CMALT Guidelines

Introduction

This document provides guidelines for CMALT candidates and assessors on:

1. how to prepare your portfolio for submission;
2. how to submit your portfolio for assessment;
3. the assessment process and assessment outcomes.

If you would like information about how to register for CMALT, renew your CMALT membership of ALT or other aspects of CMALT please refer to the CMALT web page http://www.alt.ac.uk/get-involved/certified-membership .

What is CMALT?

CMALT is the portfolio-based professional accreditation scheme developed by ALT to enable people whose work involves learning technology to:

● have their experience and capabilities certified by peers;
● demonstrate that they are taking a committed and serious approach to their professional development.

CMALT holders are learning technology practitioners, who may have learning technology within their job title but equally may be teachers or researchers, managers or administrators with a strong interest in learning technology. CMALT is designed for learning technologists from across all educational and commercial sectors.

Section 1: How to prepare your portfolio for submission

Choosing a format for your portfolio

You can only submit your portfolio for assessment if you are a registered CMALT candidate and have paid the registration fee.

You may submit your portfolio in any digital form that suits your needs. This includes (but is not limited to):

- Word application form (CMALT Submission Template)
- A Google site (there is a YouTube video on using Google sites to create your portfolio http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kl324MW3dgk&feature=channel)
- An e-portfolio, either provided by your employer or self-hosted or one of the hosted portfolios. Do make sure that the assessors will be able to see it (either by making it public, or providing a username and password)
- A podcast or vidcast. This may either be emailed, or a link provided to an online site where it is hosted. If you are emailing it there is a file size limit of 10MB
- Acceptable file formats include:
- Microsoft Office
- Open Office
- Portable Document Format (PDF)
- Web archive file (mht)
- HTML (where submitting multiple files please include index.html as the starting point)
- Audio (mp3)
- Video (MP4 or Windows Media Video (WMV))

It is your responsibility to make sure that you have covered ALL the sections discussed in the content of the portfolio below.

How to structure your portfolio

To gain CMALT accreditation, you need to demonstrate knowledge in four core areas, plus at least one specialist option of work (you may submit more, but this is not required, and generally it is better to put effort into one specialist option).

The following sections provide advice and guidance on how you should present your case for certification and substantiate this with evidence. They also provide suggestions for specialist options.

Principles and values

The development of this scheme is informed by four principles and values, identified through consultation with ALT's members. Central to the scheme is the definition of learning technology agreed within ALT.

> *"Learning technology is the broad range of communication, information and related technologies that can be used to support learning, teaching, and assessment."*

The principles and values that inform the development of the scheme are:

- A commitment to exploring and understanding the interplay between technology and learning.
- A commitment to keep up to date with new technologies.
- An empathy with and willingness to learn from colleagues from different backgrounds and

specialist options.
● A commitment to communicate and disseminate effective practice.

These should be kept in mind when completing all areas of your portfolio and selecting evidence, both for the core areas and when defining a specialist option: they will also be used by assessors to inform their judgement of your portfolio.

Overview of the portfolio structure
Each portfolio must include the following sections:

✔ Contextual statement
✔ Core area 1: Operational Issues
✔ Core area 2: Learning, teaching and assessment
✔ Core area 3: the Wider Context
✔ Core area 4: Communication and working with others
✔ Specialist option(s)
✔ Future plans
✔ Confirmation (and suggested assessor – optional)

How to write and provide evidence
The style of writing expected is one of a reflective and analytical nature and not solely descriptive. Examples of strong and weak statements can be found at the end of this document. Note that it is strongly recommended that you write in the first person as this makes clear to the assessor what you have done and what is comment.

For each section you must provide:

● A **description** of what you have done;
● **Reflection** on what you learnt as a result of doing it;
● **Evidence** to support this.

Description of what you have done

You are required to describe and reflect on your skills and experience against a set of core areas and specialist option(s), which constitute the CMALT framework. For each of these criteria, and bearing in mind the principles and values above, you should expect to follow a similar pattern. You should state the kinds of activity you have undertaken that demonstrate your engagement with the core area or specialist option.

You must include a statement outlining what you have done of relevance to the section. You should make clear your role in the activity.

Reflection

Each section must have a reflective and analytical component, rather than being merely descriptive, thereby enabling assessors to judge, rather than infer that you have appropriate levels of understanding. It is essential to reflect on the example(s) described and evidenced in the section, explaining what you have learned from it, what you might do differently next time (if appropriate), and what impact your work had on learners (this could be staff or students) and/or on the organisation.

