Constructive alignment model (Biggs, 1999)
Definitions of learning	Learners contribute to the course via Web-based tools	Participation, member of a community	Meaningful activity with others and interaction through worthwhile tasks	Emphasis on student activity
Learning outcomes	Product oriented, focussed on peer-learning, sharing and collaboration	Belonging, participating, communication, lifelong learning	Higher order thinking, team work & generic capabilities that include	A well structured knowledge base, interaction with

			information literacy and global perspective	others
Key activities	Preparation before class, activities during class, review and self assessment after class	Apprenticeship, communication, participation	Team work, interactive learning, peer learning	Teacher directed, peer directed and self directed activity
Curriculum process	Reusable learning objects and resources are created by students	Negotiated; student as participant	Needs based, project oriented, authentic	Align teaching methods, assessment and student activity
Teacher role	Design activities for maximum student participation	Facilitator, mentor	Coaching of project based learning	Maximise structure, offer scaffolding, foster self-direction

Table 1: Summary of key features - Student as Participant (based on Collis & Moonen, 2001)

The 'student as participant approach' is enabled by Web-based technology, which gives students access to learning resources, communication tools, databases and asynchronous networks. These models of learning accentuate the movement away from transmission-oriented approaches towards active learning where the student generates products and resources that can be re-used and shared with others. This approach can be applied to assessment, so it becomes less teacher-dominated and more flexible, with more autonomy and responsibly given to the student. For example, peer and self-assessment activities offer scope for learners to assume the roles of critical participant and contributor, while creating online portfolios can allow scope to share ideas and to engage in peer review.

Alternative assessment using technology

In recognition of the limitations of traditional university assessment, there is a new wave of pedagogy advocating 'alternative assessment' in which assessment is integrated with learning processes and real-life performance as opposed to display of inert knowledge (Wiggins, 1998). This form of authentic assessment is solidly based on constructivism, which recognises the learner as the chief architect of knowledge building.

In constructivist learning environments there is social interaction, communication, exchange of views, collaboration and support for learners to take more responsibility for the learning process through learner-centred tasks (McLoughlin & Oliver, 1998; Collis, 1998). Salient

features of constructivist learning environments include an emphasis on the following aspects:

- *authenticity*: learning is located in actual contexts and linked to real tasks;
- *group work*: social interaction and feedback are instrumental in communication and higher order thinking processes;
- *learner control*: learners are active in defining and negotiating learning tasks; and
- *scaffolding learning*: learners are supported as they progress from novice learners to self-regulated experts.

Authentic or performance assessment can be effectively used in constructivist learning environments as it enables both process and product knowledge to be assessed, supported by communication channels for group work, reflection, higher-order thinking and self-directed learning (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1992; Birenbaum, 1999; Reeves, 2000).

The use of the WWW to support assessment offers greater adaptability and flexibility than traditional or objective assessment (eg, based on discrete tests and multiple choice quiz items) as it enables the collection and storage of continuous data, and easily created micro-environments where learners solve real life problems. It can be argued that the move towards authentic assessment paradigms has been accelerated by technology with its capacity to cope with a broad array of activities, tasks and forums for collaboration, dialogue and student centred learning. For instance, Kendle & Northcote (2000) suggest a combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment tasks that use multiple modes of showcasing student achievement through portfolios, multimedia projects, skills demonstrations and teamwork. Table 2 contrasts some features of authentic assessment with standard objective assessment, and provides examples of how Web-based environments offer possibilities for authentic assessment tasks.

A further important contribution made by technology to authentic and performance-based assessment is the capacity to support learning processes such as communication, group work and collaborative problem solving.

Objective assessment	Authentic assessment	Indicators of authenticity	Web-based Support
Require correct responses only	Require quality product and/or performance, and justification.	Assess whether the student can explain, apply, self-adjust, or justify answers, not just the correctness of answers using facts and algorithms.	Allows students to articulate viewpoints in text-based conversation that can be archived as a learning resource
Must be unknown in advance to ensure validity	Are known as much as possible in advance; involve excelling at predictable demanding and core tasks; are not "gotcha!" experiences.	The tasks, criteria, and standards by which work will be judged are predictable or known-like a project proposal for a client, etc.	Web-based teaching allows access to multiple sources of information about the task, while allowing learners to explore alternatives.

