WP2

NATIONAL REPORT

GERMANY:

FIELD RESARCH ABOUT SPECIFIC NEED OF THE PARTNERS

REGARDING ASSESSMENT

Authors: Monika Czerwinski, Christian Hendrichs, Annette Koch

Arbeit und Bildung e.V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Assessment is an ongoing process that involves planning, discussion, consensus building, reflection, measuring, analyzing and improving based on data and artifacts gathered about a learning objective. Any assessment is linked to critical questions, such as:

- *Why* do we measure?
- *What* do we are measuring?
- *How* do we measure it?
- *How much* do we need to measure?
- *When* do we measure it?

Assessment is in the core of the project CRITON (www.criton.eu). CRITON is a transnational cooperation project to enhance the learning process in distance education systems and e-learning, using assessment methods for predicting the progress of students and to improve evaluation methods leading to better learning outcomes and more personalized learning.

In the project participate seven partners from six different countries of Europe (Greece, Austria, Finland, Lithuania, Sweden, Germany).

This National Report presents the findings of the survey about different assessment methods used in eLearning environment in order to define the most widely used assessment practices in Germany, which can provide accurate measure of student performance in eLearning.

The research questions of the study are:

- Which are the most widely used educational assessment methods in Germany and why?
- What are the particular features of assessment methods used in eLearning environments in Germany?
- Which assessment methods in eLearning environments have added value for students, staff, institutions and future employers?

- Which e-assessment formats just focus on testing the acquisition of declarative knowledge and which provide much deeper insights, for both the student and the teacher?

- How can feedback influence student achievement in eLearning?

- Under which conditions does assessment support students' progress in an eLearning environment?

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following section summarizes a desk research for task 2.1 of the CRITON project about assessment practices in e-learning in Germany conducted 2013.

This research of assessment methods and practices was mainly conducted by freelance worker Christine Tesfamariam. It was based on the provided keywords "e-assessment methods, best practices in e-assessment, forms of on-line tools to assess learner progress" and targeted specifically to those methods used in eLearning environments that support distance or hybrid learning.

Besides the general information about the different forms of e-assessment such as formative, summative and agnostic e-assessments or open-ended and closed-ended forms of e-assessment the research focused critical reflections concerning these new forms of evaluation as well as the technical implementations in Germany.

A summary and excerpt of this desk research will be provided below:

Critical Reflection on e-assessment

There is insecurity concerning these new forms of evaluation on teachers` side as well as on students` side, as none of them is used to work with these new methods of e-assessment. Especially students or learners often do not understand why their personal learning experience should be important for the evaluation process.

New forms of e-assessment often demand high financial and pedagogical investment at the beginning and hence are not without risk. Most of the presented assessment procedures (weblogs, e-portfolio, etc.) demand great expenditures in correction (comparable to the correction of term papers or presentations). Teachers can reduce their work for example, if they leave the evaluation of open-ended e-assessments to the peer group, i.e. students evaluate each other on the basis of predefined criteria. Nevertheless, a final evaluation through the teacher is indispensable, peer assessment can be used as a supplement, but never can replace a final evaluation through the teacher.

The objectivity and reliability of open-ended assessments is more difficult to prove than it is with closed-ended or traditional assessment forms. Furthermore, open-

ended e-assessments only are comparable and generalizable to a limited extend. Especially open-ended forms of assessment need new evaluation methods, e.g. the use of evaluation and competency grids (rubrics) to raise the objectivity of the assessment. Thereby the competences that learners have to show are listed in a matrix and so can be evaluated. The metacognitive development, which is inherent to many forms depends on the learner and does not always occur and consequently cannot be expected at any rate.

E-assessment can support current educational goals. Paper and pencil tests can be made more authentic by allowing students to word process essays, or to use spreadsheet, calculators, or computer algebra system in paper-based examination. ... E-assessment can be used to assess ‹new› educational goals. Interactive displays which show changes in variable over time, microworlds and simulations, interfaces that present complex data in ways that are easy to control, all facilitate the assessment of problem-solving and process skills such as understanding and representing problems, controlling variables, generating and testing hypo- theses and finding rules and relationships (Ridway et al., 2004).

But it is important to find the balance between benefit and income and the pursued educational goals. It makes no sense to replace all exams arbitrarily with e-assessments. Instead, the fields in which an additional benefit is to be expected through the integration of media into the process of evaluation have to be defined (Schiefner, 2007).

