

Evaluation

The Project team developed and partly implemented its Evaluation Framework for the Carrick project that includes formative and summative processes. The original evaluation framework focused on these areas:

- Individual learning and outcomes by participants in communities of practice.
- Communities of practice reflecting on their own processes and progress.
- Project team members observing the processes and development of communities of practice.
- Peers, or other relevant staff, observing any outcomes or impact from the activities of communities of practice.
- The project team reflecting on its own processes and interactions.

Additionally in the originating project proposal the following processes were outlined:

<i>Monitoring & Evaluating (from project proposal)</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Progress of groups will be monitored using participant observation.2. To evaluate the individual learning outcomes, both for leadership capabilities and for impact on excellence in learning and teaching we will utilise:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The completion of action learning reviews by participants at various points in the process of building the community• Action Learning sets to identify and evaluate outcomes in terms of improved practice• Self-reported outcomes at the end of the project• Other 'objective' data on outcomes – e.g. measures of excellence in learning and teaching3. To evaluate the outcomes for the community of practice and the academic area in which the community of practice has been developed we will utilise:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflections in focus groups by community of practice members on the community's processes, culture, etc• Evaluation by non-members of the community of practice (e.g. Head of School, peers, students) of the impact on the academic area.4. Outside consultant will evaluate the overall project against the project aim, (i.e. the use of communities of practice approach and networks within the context of this organisational strategic change to raise awareness, invite discussion, and provide answers to questions of leadership in learning and teaching both at the institutional and national level.)

From this during 2006 the project did develop a generic project evaluation plan. In the plan responsibilities for various activities migrated with changing project team membership.

Evaluation Framework for the ANU Carrick Leadership Project

Form	How?	Why?	Who?	When?	Done?
CEDAM Project Team	Ongoing reflection	To enable members of the Project Team to test-out and observe techniques suggested for communities of practice and to also model these reflective activities	Member of the Project Team with coordination by JH	At each meeting	Intermittently
ANU CoPs					
Monitor progress and process of groups	Participant observation	To identify the support and structures that they need and what works and what does not	One person from each group to volunteer to be in the 'Super CoP' and to be given advice on Participant Observation techniques by JH workshop sessions in Nov 2006	Probably needs to be at every meeting once the Participant Observer for each group has been identified and advice / support provided	Project staff effectively undertook participant observer roles
Process of community building	Focus Groups	To see what the group thinks is happening as it develops	JH & MH	Scheduled for, Nov, Dec 2006	ALM & TSN
Individual learning outcomes re leadership	Individual Interviews	To discover what individuals understand to be their own development	JH with assistance from other member of the project team	Jul-Aug 2007	Did not occur
Individual learning outcomes re learning & teaching	Individual Interviews	To discover what individuals understand to be their own development	JH with assistance from other member of the project team	Jul-Aug 2007	Did not occur
Seminar Series	Survey at the end of each seminar as to usefulness / learning	To see if what is offered in seminars is a) what people want and b) in the form that they want it	Seminar organiser with assistance from ANUSET staff in developing and analysing the survey instrument	Each time there is a seminar	Did not occur

Summative					
Formal evaluation of project to date	Comment on work to date Use of above findings	To provide end of year/ mid-term report Provide information for Nov 2006 presentation and February 2007 forum	Special meeting of Project Team to assist DH in development of report	Nov-Dec 2006 and Feb 2007	Occurred
Self-reported outcomes re leadership and learning & teaching development	Individual or group reflections at the end of each session	Comments to be white boarded and agreed at each meeting at to whether they can be used in the report	Individuals supported by Participant Observer	Each meeting of a CoP	Occurred
Outcomes of the project activity by academic area or level	Focus groups	To determine communities processes, culture etc	Outside consultant to meet with each group to determine developments and outcomes	Toward the end of 2007	Super CoP x 2 Focus groups— internal not external
Outcomes of activities by non-CoP staff	Interviews and focus groups	To determine impact of CoP on leadership, learning & teaching within the School/College	Outside consultant	Toward the end of 2007	Did not occur
Formal evaluative report	Review of formative and summative data	To evaluate overall project against stated aims	Outside consultant to be employed	Toward the end of 2007	Jacki Lublin engaged

Table: Agreed Project Evaluation Framework, created late 2006, revised February 2007.

However for various reasons the grand plan didn't get implemented in the way it was intended to. A substantial factor was the changing academic staff involvement with the project. However this failure is also due in part to ongoing shift in the project's focus during rollout and implementation. Much of the early thinking on the evaluation design was predicated on individual capacity development, and an institutional context of changing promotion criteria to recognise teaching excellence. The significant shift away from action learning set towards informal group based capacity development impacted on the original ideas concerning capturing data and monitoring project processes. Additionally the change from a passive project findings dissemination model to an immersive capability sharing process also resulted in changes to evaluation activity and instruments.

Generally the instability in the project team, changes in CEDAM staff and who had committed to doing what, meant there were lapses or discontinuities in evaluation activity. This was also not assisted by the project officer being employed part time for the majority of the project. There were of course additional failures on occasion—in planning, communication, technology and follow-up. During last two years CEDAM's resources have been over-stretched as it has sought to accommodate the additional workload generated by Carrick and other changes in the sector.

What did happen with evaluation?

The project has relied heavily on qualitative data, and the ongoing process of the project worker capturing material in a range of settings. What the project did manage to capture was a sense of the evolving project conversation through minutes/notes from the communities of practice, project team meetings, planning days, and the *Practice in Leadership Workshop*. The minutes and notes taken through communities of practice have been regularly circulated to all communities for comment and any required amendment. Additionally in finalising the project report, the section dealing with the Super Community of Practice was circulated for discussion with members. The Tutor's Support Network and also the Research-led Education communities that are discussed in the Community of Practice Section were also commented on by some community members.

In preparing for the *Practice in Leadership Workshop* the planning group was able to utilise the expertise of CEDAM's Evaluation staff to develop the necessary instruments for evaluation capture at the workshop and for subsequent post workshop survey. Finally the project did engage Ms Jackie Lublin to undertake an independent evaluation of the project. Both the formal instruments and data captured through them are included in Appendices: 4.

What has been undertaken?

Focus groups

- Two focus groups with Super Community of Practice (in final one machine apparently didn't record properly), June 2007 & November 2007
- One focus group with Tutor Support Network, November 2006
- One focus group with Academic Leadership and Management, November 2006

Practice in Leadership Workshop

- CoP notes from participants, 28th&29th June
- Minute Survey at PILW workshop, Day 1, 28th June 2007
- Evaluation Survey last day of workshop, Day 2, (47 completions), 29th June 2007
- Online post workshop survey (35 completions), September 2007
- Debriefing with ADU staff, occurred from August through to October 2007
- Debriefing with A-team x 2, August 2007
- Debriefing with Super CoP, August 2007

Two project planning sessions in March 2006, and February 2007.

Regular note taking at:

- Tutors Support Network CoP
- Research-led education CoP
- Super CoP
- Carrick Award Winners CoP

- Project team CoP

Formative evaluation data was used iteratively throughout project implementation to review our performance against the original project plan. It was also the basis for the decisions the team took to change the project's approaches and to justify such intentions to Carrick in our project reporting.

The evaluation data and material generated over the lifecycle of the project has also been used to inform and underpin the overall reporting structure of this document.