



ICC-Languages Quality Assurance

QA Report on the CATAPULT Project

Assessors

Barry Tomalin

Michael Carrier

August 2021

ICC-Languages Quality Assurance

QA Report on the CATAPULT Project

Contents

Executive Summary	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Aims of Project	4
3 Aims & procedures of the ICC-Languages QA Assessment	5
4 Assessment of each Output	7
5 Evaluation of Impact Study	19
6 Evaluation of Quality Assurance achieved	20
7 Conclusions	21
8 Appendix	22

Executive Summary

The CATAPULT project is an ambitious and very well-organised training and resource project to help teachers working mainly in adult and higher education achieve greater understanding of, and broader skills in delivering LSP (Language for Specific Purposes) courses.

The ICC-Languages QA team examined and assessed the five main outputs and found they reached the level of quality required for the ICC Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice.

The quality of the CATAPULT project is therefore quality assured according to ICC-Languages standards, and the project is considered accredited by ICC-Languages.

We note that the documentation of the project, including the materials from the five Outputs of the project, are all presented in a highly organised and lively way using animation, academic articles, and videos, as appropriate.

The QA team expressed some concern about the links between the Common Competence Framework and its exploitation in the MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) and suggested the need for more practical teacher training class/training room activities.

We also recognised the value of the Community of Practice and Linguaclick, while appreciating that neither has yet had the opportunity to show tangible results because of lack of dissemination and use by external participants.

Special appreciation is shown to the provision of regular feedback from MOOC online training participants through end of task posts and the opportunity to build good personal relations between participants, partly overcoming the distancing inherent in virtual learning programmes.

Recommendations:

Our recommendations are summarised at the end of our report.

All in all, the scope and detailed output of CATAPULT as an aid to skills and career development deserves recognition by, and the involvement of members of, ICC-Languages and merits the approval of a Quality Assurance Award by the ICC-Languages Board – the ICC Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice.

1 Introduction

CATAPULT is a three-year project (2018-2021) co-funded by the EU ERASMUS Programme. It is aimed at teachers of Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) in adult and university education.

This is a collaborative project with partners from 6 European countries involving higher education institutions and language teaching associations (hence the involvement of ICC- Languages as quality assurance assessor.)

The role of ICC-Languages (ICC), an international language association and a member of the ECML's professional network, is to provide a Quality Assurance Assessment of CATAPULT, which leads if appropriate to the granting of an ICC-Languages Quality Assurance Award, the Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice, to the CATAPULT project.

This entails appointing an ICC-Languages QA Assessment team, consisting of 2 assessors, who will assess the outcomes of the project, make recommendations on how the outcomes might be improved following the initial programmes in 2020 and 2021, and recommend via a detailed written report whether to grant the ICC Quality Assurance Award.

The ICC-Languages aim in this QA report is to review and assess the quality of the CATAPULT project and training scheme as a whole, including the training resources and the training assessment and certification procedure.

Since CATAPULT is an online training programme, no physical onsite visits were necessary (or possible).

The QA team evaluated and assessed the project components as follows:

- The situational survey report
- The Competence framework
- The MOOC virtual training course for LSP teachers
- The Community of Practice Platform
- The overall management of the project, internal QA and external Accreditation.

ICC Accreditation Process

The process of ICC Accreditation of the quality of an institution's project, training course or examination is based on the awarding of the ICC Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice.

If the ICC Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice is awarded to the institution in respect of its product, then the institution can use the ICC-Languages award as a mark of Accreditation of that product.

Once the ICC-Languages Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice has been awarded it remains valid for five years.

2 Aims of the project

CATAPULT aims to help teachers improve their Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) teaching skills and learn how to integrate online teaching tools in their classes and training.

CATAPULT was conceived in response to a perceived need to improve the professional development of LSP teachers. This perception was held by the project partners – drawn from professional experience, participant feedback and a range of articles.

The project aims to produce an in-service training programme using technology enhanced environments through a series of project outputs.