(Technical) Implementation

E-assessments entail great effort: the quality of the exams, the technology must be reliable, several work spaces must be available at the same time, safe assessment-nets must be created, several trial runs must be organised, etc. That discourages many teachers at the beginning.

There are different software systems, e.g. ILIAS, ViPS, LPLUS. If an university or any other educational institution introduces the electronic procedure of examination using their in-house computer and server infrastructure or even students` notebooks, the computers should be in a special security mode during the examination. For this

purpose there is a so-called kiosk-software, which disables the request of system commands as well as the use of forbidden service tools and surfing in the internet. As most electronical examination procedures are browser-based, the delivery from commercial evaluation-systems includes that so-called kiosk software. In the open source sector there is the so-called Safe Exam Browser (SEB1) which by now gets support by learning management systems like ILIAS, Moodle and OLAT in different setting-ups. Diversity of computer hardware, system software and network infrastructure complicate the distribution and the application of a kiosk-software. To facilitate the distribution of a new kiosk-software for e- assessments, the university department of medicine in Marburg (Philipps-Universität) sets up and wires so-called Thin-Clients, about 180 notebooks without a hard drive at the end of each semester in the lecture hall of the medical library. The notebooks work with a minimal Linux system software (PXE Boot 2). Besides the initial outlay of the notebooks, as well as the preparation and supply of a net-based "system software images", there are hardly more charges. In fact, the university of Hamburg in compliance with the university of Marburg and the SEB team of Zurich developed a tool with which one can web-based preconfigure such a "system software image" and download it in different formats (Sebian3) (Hamburger eLmagazin, 2011).

Experience & conclusions: Lessons Learned - 7 years of e-assessment

At the University of Bremen there are summative e-assessments since 2004. Below you find the most important long-term conclusions from Jens Bücking:

High-quality e-assessments require didactical consultation and training as well as the reinvestment of the time (which was saved during the phase of correction) into the creation of good questions and into the creation of open questions according to the educational objectives.

The validity of exams does not depend on the form of an exam. Whether it takes place electronic or handwritten, whether the questions are presented as closed-ended or open-ended assessments, none of it says anything about the quality of the assessment. The widespread prejudice that says that exams on the computer only include multiple choice questions and test factual knowledge is easy to disprove. On

the one hand, e-assessments can include a great variety of examination forms (more than it is possible in handwritten exams), on the other hand, there are also multiple choice questions which are able to test comprehension and transfer, even though it is a very challenging task for the authors to create these kind of multiple choice questions. Whereas individual assessment and creative achievements require open testing formats and thereby produce a higher postprocessing effort. Practical experience shows that the above listed prejudices often become reality because of too little temporal investment for the creation of adequate questions, the abandonment of open questions for capacity constraints and too little didactical know-how in the drawing up of good exams.

Transparency in matters of educational learning objectives and examination formats (e.g. by offering a mock exam) is even more important for e-assessments than it is for other examination forms.

In e-exams with exclusively closed-ended questions most students expect to be asked factual knowledge and therefore learn some topics by heart. Interviews with teachers and students showed that even if transfer or comprehension questions are asked, many students cling to their expectations and only prepare by learning special themes by heart and afterwards they complain about unfair or incomprehensible questions.

Formative assessments should be promoted and further developed in their efficiency. At the same time, learning institutions must work towards the creation of high-quality exams, designed to build competencies.

In many cases formative assessments make more sense than summative assessments. It is well- known that the efficiency of summative examinations is very low for lasting competency development. Although e-assessments comprise much more than summative examinations, large numbers of students and the higher effort concomitant the formative assessments make it difficult to replace traditional forms of assessment.

A test center contributes considerably to the establishment of safe and efficient examination procedures.

To accommodate a high demand for e-examinations a transition to flexible examination periods is indispensable. This is often impeded because of rigid curricular structures.

Sustainability and high-quality assistance/supervision is only attainable through perpetuation and financial protection of the e-assessment service.

The maximum number of e-assessments per semester is not limited by the availability of assessment spaces but by the capacity of the supervision through the e-learning team.

Legal uncertainty and technical risks are overrated. This is visible on the example of the "Bremer Modell" where there have been 47.000 successful performed e-examinations and without any legal proceedings or assessment cancellation until today.

The saving of expenses is much higher in the field of open-ended forms of e-assessment than in the case of closed-ended forms of e-assessment. That means a relief through e-assessments especially for teachers of philosophy, history, philology, arts, social sciences, etc. It is to assume that the main reason for the saving of time and cost in open-ended e-assessments is that unreadable handwriting is eliminated through computerized examinations.