This is often the area that causes the most problems for candidates. What are we looking for? We are looking for evidence that your practice develops as a result of your work. Hence there is a need to demonstrate reflective practice. Many people find it easiest to add reflection by adding a heading "reflection" to each section and then addressing appropriate reflective questions such as:

● What have I learnt from doing what I describe above? Or
● What went well/what could have gone better? Or

- What would I do differently another time? Or
- What was the impact on my users/students/learning?

The most common reason that portfolios are returned for further work is a lack of reflection in the portfolio.

Evidence

You must include evidence to support the statement, directly within the portfolio, or in a numbered appendix, or as a link. Evidence that already demonstrates that certain standards have been met (such as a certificate, or a publication, or a link to a piece of your work as a learning technologist) is ideal.

Evidence should be recent, ideally within the last three years, although it is recognised that in some cases older evidence will be appropriate.

Generally, the supporting evidence you supply should be brief – a well-chosen screenshot, the citation information and/or abstract for a paper or report (not the full text), a scan or image of a certificate, a one-page lesson plan, feedback from users / students and so on. As a rule of thumb, you should provide no more than a page and a half of evidence or up to 500 words in support of each area – and in some cases, less than this will be appropriate, though this will depend on the extent to which you choose to make use of appendices.

You should also feel free to cross reference (refer back) to an earlier piece of evidence where this substantiates several statements within your portfolio, rather than including it multiple times.

Note that where you publish your portfolio by making it publicly available it is your responsibility to ensure that you comply with data protection requirements and do not present personal information about other people (such as their email addresses) without their permission. Assessors will treat information that they see as confidential.

Summary

To summarise, for each area you should:

- ✔ Describe what you have done relevant to the section;
- ✔ Reflect on this;
- ✔ Provide supporting evidence.

Examples of the type of statements that you might use are provided below in the appendix.

Resubmission

When resubmitting after referral, it is helpful for the assessors to distinguish in some way any content that has been added or revised.

Content of the portfolio

While you are not obliged to follow the headings below, it is very strongly recommended that you do, as you will find that it greatly helps you to ensure that you have covered all the areas and will help your assessors to see that you have addressed them.

Contextual statement

The portfolio should commence with a contextual statement – the kind of thing you might write in a cover letter for a job application. It should provide a concise biography, outlining your career history and current role(s), highlighting briefly the operational context in which you work or have worked, and reflecting on why you are submitting your portfolio for CMALT and how this relates to your future

career aspirations. This section is not assessed, but can be very helpful for the assessors as they approach the rest of your portfolio.

Core area 1: Operational issues

Candidates should demonstrate both their understanding and use of learning technology. "Use" might include the use of technology to enhance learning and teaching, the development, adoption or deployment of technology to support teaching, training or learning.
This should include evidence of:

a) An understanding of the constraints and benefits of different technologies

You should show how you have used (or supported others to use) technology appropriately, given the constraints and benefits it provides within your context. This might include how you selected particular technologies to meet the specific needs of users (students or staff).

Evidence in support of such statements might include a brief commentary on the choices behind the development and use of learning technology that influence its fitness for purpose. (This might discuss issues such as affordances of the technology, viability, sustainability, scalability, interoperability and value for money.) You may already have something like this in the form of a design outline, proposal, conference presentation or similar. You should include such existing documentation wherever it seems relevant. Alternatively, you might want to take this opportunity to find out more about a technology you have deployed and produce a report on its viability.

b) Technical knowledge and ability in the use of learning technology

You should show that you have used a range of learning technologies. These might include web pages, Virtual Learning Environments, Computer-Aided Assessment, blogs, wikis, mobile technology, e-books, programming languages and so on.

Evidence might include copies of certificates (originals not needed) from relevant training courses, screenshots of your work, a note from academic or support staff who have worked with you or, if appropriate, confirmation that the work is your own from your line manager.

c) Supporting the deployment of learning technologies

Statements about your involvement in supporting the deployment of learning technology might relate to providing technical and/or pedagogic support to teachers or learners, advising on (or re-designing to take account of) technical and usability issues, developing strategies or policies, managing change, providing training or other forms of professional development, securing or deploying dedicated funding and so on, all within the context of the educational use of learning technology. For evidence, you might include the overview section of a strategy document, meeting minutes, summaries of student feedback, testimonials or witness statements from other colleagues.