The project set out to

- discover whether this need did indeed exist, via a situational survey
- determine what specific knowledge and competences an LSP teacher required and establish a theoretical framework for LSP teachers to reflect that need
- produce a MOOC course to upskill LSP practitioners
- create a specific Community of Practice platform and Job/client matching tool to allow practitioners to maintain and grow their competences beyond the MOOC as well as, for the independent freelance teacher, add to the range of teaching contract opportunities.
- implement the accreditation and quality assurance of the project

The project produced these outputs:

1 – a situational survey

2 – a common competence framework

3 – an online training MOOC (Massive Open Online Course)

4 – a Community of Practice (CoP) to provide a toolkit to build competences, along with a Job/Client toolkit to help teachers be more competitive in the educational market.

5 – a Quality Assurance procedure to provide both internal Quality Assurance and external Accreditation for the project

3 Aims & procedures of the ICC Quality Assurance Assessment

The ICC Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice offers recognition within the ICC, its partner organisations around the world and the wider international community.

The Certificate may be awarded for any product or service in the broad spectrum language teaching, learning and research.

The award of the Certificate to an organisation is an endorsement of the high quality and reliability of its products and service. The ICC recognises that materials, delivery systems and assessment procedures for language learning vary according to the teaching environment of the learners and the aims of the instruction. As such the product or service is appraised on its own terms of merit, relevance to markets, professionalism, production values and innovation. The ICC nonetheless sets out criteria for quality and best practice which are relevant to all products and services.

The ICC QA Criteria

For this project evaluation, the ICC QA team reviewed and extended the core ICC QA criteria used for the assessment of Training Materials and Resources.

The criteria against which the project is assessed thus include:

- A clear and appropriately detailed project plan is in place which is made available to participants and which includes a description of the aims of the programme, the learning outcomes of the project and the form and duration of the training units
- A clear indication is given of the types of participants for whom the project, its resources and its training course is appropriate
- A statement of justification for the quality and exemplification of best practice is made in the project/training schemes
- A definition of the target groups, desired outcomes and aims of the training schemes is given
- High quality training materials & resources are used that are professionally produced, clearly written, and relevant to the needs and interests of the target group
- A clear indication of the methodological and pedagogical principles underlying the development of the training materials & resources is stated
- Online elements of the training materials & resources are evaluated for accessibility, ease of use, accuracy, visual design and learning structure
- A complete set of relevant training materials & resources is in place at the time of the assessment

The ICC QA Procedure

An appraisal of the product or service takes place through the examination of documents, online resources and other evidence, and in some cases a site visit (not in the case of CATAPULT as it is online).

Where ICC members are directly involved in the creation of the documents to be appraised, the ICC either outsources the task of QA to external experts or draws on the expertise of members who have had no direct involvement in the item(s) to be evaluated.

The appraisal checks that the product or service reflects aspects of best practice in language learning, teaching and research against the criteria outlined in this document.

The appraiser's expert report gives written indications of how the product or service meets the ICC QA criteria, and thus satisfies the quality assurance requirements of the scheme.

The appraiser makes a scored evaluation of the components of the project's outputs

The appraiser makes an explicit recommendation to the ICC Board to issue, or not to issue, a Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice.

Where the recommendation is that a Certificate is not issued, recommendations will be made to the organisation which, if implemented, should enable it to meet the required standard.

The Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice is valid for 5 years.

4 Assessment of each Output

Each part of the project's output is reviewed, assessed and evaluated. The evaluation is summarised by a score of X points out of a possible 20 points per Project Output.

These points are collected in a scoring chart (see Appendix 2 for the scoring chart).

4.1 OUTPUT 1 – LSP SITUATIONAL SURVEY REPORT

What does the output consist of?

It consists of a 48-page Situational Survey published in April 2019, prepared by the project partners, to offer a better understanding of LSP language teachers' qualifications in Europe.

The survey reviews EU documentation on language teaching and teachers, and conducts a job market analysis for LSP teachers. The survey finds that many language teachers lack digital skills, and need further training. Further it seems very few have been abroad, and may lack the intercultural skills needed in LSP teaching.

The survey identifies the major need for LSP teachers to have specialised domain knowledge in order to meet the requirements of employers and recruiters.

The survey confirmed the needs that the CATAPULT project had identified for LSP teachers (eg lack of training, resource, and a sense of isolation) and would try to meet these via the MOOC training and the provision of an LSP Community of Practice.

