

LSP TEACHER EDUCATION ONLINE COURSE FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – LSP-TEOC. Pro

Project 2020-1-DE01-KA203-005687
Grant no. KA203-ABE6A51B

INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 5:

Piloting developed LSP Teacher Education online course

INTERNAL REPORT:

Marie-Anne Châteaurenaud
University of Bordeaux (France)

TEAM MEMBERS:

Marie-Anne Châteaurenaud, Marie-Christine Deyrich,
Marie-France Burgain

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

**LSP TEACHER EDUCATION ONLINE COURSE FOR PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT – LSP-TEOC.Pro**

**INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 5:
Analysis and synthesis of existing LSP teacher education and development programmes**

**INTERNAL REPORT
Marie-Anne Châteureynaud, Marie-France Burgain, Marie-Christine Deyrich**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Report	1
Introduction	2
1. Research-based identification of relevant testing and assessment methods	3
1.1. Research about usability and user friendliness: focusing on goal achievement	3
1.2. Research on diary studies meant for improvement.	3
2. Design of a robust framework for IO5 Pilot review	4
2.1. Moodle module review for quality improvements	4
2.2. Quality control issues	4
3. Conduct of test and evaluation	4
3.1. About the reviews done by pilotees/participants	5
3.2 About the involvement of participants	5
4. Analysis of the data to guide the continuation of the experiment	5
4.1. Analytical considerations based on data and discourse provided by the reviewers.	5
4.2. Main areas for improvement	5
5. Recommendations called for and resulting revisions	6

Summary of Report

This report presents a synthesis of the results of intellectual output 5 (IO 5) of the European project "LSP Teacher Education Online Course for Professional Development" (LSP-TEOC.Pro). This project No. 2020-1-DE01-KA203-005678 is supported by Erasmus+ programme.

The aim of this project is to provide future and early career teachers with a multilingual online course that will enable them to acquire the competences and skills needed to successfully implement foreign language teaching in a specific context. The goal is to develop a self-directed, online course that will be made available to the LSP community as an Open Educational Resource (OER). The course content will be available in all languages of the strategic partnership consortium, namely Croatian, English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Spanish, Slovenian and Turkish.

In intellectual output 5, the online LSP teacher training course has been tested by project partners and selected external users. The aim is to identify and eliminate any remaining technical or other issues which may jeopardise the functions of the online course. During the piloting, the diary which was designed to be kept was meant to include all positive and negative aspects and the possible impact on the system's usability. The diary resorted to is based on previous research into usability and other issues which need to be considered in the implementation of online content. Apart from the technical issues mentioned, the diary is also intended to give an idea about which course contents have proved to be especially rewarding or challenging with the aim to equalise the user experience throughout the whole online system.

At the end of this intellectual output, the online LSP teacher training course should be considered ready for the large-scale trialling phase.

The leading partner (University of Bordeaux) has carried out extensive research on usability and user friendliness topics which can be applied whilst piloting the online LSP teacher training course. The identified analysis methods have been circulated to and revised by all partners. Upon their acceptance, they were used to test the system amongst consortium partners and selected external users. User diaries were to be maintained by all involved individuals. These diaries and reviews were subsequently synthesized by the leading partner. Remaining scope for improvement was summarised and shared with all partners. Based on this summary, the online course has been revised and improved. Any remaining technical and user-related issues were to be removed. In this respect the IO5 is expected to play a major role in the success of the project.

Introduction

The objective of the project is to provide teachers of Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) with a multilingual online course which will enable them to acquire the competences needed for the successful teaching of languages in specific contexts. The developed online course targets future and early career teachers which may not have received sufficient education in LSP teaching given the gaps in LSP teacher training which have been identified in the project "Teaching Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)" – TRAILS.

The developed online course covers different aspects of LSP teaching, e.g., LSP needs analysis, LSP course design, LSP disciplinary context, LSP teaching skills, task/project/problem-based learning in LSP, LSP materials development, LSP assessment and LSP research, taking the results achieved in the TRAILS project into account. The course will be made available to the LSP community as an Open Educational Resource (OER). It will be implemented as a self-directed course in all languages of the strategic partnership consortium, namely in Croatian, English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Spanish, Slovenian and Turkish. Therefore, LSP students and practitioners will be able to use a multilingual online course to acquire competences for LSP teaching by taking individual learning pathways.

Intellectual output 5 (IO 5) is focused on testing a pilot version of the project.