Are disconnected from a realistic context and realistic constraints	Require real-world use of knowledge: the student must "do" history, science, etc. in realistic simulations or actual use.	The task is a challenge and a set of constraints that are authentic- likely to be encountered by the professional.(Know-how, not plugging in, is required.)	The task is a challenge and can extend the confines of the classroom to involve complex, ill-defined tasks and collaboration
Contain isolated items requiring use or recognition of known answers or skills	Are integrated challenges in which knowledge and judgment must be innovatively used to fashion a quality product or performance.	The task is multifaceted and non-routine, even if there is a "right answer. It thus requires problem clarification, trial and error, adjustments, adapting to the case or facts at hand, etc.	Web provides access to information, databases and course notes. Learners have control
Are simplified so as to be easy to score reliably	Involve complex and non-arbitrary tasks, criteria, and standards.	The task involves the important aspects of performance and/or core challenges of the field of study	Web-based learning provides multiple vehicles for showcasing student achievement, including portfolios and skills demonstrations
Are one shot	Are iterative: contain recurring essential tasks, and learning processes.	The work is designed to reveal whether the student has achieved real versus surface mastery, or understanding versus mere familiarity, over time.	Web-based teaching enables gathering of continuous process data on student achievement

Table 2: Elements of authentic assessment utilising the Web

Barriers and strategies for quality improvement

While educational research is advancing and developing new models and pedagogical approaches to learning, these practices may not become widespread for a number of reasons: First there exists no compelling evidence of the value of technology, but a good deal of research attests to the 'no significant difference' phenomenon when comparing traditional learning with online delivery (Phipps & Meristosis, 1999). While one can see the value-added in terms of access and equity for students living in rural and remote areas, there is a lack of solid research attesting to improved academic outcomes with ICT. The most fundamental barrier remains the issue of reliability- teachers lack confidence that the hardware, software and connections will work when they are needed. Because of these barriers, in many institutions, we are still at the stage of instructional technology uptake in schools and tertiary institutions, where the biggest challenge is to gain the acceptance of technology by teachers. Nevertheless, the importance of theoretical and pedagogical

advances needs to be highlighted as such developments seek to improve student learning and promote exemplary educational integration.

Implementing quality in curriculum and assessment

In this article we have depicted a number of approaches to quality in the design of curriculum and assessment that provide opportunities for student engagement, participation and contribution to course content. The features of student-centred curriculum and assessment include performance-based tasks that require students to create a product, engage in teamwork and elements of self and peer assessment. Laurillard (1996) combines the notion of media affordances and pedagogic reengineering and has applied this to Open University courses. The notion of affordances examines each of the media and how they can provide a different form of interaction. Four modes are identified: *attending*, *practicing*, *discussing* and *articulating*. In designing quality assessment the goal should be to decrease *attending* and increase each of the other forms of interaction. This means applying the notion of student as participant, and as active contributor to the learning and assessment processes of the unit and adopting a participatory view of the curriculum.

Future directions for quality in online learning

Judging by present trend, there is no doubt that Web-based learning and training will continue to expand, with the growth in markets, the trend towards lifelong learning and the need for universities to offer flexible, on demand educational services. In this scenario, it is likely that quality assurance processes for online assessment will intensify, with benchmarking procedures developed to compare learner performance to exit level or industry standards. Key questions that tertiary providers may have to respond to are: *How is this graduate performing in comparison with a professional in the field? What are the minimum exit standards for this student entering the profession?*

Another issue is that benchmarks must be transparent to the learners, and must represent authentic behaviour and expectations, rather than abstract decontextualised knowledge. These immediate trends are emerging in higher education and will impact on assessment design. Other innovations mentioned in this paper relate to a re-conceptualisation of curriculum as participatory, with students contributing resources rather than content being prescribed. This emphasis on knowledge building and participation has already brought about an increased focus on authentic assessment, which better reflects real world performance. On the horizon looms the question: If authentic, quality learning and its demonstration depend upon performing in a genuine, real life situations what are the actual limits of online learning? How can teachers adopt new research designs that tap the potential of online pedagogy?

References

Abbey, B. (2000). *Instructional and Cognitive Impacts of Web-based education*. Hershey: Idea group Publishing.