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

We reviewed the Situational Survey final report.

What issues did we identify?

No significant issues were identified. The survey report was comprehensive, clear, and well-referenced.

What evaluation do we give?

The QA team felt that the output met the Quality Assurance criteria.

4.2 Output 2 – LSP COMMON COMPETENCE FRAMEWORK for LSP practitioners

What does the output consist of?

Output 2 consists of the Common Competence Framework, a framework of LSP competences expressed as a chart containing three columns:

- Teaching competences areas
- Teaching competences
- Indicators of teaching competencies

There are five areas of teaching competences:

1. General teaching competences
2. Collaboration and Intercultural mediation competences
3. Analytical competences
4. Course and materials design competences
5. Evaluation competences.

The five areas are broken down into 17 specific **Teaching Competences**, on average 3 or 4 per area.

The 56 **Indicators** list what teachers are expected to know and to be able to do in each area of competence.

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

The information was gathered from Teacher Training providers teaching LSP skills and is a thorough and comprehensive listing of skills identified by competence and area of operations.

What issues did we identify?

1 – It seems that the language used in the Framework, specifically in the indicators, is quite specifically academic, written by and for academics, and may be difficult for many practising teachers to understand, if they have not done graduate degrees in applied linguistics.

We would recommend that the language be simplified and academic jargon reduced.

Similarly, the Framework assumes a much higher degree of knowledge of concepts such as 'Community of Inquiry', 'intersubjectivity', 'corpus linguistics' than most teachers would normally have access to.

Further, very few teachers would have skills such as 'can gamify a course' or 'can use tools of corpus building', even though they may be aware of the concepts.

2 – There is unfortunately no reference to the Council of Europe (CEFR) level framework which focuses on language and functions to be taught at three levels of language competence.

While offering an excellent and thorough typology of LSP teaching skills we did feel these skills were not systematically developed in Output 3, the MOOC.

We also noted that the materials in Outputs 2 and 3 assume native speaker or near-native speaker fluency in English, which is not universally the case even in Europe.

3 – References

We would recommend replacement of the term *andragogy* or at least an explanation thereof in 1.3. This is not a term that is much used in English to refer to adult education. The term ‘Pedagogy’ is still used even for adult education although we all know that strictly speaking that term refers to children.

We also noted that acronyms like CALL and ICT were not spelt out. We would recommend correcting this the first time acronyms are used in a document. A note in student feedback bears this out: *“It’s been difficult at first to distinguish between all the different acronyms, but once you get the essential differences, it makes a lot of sense, and it has the advantage of putting a name on your own practice.”*

4 - Design

One minor point we found is that the Framework is printed in quite garish colours which made it hard to read. We had to remove the colour shading in order to assess it and perhaps other teachers may find it overpowering too.

What evaluation do we give?

While acknowledging the value of the Common Competence Framework as a checklist of skills divided up by area of competence we feel that users might need (in a different project, perhaps) to have access to an LSP teacher training syllabus to show how these skills can be developed for teachers.

However, as a checklist of competences needed we are happy to give it a positive quality assurance assessment, indicating that the output met the Quality Assurance assessment criteria.

4.3 Output 3 – LSP TRAINING PROGRAMME (MOOC)

What does the output consist of?

The output consists of a 6-module online teaching programme with participation at three levels, Browser, Tester and Creator level, chosen by the participant.

If the participant chooses Browser or Tester level, they can complete the course (& some activities which grant them Badges) but do not get a Certificate of Completion. This is helpful as it allows participants to have different engagements with the course, and utilise different time commitments, but still gain from the course. On the other hand, it might have been easier to simply merge the Browser and Tester levels, for ease of participant use – having three user types is confusing.

The Certificate of Completion is awarded to Creators completing the whole of the CATAPULT training course.

Badges are given for each module completed, and the Certificate is granted when all modules have been completed successfully.

Each module consists of an Introductory video cartoon, a text introduction, a rich mix of audio, video, web and text resources, and varied activities such as quizzes, assignments, polls, shared posts in a forum with other participants etc.

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

The assessors went through each module (& each component of each module) of the MOOC as if they were LSP teachers, in order to test out the materials and resources.