In order to calculate the expectable saving of expenses (time and money) for the tutors, in the summer of 2009 there have been comparative measurements during the phase of evaluation, which brought these unexpected results to light. The working hypothesis was that e-assessments above all develop their full potential in the field of standardized and thereby automated evaluable exams with closed-ended questions. The measurements came to the conclusion above (Hambuger eLmagazin, 2011).

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Within the framework of task 2.2 of the CRITON project a field research in the form of questionnaires has been conducted by Arbeit und Bildung in Germany in 2013. These questionnaires were conducted in order to validate the findings of the desk research and at the same time specialize them to our specific situation in Germany.

The questionnaires were developed by HOU (Greece) and targeted to students and teachers of all educational levels (primary and secondary education, higher and adult education, VET). The data was collected through the website Surveymonkey [https://www.surveymonkey.com/] and obtained in a form suitable for statistical processing, either through the statistical package SPSS or Microsoft Excel software. Arbeit und Bildung used the latter to provide the findings in point "4. Research Results".

According to the type of data, descriptive statistic conducted through frequency tables and graphs for all variables and comments were made on the results.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

This section summarizes the results of the empirical survey. The survey took place between May 21 2013 and September 9 2013 for the German participants.

The table below summarizes the number of collected questionnaires. 1 student from primary and secondary school answered the questionnaire, the number is very low due to the fact that only few schools in Germany use e-learning at all. 23 students in higher education and adult education as well as 16 students in VET answered the questionnaire. 6 tutors and teachers answered the survey to also view their opinion.

Table 1: Study population

Study population	Students in primary & secondary education	Students in higher education & adult education	Students in vocational education and training	Tutors and teachers	SUM
Germany	1	23	16	6	n=46

As the table above shows, analysis only makes sense for higher education and adult education and for VET. In the next section therefore the results of students in higher education (college, university) and adult education and students in vocational education and training are described.

4.1 STUDENTS IN HIGHER AND ADULT EDUCATION LEARNER

4.1.1 STUDY POPULATION

Students from higher education and adult education were mainly under 25 years old. Only 43,5 % were between the age of 25 and 39 years.

Table 2: Age of study population

Age of the students in the survey	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Under 25 years	13	56,5 %
25-29 years	6	26,1 %
30-39 years	4	17,4 %
40-49 years	0	0 %
50-59 years	0	0 %
60 years or older	0	0 %

The questionnaire included one question about self-reported socio-economic status. Only 8,7 % rated themselves as people with a high socio-economic status (status of their job, educational background, income) and 17,4 % reported low status. The most of them (73,9 %) rated themselves as people with a middle socio-economic status.

Table 3: Socio-economic status

Self-reported socioeconomic status of the students in the survey	Frequency	Percentage (%)
High status	2	8,7 %
Middle status	17	73,9 %
Low status	4	17,4 %

Gender was divided into 3/4 female and 1/4 male study participants.

Table 4: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
female	17	73,9 %
male	6	26,1 %

60,9 % of the students from higher education and adult education in the survey were in employment. 35,7 % of them work part-time, only 21,4 % work full-time and most of them (42,9 %) have seasonal or occasional jobs. This is important regarding the following results and their choice of e-learning in general.

Table 5: Work status

Current work status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	14	60,9 %
No	9	39,1 %
Type of work	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Part-time work	5	35,7 %
Occasional/seasonal work	6	42,9 %
Full-time work	3	21,4 %

4.1.2 USING E-PORTFOLIOS, LEARNING STYLES AND PREFERRED ANSWER FORMATS

The following section summarizes the results about the use of e-portfolios, learning styles and preferred answer formats in e-learning.

17,8% of the students from higher education and adult education use e-portfolio, but the majority (82,6%) does not use it. From those who use it, 75 % consider e-portfolio very useful.

Table 6: E-portfolio usage

E-portfolio use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	4	17,4 %
No	19	82,6 %
E-portfolio usefulness if in use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not much	1	25 %
A bit	0	0 %
Quite a lot	0	0 %
Very much	3	75 %

We came to know something about learning styles of the students with the next question. Only 1/4 answered that trying to understand the topic while doing e-learning exercises was their main goal. 3/4 concentrated on finishing the exercise.

Table 7: Main focus while e-learning

Concentrate on:	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Understanding the topic	6	26,1 %
Finishing the exercise	17	73,9 %

According to the study population, multiple choice questions are still the most dominant answer type (31,2%), followed by short answers (14,1%) and drag and drop menus (12,5%). 9,3% are familiar with sentence builders, 7,8 % with voice response, 6,3 % with tables and charts as well as word match during e-learning assessments. Less used formats are animated quizzes and games (4,7% each) and sliders (3,1 %).