Core area 2: Teaching, learning and/or assessment processes

Candidates should demonstrate their understanding of and engagement with teaching, learning and assessment processes. 'Engagement' may include using understanding to inform the development, adaptation or application of technology.

Note that your learners are the people with whom you work. For teaching staff this will typically be students. For many learning technologists this may be students or the staff that you support and train.

This should include evidence of:

a) An understanding of teaching, learning and/or assessment processes

Statements here might relate to areas such as teaching experience, learning design, curriculum development, work-based assessment, the creation and execution of a programme of training and so on.

Evidence might include being on the register of the Higher Education Academy, a PGCE award, having completed a SEDA-approved course, extracts from your Institute for Learning (IfL) portfolio or undertaken relevant sections of the Certified E-Learning Professional courses. Commentaries from peers on your approach would also provide suitable evidence. Other possibilities include teaching experience, reflective statements that analyse experience in terms of learning theory, pedagogic approaches, sociological theories, or a comparable, recognised perspective. In relation to learning design, a report, specification or reflective statement might be provided that clearly elaborates the principles that informed the design process. In any collection of evidence there should be some consideration of how technology is changing approaches to teaching and learning and/or the roles of learners, teachers and support staff.

b) An understanding of your target learners

Statements should show how you have found out about learners' needs and the context for their studies, and how you have developed approaches that reflect this.
Evidence might include a description of how assistive technologies have been used to support disabled students, how learner feedback has influenced the design of an e-portfolio, how the needs of work-based learners or overseas students have shaped the curriculum, or records of conversations with product analysts, marketing departments or course teams and the resulting plans for your design. Evidence of changed practice, rather than simply the recognition that this is an important area, is required.

Core area 3: The Wider Context
Candidates should demonstrate their awareness of and engagement with wider issues that inform their practice.

Candidates must cover at least one legislative area and either a second legislative area or a policy area. That is you need to cover a minimum of two areas, at least one of which must be legislative.

a) Understanding and engaging with legislation, policies and standards

Statements here should show how relevant legislation, has influenced your work. You are not expected to have expert knowledge of all of these areas, but are expected to be aware of how they relate to your current practice.

In the UK you would be expected to demonstrate how you work within the context of relevant legislation such as:

- Accessibility including special educational needs
- Intellectual property (IPR)
- Freedom of Information (if you work for a public body)
- Data protection.
- Child protection
- Anti-discrimination law
- Points Based Immigration System (PBIS)
- Other related examples

In your country there may be different requirements, and you should indicate this in your portfolio. It is suggested that you pick at least two areas to discuss.

b) Policy

You are not obliged to address this area so long as you have addressed at least two legislative areas. Examples of policy issues you may address include:

- Policies and strategies (national or institutional)
- Technical standards
- Professional codes of practice

You might also be expected to engage with institutional policies and, where appropriate, national policies and evidence of some of this should be provided.

The kinds of evidence that would support this would include minutes of meetings with legal advisers, documentation showing how legal issues have influenced work (such as reports or data protection forms), justifications for modifications to a course to reflect new policies or a record of how technical standards have been taken into account during system development.

Core area 4: Communication and working with others

Candidates should demonstrate their knowledge and skills in communication through working with others.

Statements could describe the way in which your work involves collaboration, for example through participation in a team or acting as an interface to other groups.

Relevant evidence would include reflection on collaborations with others, reports outlining your activity within a team process, how you have brokered support for a particular initiative (for example from a technical or legal support service) or how you have worked with others to solve problems.

Where your evidence involved collaboration, please acknowledge the contribution of others. You may also chose to discuss how you select appropriate forms of communication.

Specialist Option(s)

As well as the core areas, candidates are required to demonstrate evidence of independent practice in one or more specialist options. This reflects the fact that, although there are common areas of work for learning technologists, practice is extremely diverse and everyone specialises in something different.

Your specialist topic should reflect an area where you have particular expertise. This may be unique to you or common across your team, but goes beyond what would be expected of any learning technologist. Below is an indicative list of possible specialist options. You are free to choose from it, or to select a different area that reflects your expertise.