They assessed the modules' relevance to increasing LSP users' knowledge and practical skills. They also checked the MOOC modules against the skills listed in the Common Competence Framework.

What issues did we identify?

There are many positive features of the MOOC.

- it is easy to use and visually attractive
- the structure of the course is clear and all course and module components are clearly listed and are individually addressable, so participants are not locked into a linear sequence
- the explanatory texts in each module do not just list other texts and resources but walk the participants through the resources, linking to them outside the module, so that participant has a lot of optional extra work to do – the modules could take some considerable time to complete.
- there is a clear and motivating video cartoon to introduce each module
- there is a good range of activities – reading, watching videos or presentations, doing quizzes, assignments etc
- there is a good level of interactivity, creating posts to share with other users (and the number of which can be graded towards the certificate to show participation)

A positive feature is that every module ends with a Reflection, where the learning of the module is summarised and synthesised.

- the MOOC itself is well-organised and interesting, with multiple varied features including a mixed media approach with videos and text as well as questionnaires.
- the introductory cartoons at the beginning of some modules are an excellent introduction.
- however, we also felt it was quite academic in many respects, and could have included more practical advice and lesson plans particularly for teachers

This academic bias can be seen in the feedback from participants – most participants were university-based and teaching a specific group (medical students, chemical engineering students, and general students learning LSP). Only one teacher contributing to the feedback said he came from an industry as opposed to an education background.

Similarly, we noted that important skill indicators such as *lexical approach*, *gamification*, *Community of Inquiry*, *transversal skills*, *corpus linguistics* and *corpus compilation* were not explained or dealt with in the MOOC modules.

- The assessors would also query the complexity of textbook reference materials, but the video materials are on the whole well-chosen and in some cases, especially modules 4 and 5, inspiring.

Occasionally the videos are not appropriate to the topic of the module. We would recommend that in future iterations of the project, practical advice can be offered on lesson planning and organisation of lessons as well as practical teaching tips that may be offered through pre-recorded materials or ideas offered by the project partners and participants’.

Activity

- there was significant amounts of Interactivity shown by the over 500 posts shared by the participants on this course.
- looking at the MOOC Activities, the questions varied from multiple choice, to gap-fill to writing brief paragraphs on conclusions. The exercises were automatically marked and the paragraphs created by the participants were marked by the tutors.
- Some participant feedback criticised the multiple choice questions as being too general, particularly in the introductory module.
- All the feedback made the point that the reading and essay writing called for hard work and was in some cases quite challenging. This was seen as a positive attribute by the participants.

Assessment & Certification

- The ‘Check your progress’ chart in each module is very helpful to support users in completing all tasks required.
- Gradebook – it seemed strange that all the grades and scores are visible to any user – there is no private scoring of performance.

- However the majority of 292 participants only did 0 or 1 module, and very few completed – only 11 people complete the entire course in season 3 June 2021.
- Badges – similarly although 74 people got badges in Module 1, only 16 got badges in Module 6.
- These data suggest that there is (as often the case) quite a big drop off in motivation and completion. The varied and excellent course content cannot be held responsible for this, however.
- Certificate of Completion – this is not visible in any menu or inside the GradeBook. A computer glitch made it difficult for students to access and download the Certificate of Completion, though this was resolved quickly.

Notes on each of the modules:

Introductory:

1. What are LSPs? 5 tasks focusing on key concepts and needs analysis with clear and watchable video presentations by Cédric Sarré. Feedback stressed value of improving PRACTICE and TEACHING SKILLS. Quite a lot of participants wrote they had no prior training in LSP and valued this opportunity to learn new skills.

2. LSPs and corpora: 5 tasks focusing on the definition of a corpus and how to build your own for training purposes

3. Skills for successful communication in LSP: 7 tasks focusing on materials and tools, ICT tools for communication and the value of reverse planning and working with cultural differences. In feedback some participants found the questions quite general, vague and difficult to express an opinion about. However, one participant valued the idea of quizzes to test preconceptions and then posts to encourage reflection.

4. Student engagement: 7 tasks focusing on how to keep students motivated, the impact of culture and tools for student engagement. A very successful module resulting in very positive feedback. See below.