Table 8: Dominant answer formats

Assessment Formats in use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Multiple Choice Question (MCQ)	20	1,2 %
Short answer question type	9	14,1 %
Sentence builders	6	9,3 %
Tables and charts exercises	4	6,3 %
Voice responses	5	7,8 %
Drag & Drop	8	12,5 %
Word match	4	6,3 %
Animated quizzes	3	4,7 %
Games	3	4,7 %
Sliders	2	3,1 %

Asked about their four preferred answer formats in e-learning assessment, students from higher education and adult education stated preferring multiple choice over games, short answers, drag and drop menus, and animated quizzes.

Table 9: Preferred answer formats

Assessment Formats in use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Multiple Choice Question (MCQ)	14	30,4 %
Short answer question type	5	10,9 %
Sentence builders	2	4,3 %
Tables and charts exercises	3	6,5 %
Voice responses	2	4,3 %
Drag & Drop	5	10,9 %
Word match	3	6,5 %
Animated quizzes	5	10,9 %
Games	6	13,1 %
Sliders	1	2,2 %

Students from higher education and adult education were also asked about the familiarity with peer assessment. 43,5% answered never using it, 39,1 % answered rarely using it, which means that assessment is in most cases still done by the teacher alone. Only 13% usually and 4,3 % always use peer assessment. When asked about the usefulness of peer assessment, only 17 students answered – for more than 3/4 it was not useful or a little bit useful. Less than 1/4 stated that it was quite helpful for them.

Table 10: Peer assessment

Peer assessment frequency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Never	10	43,5 %
Rarely	9	39,1 %
Usually	3	13,1 %
Always	1	4,3 %
Peer assessment usefulness	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not much	1	5,9 %
A bit	3	17,6 %
Quite a lot	6	35,3 %
Very much	7	41,2 %

17,4 % of students from higher education and adult education stated not paying attention to feedback at all, while 47,8 % mentioned paying attention to a little bit. 30,5 % answered that they pay quite a lot of attention to it and only 4,3 % state paying very much attention to it. 47,8 % students pay attention to feedback in the case of a good and bad mark, also 47,8 % pay attention to feedback in case of a bad mark. Only 4,3 % mention paying more attention to feedback in the case of a good mark. Feedback as a useful tool in the learning process was agreed on by most students (21 answers): 42,9 % say that feedback helps them very much or quite a lot 33,3 % say a little bit and at least 23,8 % say that feedback helps them not much.

Table 11: Feedback practices

Attention to feedback	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very much	1	4,3 %
Quite a lot	7	30,5 %
A bit	11	47,8 %
Not much	4	17,4
You read feedback more carefully in the case of:	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
A good mark	1	4,3 %
A bad mark	11	47,8 %
Both cases	11	47,8 %
In what extent does feedback help you understand and learn in e-learning environment?	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Not much	5	23,8 %
A bit	7	33,3 %
Quite a lot	8	38,1 %
Very much	1	4,8 %

We also wanted to know if feedback practices in e-learning lead to discussions with the teacher. Unfortunately it does not, 50 % say that is does not lead to a discussion, 45,5 % say only sometimes and only 4,5 %% say that it leads to a conversation with the teacher often.

Table 12: Feedback with the teacher

Feedback leads to discussion with teacher	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Never	11	50,0%
Rarely	10	45,5 %
Usually	1	4,5 %
Always	0	0 %

4.2 STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

4.1.4 STUDY POPULATION

Students in vocational education and training were mainly between the age of 40 and 59 years. Only 18,75 % were under 40 years old

Table 2: Age of study population

Age of the students in the survey	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Under 25 years	0	0 %
25-29 years	1	6,25 %
30-39 years	2	12,5 %
40-49 years	3	18,75 %
50-59 years	9	25,25 %
60 years or older	1	6,25 %

The questionnaire included one question about self-reported socio-economic status. Only 6,6 % rated themselves as people with a low socio-economic status (status of their job, educational background, income) and 13,3 % reported high status. The most of them (80 %) rated themselves as people with a middle socio-economic status.

Table 3: Socio-economic status

Self-reported socioeconomic status of the students in the survey	Frequency	Percentage (%)
High status	2	13,4 %
Middle status	12	80 %
Low status	1	6,6 %

Gender was balanced with 87,5 % female and 12,5 % male study participants.