- producing learning materials/content/courseware;
- project management, including resource management, in learning technology;
- training, mentoring and developing others;
- evaluation;
- research;
- management/administration of a sustainable e-learning process;
- supporting and tutoring learners;
- designing tools and systems;
- institutional development/strategic work;
- knowledge and application of emerging standards for learning technology;
- assistive technologies;
- VLE administration and maintenance;
- interface design;
- distance learning/blended learning;
- managing and sourcing content;
- copyright;
- learner support;

- accessibility;
- sustainability
- inclusive learning practice
- open education resources (OER)
- MOOCs

Defining and evidencing your specialist option

In describing your specialist option you should refer to the values listed at the top of these guidelines. Because these are specialist options you should be clear what makes your work distinct from common practice; many people teach on online courses, but designing and delivering fully online courses requires specific skills and would be considered specialist. . Similarly, many teachers provide blended learning, but developing and sharing guidelines for such practice or working with a distinctive blend of contexts might distinguish your work as specialist. It may be that your specialist option is common amongst the group that you work in as you all work in a similar area; that is perfectly acceptable.

Evidence for your specialist activity is likely to be very specific but could include: reports, papers or presentations you have written; this could be backed up by a job description plus written statements supporting your specialist knowledge from colleagues, clients or managers; active membership of professional or other bodies; certificates of completion of specialist training programmes or courses.

Future plans

While this section is not assessed you must complete it. This can be as detailed as you like. The purpose of this is to help you plan for your professional development; it will also be useful when preparing to meet your continuing professional development requirement to remain in good standing.

Suggested assessor

This section is the only optional section. It allows you to provide details of a person (or persons), known to you, who would be a suitable assessor for your portfolio. You may wish to choose, for example, someone who works within the same sector or who has a similar role. You should not nominate someone who is directly responsible for your work or who has worked with you in the production of any of the evidence included in your portfolio. Your portfolio will be assessed by two people; at least one of them will be someone who is not chosen by you, who may not be known to you and who may work in a different sector or a different kind of role. For this reason, you should ensure that your statements and evidence are comprehensible to someone whom you might consider to be a lay reader rather than someone with the same expertise as you. Note that you should have sought people's permission and established their availability before including their details here, and that inclusion does not oblige ALT to call upon them.

Confirmation

You are required to include and electronically sign a declaration that the portfolio you have submitted is honest and fair. If there is reasonable cause to believe that you have given false evidence or breached procedure in some other way, your certification may be revoked.

Section 2: How to submit your portfolio for assessment

How to submit: You should submit your portfolio using this form: http://go.alt.ac.uk/CMALTsubmit. You will receive a confirmation by email.

If you don't have a URL to your portfolio, for example if it is in Word or some other format, you can

still send it to us as an attachment at cmalt@alt.ac.uk (max 25MB) after you have completed the form.

When submitting your portfolio it should either be a single file or a zipped collection of files (for instance to include evidence). As many email systems block large attachments this should not exceed 10Mb. Please be aware that assessors may not have access to specialist tools, and it is therefore best to avoid proprietary formats.

When to submit: There are three submission windows throughout the year. You may submit your portfolio:

by 31 January for assessment during February, March and April and assessment result in May;

by 31 May for assessment during June, July and August and assessment result in September;

by 30 September for assessment during October, November and December and assessment result in January.

We aim to come to an initial decision about submitted portfolios within 3 months of receipt. The initial decision will either be a pass of the portfolio or a referral, requesting additional information to bring the portfolio up to the requisite standard. *N.B. The most common reason that portfolios are referred for further work is a lack of reflection in the portfolio*.

If you are asked to revise the portfolio the second assessment will be final, resulting in either a pass or fail.

Portfolio submission checklist

Before submitting your portfolio for assessment you should use this checklist to ensure that you have included all relevant information:

First, check that you have included all the following sections:

- ✔ Contextual statement
- ✔ Core area 1: Operational Issues
- ✔ Core area 2: Learning, teaching and assessment
- ✔ Core area 3: the Wider Context
- ✔ Core area 4: Communication and working with others
- ✔ Specialist option(s)
- ✔ Future plans
- ✔ Confirmation (and suggested assessor – optional)

Next, review all core areas and the specialist option(s) and check that you have:

- ✔ Described what you have done relevant to the section;
- ✔ Reflected on this;
- ✔ Provided supporting evidence.

Once you have completed this checklist, ensure that your portfolio clearly states:

1. Your name
2. Contact details including email address

3. A signed and dated confirmation as follows:

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, the statements and evidence included in this submission accurately describe my practice and are drawn from my own work, with the input and support of others duly and clearly recognised.
Signed:
Date:

Submitting
Please submit your portfolio using the form at: http://go.alt.ac.uk/CMALTsubmit . Please ensure that you complete the form carefully. You will receive a confirmation by email.