5. Collaboration: 6 tasks focusing on helping learners exploit their skills and introducing the CoP community of practice. This module got varying feedback, frequently due to unfamiliarity with the concept of Community of Practice. One participant wrote: *Unfortunately, my experience as regards CoP is limited but as this course has been so enlightening, I would like to join the CATAPULT CoP. I am looking forward to that!*

Another participant wrote: *It is a great initiative to build a community of practice with LSP teachers and I registered, hoping to contribute at some point. I am not sure it is going to be really user-friendly over time without more tabs to organize content. I would need a description of the type of resources under the titles in the resource inventory.*

6. Portfolios in LSPs: 4 tasks introducing and explaining the value of ePortfolios in job searching for students and teachers. This module provoked a wide range of feedback, some positive and some more doubtful. This feedback provides a useful summary of opinion:

I was not really convinced of the value and benefits of portfolios but these articles made me see them as a way for a student, who has built it early at the start of his academic path, to provide evidence for any claimed expertise. That's one of the major benefits I can see for students as well as supporting the development of critical skills, self-assessment.

For teachers, portfolios orient teaching towards competence-based curriculum to 'fill' the portfolios, which can be a good thing. I have discovered ePortfolios in this MOOC so I have no experience to share yet!

7. Standalone (ICT):

There is a standalone module on ICT, giving more information about the ICT tools presented and used in the course. This is a very useful way of bringing together all the ICT information which is spread throughout the course, so the individual tools can be better explained and more easily found in future (without going through all the tasks).

Notes on the ePortfolios

Although there were some initial reservations about ePortfolios, student feedback generally found them a positive development. Here are examples of the feedback.

'I think the tools presented here could be a good way to implement ePortfolios in adult classes. At the beginning of the module I had doubts on whether this idea could work for adult students as well, considering their potential lack of motivation, time or confidence with the technology involved. Then I thought of what professionals usually do on social networks such as LinkedIn (showcasing achievements and certificates) and I realised that probably many of my students are already familiar with the concept of ePortfolios without even realizing it.'

'I would use simple tools such as Google Sites and show them examples of ePortfolios compiled by other students. It's important in my opinion that, as students, they feel involved in the project and understand the reasons why we are doing it, and that, as teachers, we are fully aware of the benefits but also potential challenges.'

Participant feedback

A very strong feature of the course was the participant feedback, which actively encouraged exchanges of views and contributions of ideas contributing to the course. Most importantly, it created a real sense of community and mutual appreciation between those who contributed.

Examples of participant feedback

This course is probably one of the most engaging courses I've taken. It's very challenging and time consuming, but the variety of contents and assignments has made it fun from the start. That combination of serious academic material and fun is key for motivation, as far as I'm concerned. From the very beginning, your engagement into the course is rewarded, through credits and/or feedback, which makes all the difference. Had some of the participative activities not been taken into account that way, I probably wouldn't have done half of them :)

I particularly find this course one of the most engaging courses I have ever done. To start, the content is so relevant for my teaching and for my final dissertation (my research paper is in progress). The second thing I like is the variety of tools and materials that it offers. You never get bored! Next, I like the idea of the reflections, they make me connect with I am doing. Finally, I can put into practice all the things that I learn here, either in my teaching or in my project.

Barring a face-to-face environment, which works best for me, this course has been great with all the different methods of submission, different methods used to emphasise where we really need to retain information and others simply for our information. (this helped push me into "study-mode") The combinations of reading/video engagement helps to keep the mind engaged. That chopping and changing concept I know I could integrate into my lessons quite easily - just need to do.

Recommendations or suggestions

The webinars referred to in some modules should be recorded and available after the event.

External article references must be in full text; it cannot be assumed (as is the case here) that all participants have an ATHENS subscription via their university. Most teachers would not have this. So references like Basturkmen in Module 1 cannot be accessed. We would recommend that additional optional modules be produced to cater for the LSP teachers and trainers working in business and corporate settings rather than only higher education settings.

What evaluation do we give?

Subject to the comments made above we would propose that the output met the Quality Assurance criteria. However we would ask for special reference to be made to linking the MOOC more clearly to the Skills indicator of the Common Competence Framework, and the practical requirements of teachers in business and corporate settings.