Table 4: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
female	14	87,5 %
male	2	12,5 %

92,9 % of the students in vocational education and training in the survey were employed. 50 % of them work full-time, 42,9 % work part-time and only 7,1 % have seasonal or occasional jobs. This is important regarding the following results and their choice of e-learning in general.

Table 5: Work status

Current work status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	13	92,9 %
No	1	7,1 %
Type of work	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Part-time work	6	42,9 %
Occasional/seasonal work	1	7,1 %
Full-time work	7	50 %

4.1.5 USING E-PORTFOLIOS, LEARNING STYLES AND PREFERRED ANSWER FORMATS

The following section summarized results about the use of e-portfolios, learning styles and preferred answer formats in e-learning.

Only 10 % of the students in vocational education and training use e-portfolio, but the majority (90 %) does not use it. From those who use it 50 % find e-portfolio very useful.

Table 6: E-portfolio usage

E-portfolio use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	1	10 %
No	9	90 %
E-portfolio usefulness if in use	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Not much	1	50 %
A bit	0	0 %
Quite a lot	0	0 %
Very much	1	50 %

We came to know something about learning styles of the students with the next question. 44,4 % answered that trying to understand the topic while doing e-learning exercises was their main goal. 55,6 % concentrated on finishing the exercise.

Table 7: Main focus while e-learning

Concentrate on:	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Understanding the topic	4	44,4 %
Finishing the exercise	5	55,6 %

According to the study population multiple choice questions and short answer question type are still the most dominant answer type (19,5% each), followed by voice responses and drag and drop menus (12,2% each). 9,75% are familiar with sentence builders as well as with tables and charts. Less used formats are word math (7,2 %), games (4,8 %) sliders and hotspot (2,4 % each).

Table 8: Dominant answer formats

Assessment Formats in use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Multiple Choice Question (MCQ)	8	19,5 %
Short answer question type	8	19,5 %
Sentence builders	4	9,75 %
Tables and charts exercises	4	9,75 %
Voice responses	5	12,2 %
Drag & Drop	5	12,2 %
Word match	3	7,2 %
Games	2	4,8 %
Hotspot	1	2,4 %
Sliders	1	2,4 %
Animated quizzes	0	0 %

Asked about their four preferred answer formats in e-learning assessment, students in vocational education and training stated preferring multiple choice over short answers, sentence builders, word math and games.

Arbeit und Bildung e.V.

Lifelong Learning

Table 9: Preferred answer formats

Assessment Formats in use	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Multiple Choice Question (MCQ)	6	25 %
Short answer question type	4	16,7 %
Sentence builders	4	16,7 %
Tables and charts exercises	1	4,1 %
Voice responses	0	0 %
Drag & Drop	1	4,1 %
Word match	3	12,5 %
Games	3	12,5 %
Hotspot	2	8,4 %
Sliders	0	0 %
Animated quizzes	0	0 %

4.1.6 PEER ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK PRACTICES IN THE STUDY POPULATION

Students in vocational education and training were also asked about the familiarity with peer assessment. 10 % answered they are never using it, 70 % answered rarely using it, which means that assessment is in most cases still done by the teacher alone. Only 10 % use peer assessment usually and 10 % use peer assessment always. When asked about the usefulness of peer assessment, only 10 students answered – for 90 % it was not useful or a little bit useful. Only 10 % stated that it was quite helpful for them.

Table 10: Peer assessment

Peer assessment frequency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Never	1	10 %
Rarely	7	70 %
Usually	1	10 %
Always	1	10 %
Peer assessment usefulness	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Not much	3	30 %
A bit	6	60 %
Quite a lot	1	10 %
Very much	0	0 %

Only 10 % of students in vocational education and training stated paying none or a little bit attention to feedback at all, while 80 % mentioned paying attention to it quite a lot and 10 % answered that they pay very much attention to it. 70 % students pay attention to feedback in the case of a good and bad mark, 30 % pay attention to feedback in case of a bad mark and none of them mentioned paying more attention to feedback in the case of a good mark. Feedback as a useful tool in the learning process was agreed on by most students (10 answers): 80 % say that feedback helps them very much or quite a lot, 20 % say a little bit.