American Psychological Association. (1993). *Learner-centered psychological principles: Guidelines for school reform and restructuring*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association and the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

- Alexander, S., & McKenzie, J. (1998). *An evaluation of information technology projects for university learning*. Canberra: Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development.
- Berge, Z. L., Collins, M., & Dougherty, K. (2000). Design guidelines for Web-based courses. In B. Abbey (Ed.), *Instructional and cognitive impacts of Web-based education* (pp. 32-41). Hershey: idea group Publishing.
- Birenbaum, M. (1999). Reflective active learning in a graduate course on assessment. *Higher Education, Research and Development*, 18(2), 201-219.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2001). *Flexible learning in digital world*. London: Kogan Page.
- Collis, B. (1998). WWW-based environments for collaborative group work. *Education and information technologies*, 3, 231-245.
- English, S., & Yazdani, M. (1999). Computer-supported cooperative learning in a virtual university. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 15(2), 2-13.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences*. London: Fontana Press.
- Greeno, J. P., & Hall, R. P. (1997). *Practicing representation: Learning with and about presentational forms*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(5), 361-367.
- Gunawardena, C., & Zittle, F. J. (1997). Social presence as a predictor of satisfaction within a computer mediated conference environment. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 11(3), 8-26.
- Innovations in Distance Education (1998). *An emerging set of guiding principles for the design and development of distance education*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University. Online at <http://www.outreach.psu.edu/de/ide>.
- Kendle, A., & Northcote, M. (2000). The struggle for balance in the use of quantitative and qualitative online assessment tasks. In R. Simms, M. O'Reilly, & S. Sawkins (Eds.), *Learning to choose, choosing to learn*. Coffs harbour: Online at: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/coffs00/>.
- Klemm & Snell, 1996: Klemm, W. R., & Snell, J. R. (1996). Enriching computer-mediated group learning by coupling constructivism with collaborative learning. *Electronic Journal of Instructional Technology*, 1(2). On-line at <http://www.usq.edu.au/electpub/e-jist/vol1no2/article1.htm>.
- Laurillard, D. (1993). *Rethinking University Teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Laurillard, D. (1996). *How should UK higher education make best use of new technology?* ALT-C 1996 Conference, Glasgow.

Littler, A., & Mahyuddin, J. (2002). Travelling without maps. In G. Webb (Ed.), *Online teaching and learning with technology* (pp. 146-154). London: Kogan Page.

McKinnon, K. R., Walker, S. H., & Davis, D. (2000). *Benchmarking: A manual for Australian universities*. Canberra: Australian Government publishing service.

McLoughlin, C., & Oliver, R. (1998). Maximising the language and learning link in computer learning environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 29(2), 125-136.

National Education Association (2000). *A survey of traditional and distance learning higher education members*. Washington, DC: National Education Association; <http://www.nea.org/he>; <http://www.nea.org/he/aboutthe/dlstudy.pdf>

Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (2000). *What's the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education*. Retrieved Nov 3, 2002, from <http://www.nea.org/he/aboutthe/disseddif.pdf>

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (1998). *Guidelines on the quality assurance of distance education*. UK. Online at <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/dlg/intro.html>.

Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Ramsey, G. (2000). *Quality Matters: Revitalising teaching: critical times, critical choices*. Sydney: NSW Department of School Education.

Reeves, T. C. (2000). Alternative assessment approaches for online learning environments in higher education. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 23(1), 101-111.

Russell, T. L. (1999). *The "no significant difference phenomenon."* Chapel Hill, NC: Office of Instructional Telecommunications, North Carolina University. On-line at <http://cuda.teleeducation.nb.ca/nosignificantdifference/>

Schacter, J. (1999). *The impact of educational technology on student achievement: What most current research has to say*. Santa Monica: Milken Exchange on Education Technology.

Sfaard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the danger of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4-13.

Warren, K. J., & Rada, R. (1999). *Manifestations of quality learning in computer-mediated university courses*. Available online at: <http://www.eecs.wsu.edu/~kwarren/manifest.htm>.

Spector, M. (2000). Designing technology enhanced learning environments. In B. Abbey (Ed.), *Instructional and cognitive impacts of Web-based education* (pp. 241-261). Hershey: idea group Publishing.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1992). An architecture for collaborative knowledge building. In E. D. Corte, M. C. Linn, H. Mandl, & L. Verschaffel (Eds.), *Computer-*

based learning environments and problem solving (pp. 41-66). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Shaffer, D. W., & Resnick, M. (1999). "Thick" authenticity: New media and authentic learning. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 10(2), 195-215.

Twigg, C. (2002). *Improving quality and reducing costs: Designs for effective learning using information technology*. Retrieved November 30, 2002, 2002, from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk>

Wiggins, G. P. (1998). *Educative assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.