4.4 Output 4 – LSP COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (CoP Platform)

What does the output consist of?

The CoP Platform provides an ongoing environment for exchange of contacts and information and for CATAPULT alumni to advertise their areas of specialisation and seek work opportunities.

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

We referred to the programme description (above) and also to participant feedback from the LSP training programme.

What issues did we identify?

Website Design

- The website is very attractive, with a good design, good use of colour, and very nice graphics illustrating the blog posts.
- The introductory YouTube presentation is very attractive, engaging and informative.

- The website is quite easy to navigate, but we noticed spelling errors eg '[Suscribe](#)'

Content:

- We found the Resource Inventory was a very rich resource and would be very helpful for LSP teachers – ca. 60-70 resources already available.

- However clicking on the word 'resource Inventory' in the breadcrumbs brought a 404 error:

<https://linguacop.eu/resource-inventory/>

- We noticed a little confusion about the use of words as links – the link on the Home page called 'Articles' and at the bottom 'Latest Articles' actually takes the user to Blog posts – not articles.

- This could perhaps be made clearer – calling them 'Blog Posts' or even 'Blog Articles'. Otherwise it seems Blog and Articles would be different locations and resources.

- The Notifications were very helpful – being links to external resources.

Usage:

- We noticed the Forums were not being used much – only 18 posts in the last year.

- This suggests LSP teachers have not heard of LinguaCoP, and so a broader dissemination activity is required.

Teachers had not yet entered the Community of Practice but all feedback showed enthusiasm about doing so.

It is a great initiative to build a community of practice with LSP teachers and I registered, hoping to contribute at some point. I am not sure it is going to be really user-friendly over time without more tabs to organize content. I would need a description of the type of resources under the titles in the resource inventory.

What evaluation do we give?

At the moment the CoP offers potential but we have little evidence of take-up. Nevertheless, it is seen as a positive follow-up to the successful completion of the MOOC. The QA team felt that the output met the Quality Assurance criteria.

4.4.1 Sub-output 4 The Job/Client matching tool

What does the output consist of?

This is a subset of the Community of Practice, allowing teachers wishing to learn a new language or improve their language skills to get in touch with a qualified and experienced language teacher.

It is delivered as a website, linguaclick.com, where teachers can register as providers of services in different languages. They can specify the language they teach, their location, their specialisations, their prices, availability – and whether they are a native speaker or not.

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

We looked at participant feedback from the project

Does this website seem well-written, clear and accessible?

Does it make clear what the language services are and help language student participants (ie people searching) find the right teacher provider?

Does it meet its aims of putting LSP teachers in touch with their market?

What issues did we identify?

The website is attractive, easy to use with clear instructions and information, and the search function seems to work – we were able to identify LSP teachers for common languages.

It was not possible to identify clear outcomes of the student use of the Lingaclick system, as there had been insufficient student engagement with this tool.

Search Filters:

The word 'Modality' is a teacher word – language students may not know what it means. 'Type of class' is better.

It was interesting that the designers used the word 'branches' to mean the subject specialisations of the LSP teacher. We might recommend using 'Specialisation' or similar instead. A 'branch' seems like a branch office of a company or a bank.

The list of 'branches' doesn't include 'business' or 'management'. It does make a distinction between 'employees' and 'executives' which is undefined – that might be difficult for some people to decide about themselves. And perhaps a little unusual for a teacher to say they taught one but not the other.

It was interesting that the designers decided that specifying whether a teacher was a native speaker or not was an important criterion to offer the searchers. That might offend some teachers.

Website design:

A serious omission is a sign or link to show that if you click on the name or photo of the teacher, you get a full page of further information text written by them as a profile. This is not at all obvious to the user. We recommend a button marked 'Profile' that students can click.

The search box has a long list of languages including many which teachers are unlikely to be familiar with – eg Chewa, Chechen. Perhaps this list should be shorter and more realistic until a teacher of a new language actually registers themselves. Otherwise the user/search may be put off by many Zero responses.

The Lingualick Website terms and conditions have the website address spelled incorrectly (linguaclick.com), and there are other spelling errors on the site.