Table 11: Feedback practices

Attention to feedback	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very much	1	10 %
Quite a lot	8	80 %
A bit	1	10 %
Not much	0	0 %
You read feedback more carefully in the case of:	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
A good mark	0	0 %
A bad mark	3	30 %
Both cases	7	70 %
In what extent does feedback help you understand and learn in e-learning environment?	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Not much	0	0 %
A bit	2	20 %
Quite a lot	7	70 %
Very much	1	10 %

We also wanted to know if feedback practices in e-learning lead to discussions with the teacher. Unfortunately it does not, since 60 % say that it never or rarely lead to a discussion, 40 % say only sometimes.

Table 12: Feedback with the teacher

Feedback leads to discussion with teacher	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Never	1	10 %
Rarely	5	50 %
Usually	4	40 %
Always	0	0 %

5. FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In German the term 'e-assessment' refers to tests at the beginning of an education programme or as an aptitude test for employment. Only recently with the slow growth of e-learning in Germany 'e-assessment' is also used for the whole progress of e-learning (defining/creating tasks, learning, testing, evaluating). This use of the word 'e-assessment' is what we refer to in the CRITON project.

Besides the e-assessment throughout an e-learning course there can be specific assessments as intermediate examinations or final examinations. In this context this is often referred to as 'self-assessment'.

Final examinations in German schools or universities can only take place with the students being present, hence no distant learning. The main reason for this is mostly to prevent cheating.

Interestingly the tendencies for schools and universities in that matter go completely different ways: Whereas in schools (primary and secondary) – despite the introduction of centralised final examinations for primary and secondary education as well as the unified Abitur – the written form is mandatory and the rules for technical aids (which formulary , which calculator) are precisely defined.

In universities, however, electronically controlled examinations are becoming more and more prominent. This is mostly due to the fact of the rapidly growing number of students. The evaluation of electronically controlled examinations is a lot faster.

Many e-learning platforms offer self-assessment. These assessments can normally be applied any number of times and will not be evaluated by the tutor. They are based on the assumption that the learner wants to learn and so they are considered as a learning tool for the student and not as a controlling instrument for the teacher.

It is shown that for **students in higher education & adult education** multiple-choice-questions are by far the most common form of self-assessment, followed by short answer question types.

Essential for a possible prediction of the learning progress are questions about peer assessment and the importance of feedback.

We came to understand that the respondents rarely use peer assessment and do not measure high importance to it. However, the students do pay more attention to feedback by the tutor. This suggests that students rather expect helpful and correct advice from the tutors than from other students. This could correspond to the trend of 'bulimic education' where the students only learn to pass as test.

The evaluation of the questionnaires for **students in vocational education and training** show a similar but less pronounced trend. This could be linked to the considerably higher age and employment rate of these respondents. An interesting outcome for this group is the fact that the given feedback very rarely led to discussion with the teacher.

A comparison of the results shows that due to the predominant use of blended learning the question of predicting the learner's progress doesn't play a significant part. This will still be applied during the presence parts of the education programmes using common or old-fashioned methods.

The necessary changings of the didactics and methodology in teaching are still in its infancy. Mostly, e-learning is still considered merely as an addition to classroom presence. Transferring classroom-learning to e-learning and using the presence parts as 'tutorials' or in-depth discussions, has not been generally accepted yet.

Due to the new Professional Qualifications Assessment Act in Germany, a law that regulates the recognition of foreign professional qualifications, a large upswing is expected for e-learning in the area of vocational education and training. A strong increase of very individualized partial qualifications is expected that divides into professions and countries of origin. Consequently it seems very unlikely to serve this high demand solely by learners being present in a classroom.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Publication	Author(s)	Title
Beiträge zur Lehrerbildung 25 (2007)	Schiefner, M.	E-Assessment in der Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung: What`s new with the "E"
E-Learning: Eine Zwischenbilanz (2009)	Kerres, M. et al.	E-Learning-Umgebungen in der Hochschule: Lehrplattformen und persönliche Lernumgebungen
e-teaching.org	e-teaching.org	Prüfungsformen
Hamburger eLmagazin – eAssessment auf dem Prüfstand (#7 – 12/11)	Bücking, Jens	Lesson Learned - Erfahrungen aus 7 Jahren eAssessment
Hamburger eLmagazin – eAssessment auf dem Prüfstand (#7 – 12/11)	Schmees, Markus	E-Assessments an den Hochschulen
Hamburger eLmagazin – eAssessment auf dem Prüfstand (#7 – 12/11)	Schneider, Stefan	Prüfen mit dem USB-Stick
Hamburger eLmagazin – eAssessment auf dem Prüfstand (#7 – 12/11)	Schulz, A. and Apostolopoulos, N.	eExaminations Put To Test - Potenziale computergestützter Prüfungen