The leading organisation was the University of Bordeaux. Other organisations participating in IO 1 were two universities from Germany, namely, Jade Hochschule Wilhelmshaven/Oldenburg/Elsfleth and Hochschule Pforzheim, Università degli studi di Bergamo from Italy, Universidad de Cadiz from Spain and Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu from Poland.

The presentation of the activities carried out in IO 5 have been divided into five phases:

- 1) Research-based identification of relevant testing and assessment methods.
- 2) Design of a framework for IO5 Pilot review.
- 3) Conduct of tests and evaluation.
- 4) Analysis of the data to guide the continuation of the experiment.
- 5) Recommendations called for and resulting revisions

1. Research-based identification of relevant testing and assessment methods

This section focuses on driving questions and key activities carried out prior to implementation. The leading partner (University of Bordeaux) has carried out research on usability and user friendliness topics which was intended to be applied whilst piloting the online LSP teacher training course.

The identified analysis methods were circulated to all partners and upon their acceptance, they were to be used to test the system amongst consortium partners and selected external users.

1.1. Research about usability and user friendliness: focusing on goal achievement.

The following are the main points that guided our analysis and decision-making on how to guide the follow-up of the evaluation of the modules:

a) Usability

Usability testing is an essential skill for usability practitioners – professionals whose primary goal is to provide guidance to product developers for the purpose of improving the ease-of-use of their products. It is by no means the only skill with which usability practitioners must have proficiency, but it is an important one.

Usability testing is a method of testing how easy it is for users to use a website or app. It involves testing with real users to see how they interact with the design, and whether they can achieve their goals. (see Annex 1 for more details).

This process is important because it can help to identify problems with the design of a website or app, and suggest ways to improve it. By making a website or app more user-friendly, you can increase its chances of success.

b) User-friendliness vs Usability

Even if usability is the more correct and well-defined term, participants should still demand ease of use from products that claim to be "user-friendly". Regardless of which term is used, developers must be able to back-up their claims as even if promises of "user-friendliness" might sell products in the short term, products that actually have good usability will be successful in the long term.

1.2. Research on diary studies meant for improvement.

a) About diary studies

A diary study is a research method used to collect qualitative data about user behaviours, activities, and experiences over time. In a diary study, data is self-reported by participants longitudinally — that is, over an extended period that can range from a few days to even a month or longer. During the defined reporting period, study participants are asked to keep a diary and log specific information about activities being studied. (See Annex 2 for the timeline of activities that take place throughout a typical diary study).

b) A missed appointment

These diaries (called "Reflection Journal" for this project) were intended to be subsequently synthesized by the leading partner. Remaining scope for improvement was summarised. Based on this summary, the online course was to be improved, and any remaining technical and user-related issues were to be removed. At this point, it is important to stress that user diaries were supposed to be maintained by all involved individuals. We discovered that unfortunately the project testers had not been able to complete this task, thus depriving us of valuable data (see below for more details).

2. Design of a robust framework for IO5 Pilot review

2.1. Moodle module review for quality improvements

Here are the framework elements provided by the partner in charge of the evaluation (Arcola), on which we have based our work:

LSP-TEOC.Pro has made a commitment to a quality control and peer review evaluation methodology that includes a two-step peer review process involving a Primary and Secondary reviewer. The responsibility in our system lies with the Primary Reviewer to check that all improvement recommendations have been implemented by the module Producer, and that the module is in fact fit for purpose (and translation).

What occurs at this stage (IO5) is that the responsibility for ensuring that all improvements and recommendations made by the review partner and those piloting the course are checked by two members of the partner review teams referring to all sources of feedback namely:

Pilot review recommendations made by the IO5 lead (UB) in the IO5 report which is informed by the feedback collected from the Moodle pre and post participation surveys IO5 pilotees and that review teams have completed.

The detailed feedback provided by the allocated partner review team and shared with the module producers.

Only once this has been checked and confirmed by the Primary Reviewer (with further iterations requested of the author if necessary) can each module be signed off and accepted.

2.2. Quality control issues

The work that teams have put into reviewing these modules is considerable, as is the work of the module producers. It is therefore essential that Quality Control at this late stage is as robust as possible, that can only be achieved through the diligent attention of the primary reviewer in overall control and a thorough secondary review that double checks that nothing has been missed.