What evaluation do we give?

Once again this is still an area of potential which needs further work.

We will need to see the proposed language teachers' qualifications and experience, and gain evidence from students about how they felt using the system. Did it give them the information they needed? Did they need something else? How did they make a selection of the teachers?

However, the website tool provides a positive step forward in terms of helping LSP teachers engage with their market. The QA team felt that the output met the Quality Assurance criteria.

4.5 Output 5 – Quality assurance and Accreditation

What does the output consist of?

The output consists of a variety of tools and situations which were very well-organised and presented. They were:

- Presentation and introduction of CATAPULT online
- Regular team meetings to harmonise development of the project and ensure time-keeping
- A multinational team of course developers with partners representing six countries

What approach did we use to evaluate this output?

We looked at the Internal QA tools (module feedback, Impact Study) and used ICC accreditation reports from previous projects and quality assurance awards to match quality levels.

What issues did we identify?

We noticed the following:

- The presentation of the different outputs of the project is lively, entertaining and informative.
- Of particular value is the use of animation to introduce outputs based on the problems faced by teachers, as were the presentations by CATAPULT project leaders.
- The minutes we have seen of regular team meetings show clear results, excellent organisation and timing.
- The cooperation and division of work between representatives of the different countries seems to have worked very well.
- The internal QA tools seemed well-designed and collected useful data
- The Impact Study seemed well-designed and although data was not yet available it appeared to be capable of gathering useful impact data

What evaluation do we give?

The QA team felt that the output met the Quality Assurance criteria.

5 EVALUATION OF CATAPULT Impact Study

How do we evaluate the Impact study and its reach & engagement analysis?

The CATAPULT Impact study is 15 statements that students complete after they have finished each module.

Each statement can be scored between 1 and 10 and there is a column for comments including an overall appraisal of the material.

The Impact study can be seen below in Appendix 3 but we have not seen completed copies of the study to analyse.

However, general course feedback had generally positive remarks about the *ePortfolios* that students were asked to complete and were generally enthusiastic about the course and the teaching.

6 EVALUATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE ACHIEVED

Do we feel the project has reached the level of quality it should?

This has been a powerful and comprehensive initiative which provides teaching and assessment of LSP skills and provides an excellent online feedback exchange network and opportunities to access the work and career market through the Community of Practice.

At present the programme is aimed mainly at teachers of LSP in higher education, but could usefully be extended to teachers based in corporations and international organisations, where it would have a larger market. In our opinion, the project could be opened to trainers in the corporate sector and a possible extra optional module could be added to the MOOC on Training LSPs and Culture with emphasis on useful techniques which the MOOC as at present constituted needs more of.

The overall evaluation is shown in the sections above (confirmed by 2 assessors) and in this summary of whether ICC criteria have been met or not met:

ICC Criteria	'Met' or 'Not met'
A clear and appropriately detailed project plan is in place which is made available to participants and which includes a description of the aims of the programme, the learning outcomes of the project and the form and duration of the training units	Met
A clear indication is given of the types of participants for whom the project, its resources and its training course is appropriate	Met
A statement of justification for the quality and exemplification of best practice is made in the project/training schemes	Met
A definition of the target groups, desired outcomes and aims of the training schemes is given	Met
High quality training materials & resources are used that are professionally produced, clearly written, and relevant to the needs and interests of the target group	Met
A clear indication of the methodological and pedagogical principles underlying the development of the training materials & resources is stated	Met
Online elements of the training materials & resources are evaluated for accessibility, ease of use, accuracy, visual design and learning structure	Met
A complete set of relevant training materials & resources is in place at the time of the assessment	Met

7 CONCLUSIONS

ICC QA Award decision

After going through and evaluating the content of and participant feedback on the CATAPULT project the **ICC-Languages QA team is happy to recommend that ICC-Languages award the Certificate of Quality Assurance and Best Practice to the CATAPULT project.**

The QA team makes the following recommendations for in-course improvements when time and opportunities allow, as well as suggestions for better marketing.

Recommendation 1:

The MOOC needs to make better and systematic reference to the Common Competence Framework and how the activities described in the MOOC relate to the skills listed in the Framework.