Section 3: Assessment process and assessment outcomes

How the assessment process works
Each portfolio has two assessors: one of whom may be nominated by the candidate and one a holder of CMALT appointed by ALT, and referred to as the "Lead Assessor". If the candidate does not provide details of a suitable assessor, or if their nomination(s) are felt to be unsuitable for any reason (such as the nominated person not agreeing to undertake the work), then two holders of CMALT will be appointed by ALT, one of whom will be defined as the Lead Assessor.

Assessment outcomes
If the portfolio is being assessed for the first time, there are two possible outcomes of the assessment:

● Pass:
Both assessors should agree that the portfolio adequately meets the criteria for all the sections including at least one specialist option;

● Referral:
This would arise if at least one assessor judges one or more sections of the portfolio to be inadequate. In this case the lead assessor will write a feedback statement to be sent to the candidate. This should identify the areas which need revising and outline, in a constructive, supportive manner, what needs to be done for the portfolio to pass.

If the portfolio is being assessed after a referral, there are two possible outcomes of the assessment:

● Pass:
Both assessors should agree that the portfolio now adequately meets the criteria for all the sections including at least one specialist option;

● Fail:
This would arise if both assessors judge one or more sections of the portfolio to be inadequate. In this case the lead assessor will write a feedback statement to be sent to the candidate.

The role of assessors
The task of the assessors is firstly, independently to assess the portfolio and complete the CMALT Portfolio Assessment Form (see below). Once the independent assessment is complete, the assessors exchange results. Next, both assessors jointly agree a decision. To assist them in determining the standard of each section of the portfolio, assessors will take account of the

"benchmark" portfolio examples provided.

The Lead Assessor should communicate the outcome of the assessment process or any delays during the assessment to the Membership Manager, who will communicate with the candidate.

Email exchanges between the assessors should be copied for information to the Membership Manager, to enable progress to be monitored.

The principles and values that inform the development of the scheme are:

- A commitment to exploring and understanding the interplay between technology and learning.
- A commitment to keep up to date with new technologies.
- An empathy with and willingness to learn from colleagues from different backgrounds and specialist options.
- A commitment to communicate and disseminate effective practice.

These should be kept in mind when assessing the portfolio and examining evidence, both for the core areas and specialist options.

Assessors should judge each section of the portfolio as being of one of the following standards:

1. Description, evidence and reflection are **strong (S)** in that it is well documented and highly convincing; or
2. Description, evidence and reflection are **adequate (A)** in that it is both complete and credible; or
3. At least one of description, evidence and reflection are **inadequate (I)** (or non-existent).

Assessment should be completed within 6 weeks of the portfolio being received by the assessors. A maximum of 3 months duration can be requested in exceptional circumstances, bearing in mind that candidates **must** receive their results before the start of the next submission window (see above, pp. 9-10). The submission and assessment cycle is as follows.

Candidates will submit their portfolios:

by 1 February for assessment during March and April and assessment result in May;

by 1 June for assessment during July and August and assessment result in September;

by 1 October for assessment during Oct/Nov/Dec and assessment result in January.

All correspondence regarding assessments should be directed to cmalt@alt.ac.uk, for the attention of the Membership Manager. It is essential that any potential problems for assessors should be highlighted early on so that candidates receive a uniform and fair experience within the structure of the submission/assessment cycle outlined above.

Portfolio assessment form

The assessment form used during the assessment process can be downloaded at https://www.alt.ac.uk/certified-membership/cmalt-support, under 'Information for Assessors'. This form will be sent to assessors together with the portfolio to be assessed.

Both assessors should complete their sections of the form before exchanging their assessment. The Lead Assessor should then complete the final section of the form, showing the jointly agreed outcome for each section. Each section can either be: strong, adequate or inadequate.

Appendix: Examples of strong and weak statements that might be included in a portfolio

Core area 1: Operational issues:

1a - Understanding constraints and benefits of different technologies

Although we used a VLE on a local server for a number of years, it was extremely cumbersome, expensive to set up and maintain, insufficiently flexible and unreliable. As a result, we talked to colleagues in other institutions and on their advice we replaced this system with a new thin client application, which simplified matters and required fewer specialist staff to support. As a consequence, we have doubled the number of supported users in the last two years. I was responsible for producing the report and recommendations and developing the service level monitoring criteria. I think that we may have been over reliant on the opinions of colleagues in other institutions, rather than concentrating on the needs of our own staff and learners.

(Evidence: service level monitoring document covering the last three years.)