We followed the instructions given by the partner in charge of the evaluation (Arcola) to guide our reviewing work and ensure its quality. Here are the main points:

- A two-step review - primary and secondary reviewers - as per our quality system, to ensure that nothing is missed this time. Both primary and secondary can be from the same team, we need this robust approach to ensure that there are no further significant problems moving into IO6. The Quality review controller and main responsibility lies with PIR 1, PIR 2 is to make sure nothing is missed by number 1. PIR 1 has to check that review recommendations are implemented and complete before 'passing' the module.
- A robust system in place to ensure that the review and all amendments are made at this stage- ideally a primary and a double-checking secondary reviewer.
- Adoption of a check list to make it easier to carry out the final step and ensure that everything has been suitably adjusted or amended.
- Implementation of the inbuilt evaluation surveys created in the Moodle modules to deal with and include feedback from the IO5 surveys.
- Information that it is important that module producers realise that they may have additional work to do once the IO5 pilot review reporting and analysis is complete and communicated to each of the module production teams. In addition to the internal partner team individual module reviews.

3. Conduct of test and evaluation

The LSP-TEOC-PRO Assessment Tool which was designed and implemented provides a simple and quick way for LSP-TEOC-PRO Pilotees and Participants to review their LSP knowledge and skills before and after online learning in single Modules or in the whole Course, available in the Moodle. Details of the Review instruments are given in Annex 3.

Moodle modules in LSP-TEOC Pro's course have undergone test piloting by pilot participants of the whole course, as well as of individual modules by allocated project review partners. It is essential that all Modules and their content is complete, fit for purpose and conforms to the high standards expected of a course at this level.

All modules were reviewed in September and October by internal and external users and by a peer. The analysis of the reviews was organised in a grid and a synthesis was provided for all modules and sent to all partners involved.

3.1. About the reviews done by pilotees/participants

28 participants have registered. Our testers are mostly women, which is representative of the teaching population in Europe. (22 female 6 male).

Among the 28 participants, only 9 participants (32%) have passed the 8 modules and received the certificate in December. It isn't much, some haven't finished the course and it is therefore important to review.

3.2 About the involvement of participants

Based on the overview table from the grade's summary, we notice that none of the participants has completed the diary called "reflection journal"- probably because the course was really too long.

This is corroborated by the fact that the number of participants who have completed the required tasks decreases as the modules progress: the largest number of participants is for module 0, the smallest number of participants is for modules 6 and 7, which does not allow comparisons to be made and which considerably distorts the analyses.

4. Analysis of the data to guide the continuation of the experiment

We recall here that we have been given a very limited number of complete analyses, as few reviewers have completed the course.

4.1. Analytical considerations based on data provided by the reviewers.

We have carried out a point-by-point analysis of the data at the level of the reviewers' discourse and the results are mixed. Although the modules were generally well regarded by the reviewers, as evidenced by the recurrent use of the adjective "interesting", most of them complained about the length and the excessive amount of time they had to spend on the course. Indeed, many of them dropped out of the course before the end.

Basing our study on the main issues raised by reviewers, we summarise below the points that have emerged as the main areas for improvement.

4.2. Main areas for improvement

At the partners' online meeting (14 December 2022), we took stock of the results of the reviews and asked our partners for several changes to improve each of the modules.

The most urgent issues to be addressed were identified. Here are the points we highlighted, bearing in mind that the most pressing issues to be addressed are organizational.

In particular, there were concerns about the length of time spent on each of the modules and the large amount of information and activities. We also discussed pedagogical issues such as the need to adapt content to the needs of participants. Finally, we pointed out the need to take account of the technical problems mentioned and to make corrections at the linguistic level. Finally, we pointed out the need to tackle the technical problems mentioned as well as the linguistic corrections to be made.

5. Recommendations called for and resulting revisions

To develop reliable recommendations for improving the course in preparation for IO6, we worked on two axes: on the one hand, we had to focus on the issues which need to be considered in the implementation of online content and on the other hand, we had to ensure a uniformity of the modules allowing to equalise the user experience throughout the whole online system.

These recommendations were presented and discussed on 14 December ahead of the final preparations for modules and their implementation on the Moodle platform (see Annex 4 for a summary).

The most important point we have highlighted is of a structural nature, notably by limiting time and activity, even if it means that some of these activities may be optional. We also suggested that the course could look nicer, more user-friendly.

We very much hope that these recommendations will have been taken into consideration in advance of the large-scale trialling of the course.