Recommendation 2

More practical teacher training activities need to be included in the MOOC, perhaps as Practical Tips from the field, and can include ideas submitted by course participants in the feedback and task completion posts.

Recommendation 3

CATAPULT should be extended to trainers working in the corporate sector who may not be based in university or adult education institutions. One way of achieving this might be an optional module specially devoted to in-company training. The Cultural input could be effectively developed by modules on 'Managing Diversity and Inclusion' and modules on 'The intercultural aspects of communication', and on 'Project Management'.

These might be developed in collaboration with the ICC-Languages EUROLTA teacher training programme.

Recommendation 4

The Community of Practice and Linguaclick should be kept under review and developed to encourage ongoing communication between alumni, both in the interests of information exchange and potential career development for participants.

Recommendation 5 Marketing

The CATAPULT programme needs better marketing by all project partners both in partner countries and Europe-wide through academic publications, webinars and conferences as well as other avenues of information spreading and publicity. This will depend on a much wider dissemination strategy being developed, along with targeted marketing activities to ensure that all LSP teachers can be made aware of the resources that CATAPULT can offer. ICC-Languages could play a useful role in this regard.

Note: The ICC-Languages Quality Assurance award to CATAPULT is not dependent on the implementation of these recommendations.

Michael Carrier and Barry Tomalin

ICC-Languages Quality Assurance team

8 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Links to the project & MOOC sites:

<http://catapult-project.eu/>

<https://www.thecn.com/6797773>

<https://linguacop.eu/>

<https://linguaclick.com/>

APPENDIX 2

Evaluation Scoring Chart - ICC CATAPULT Assessment Scales

OUTPUTS	First QA Assessor Comments	Marks	Second QA Assessor Comments	Marks	Agreed Marks
Output 1 SITUATIONAL SURVEY REPORT AND COMPLETION CERTIFICATE					
Output 2 COMMON COMPETENCE FRAMEWORK					
Output 3 TRAINING PROGRAMME (MOOC)					
Output 4 COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (CoP Platform)					
Output 5 OVERALL MANAGEMENT					
TOTAL MARKS					

RECOMMENDATION

ICC QUALITY ASSURANCE AWARDED TO CATAPULT PROJECT.

APPENDIX 3

Module Feedback questionnaire

Output 3 Unit Feedback

Please complete this questionnaire when reviewing all modules.

Please indicate whether you agree with the statements below on a scale of 1 – 10, where 1 indicates total disagreement and 10 indicates total agreement. Where an element is not appropriate to your reflection, please indicate with N/A

Please write any comments you may have in the right hand column.

Module name: **Portfolios**

Please indicate if you are reviewing/commenting on the complete module or on specific tasks/activities within the module. If commenting on specific tasks, please indicate which tasks/activities

	Score	Comments
The aims of the material are transparent		
The material achieves its own stated aims		
The material is appropriate for use in a professional context		
The material is sufficient for use in the given timeframe		
The material is user friendly		
It is easy to navigate through the material		
There is a clear progression through the material		

The material offers good balance and variety		
The material encourages active learner engagement		
The material encourages learner – learner interaction		
The material is attractive		
The material is adaptable to a range of contexts		
The instructions for tasks are clear		

Overall appraisal of the material		
-----------------------------------	--	--

APPENDIX 4

MOOC Impact Study

1. Which CATAPULT MOOC course(s) did you attend? (please put the dates)				
2. Which modules did you engage with?				
Module 1 What is LSPs?				
Module 2 LSPs and Corpora				
Module 3 Skills for successful communication in LSP				
Modul 4 Student Participation and Engagement				
Module 5 Collaboration				
3. Did you complete the modules you engaged with? (crrcle the appropriate response)				
Yes		No		Some
4. How did you feel about the course when you completed it?				

Not useful at all	1	2	3	4	5	Really Useful
5. How do you feel about it now?						
Not useful at all	1	2	3	4	5	Really Useful

6. What from the course have you taken into your own teaching?
7. How successful has this been?
8. Are there ideas from the course that you would like to investigate further or have investigated further? If so, what?
9. How has the MOOC influenced your thinking and practice in LDP teaching? (if at all)