Classed as strong because it shows evidence of keeping up to date with new technologies, a willingness to learn from colleagues from different backgrounds and reflection on personal practice. The evidence substantiates the impact of this. There is also reflection on the process

1b - Technical knowledge and ability in the use of learning technology

We are fully committed to online learning. As a consequence, the course is entirely delivered in BlackBoard. Students log in on day one, and we inform them that we will only interact with them within the learning environment, to ensure that they commit to it properly.

(Evidence: page from the students' handbook explaining how to log into BlackBoard.)

Classed as inadequate because it shows none of the values and principles. (Arguably, the commitment to fully online learning isn't a commitment either to understand or explore the interplay between technology and learning, and use of a VLE only illustrates keeping up to date with one technology, not with technology more generally.)

To bring it up to strong it would be necessary to discuss the nature of the commitment to online learning (although that might be covered in 1c), and how some of the tools within the VLE are being used to support different aspects of the teaching and learning. The evidence is also weak, and a better example would be of how to use some of the educational features found in Blackboard. There would also need to be some reflection.

1c - Supporting the deployment of learning technologies

As a staff developer, I've run a series of training workshops on how to use new technologies at my institution. In order to do this, I've had to learn about them myself. Having to teach the workshops has really ensured that I learn how to use the technologies properly.

(Evidence: workshop schedule with named responsibility for sessions.)

Classed as adequate because it shows a commitment to keeping up to date with new technologies and communicating effective practice. However, the evidence for this is only borderline acceptable, since it shows the commitment to keeping up to date, but not that the practices being communicated are particularly effective. To bring it up to strong some evidence from the workshops would be needed together with more reflection.

Core are 2: Teaching, learning and/or assessment processes:

2a - An understanding of teaching, learning and/or assessment processes

Our sociology course was under-recruiting, so we recently revised it so that it is taught online. We were particularly concerned that the discussions that used to take place in seminars shouldn't be lost, as this process of sharing perspectives on contemporary issues is at the heart of what we want to achieve. I read Laurillard's book, rethinking university teaching, and came to the conclusion that we had two parts to seminars: a narrative element and a discursive one. The narrative part consisted of a student presentation; the discursive part was the whole-group discussion that followed. To recreate this, we provided all students with a cheap webcam and some open source video capture software as part of their study materials. What happens now is that students take it in turns to record themselves doing a short presentation on their set topic.

They upload this and give links to any associated readings as part of our VLE. I lock that page, and release it when the scheduled discussion is due to start. The other students then access it, and I facilitate a discussion on the bulletin board. So far, it seems to work well – we've only done it once, but the student feedback was extremely positive. I think that having a scheduled discussion with the transmission locked beforehand helped to foster the group dynamic and I will repeat this.

(Evidence: excerpts of student feedback.)

Classed as strong. It shows a commitment to exploring the interplay between technology and learning and an attempt to keep up to date with new technologies. The evidence gives strong support for the commitment to understanding the interplay between technology and learning. There is some reflection.

2b - An understanding of your target learners

At a conference, I went to a session on teaching medical students, and heard about this computer-aided assessment system that people in the university down the road are using. It sounded useful, as we've had problems with students who have gaps in their basic knowledge, so I went along to a workshop they organised a couple of months later. Since then, we've started making use of a question bank to test basic knowledge of anatomy. The system automatically selects a sample of questions on the topics you specify, and produces tests for students, each of which is unique but equivalent. This has been really helpful – accessing a validated set of questions has saved a considerable amount of time for us, and having students sit different but equivalent tests has meant that plagiarism is impossible. Most importantly, though, it provides students with immediate feedback on areas of weakness, and they can use the test formatively by re-taking it as many times as they want.

(Evidence: collated output of student performance from the CAA system.)

Classed as inadequate, since it does show commitment to understanding the interplay between technology and learning, some commitment to keeping up to date with new technologies and a willingness to learn from colleagues. However, the evidence does not provide strong support for these values. There is also a lack of reflection. To make this strong you could provide some evidence of greater student learning, how you determined that the questions were equivalent; AND add some reflection.

Core area 3: Wider context

3a) Understanding and engaging with legislation, policies and standards

I recently went on a training course about freedom of information in relation to online teaching. (I'm not sure it was all that relevant, though.)

(Evidence: attendance certificate.)

Classed as Inadequate because even though there is some evidence of commitment to keep up-to-date with technology-related legislation, there is no evidence of engagement with the issues. To make this strong you would need to explain how you apply what you learnt to your work and some reflection on this.

Version	Date	Author	Notes
0416	2016-04-07	Thomas Palmer	