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OVERVIEW

1. Project management of the AHELO Feasibility Study involves carefully integrated work that is designed to maximise efficiency and ensure successful project outcomes. Design of the work has been underway since 2008. Work on the project progressed between December 2009 and March 2010, and then from July 2010 after a contract was signed.

2. This Module E Progress Report provides an update of work undertaken between September 2010 and February 2011 in Module E of the AHELO Feasibility Study. This document provides background information that will be elaborated on with a verbal report at the sixth AHELO GNE meeting being held in Paris on March 28 and 29, 2011.

INTERNATIONAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT

3. ACER will be responsible for the oversight and coordination of Module E and therefore the whole AHELO Feasibility Study. (Contract M09/57)

Management context

4. The international operating context for the AHELO Feasibility Study has evolved considerably since the study was first conceptualised in 2007, and continues to expand apace. A brief summary is presented here to contextualise this Module E Progress Report. As this summary shows, even at this formative stage a considerable presence, infrastructure and momentum has been established for AHELO.

5. Figure 1 summarises the various stakeholders involved in the AHELO Feasibility Study. The central management database includes around 300 records for individuals in governance, management and stakeholder/expert advisory roles. As well, it could be expected that up to 10,000 leaders, faculty and students take part in the feasibility work alone. Many more thousands are closely following the study in the media (about two stories per week), through scholarly and policy debates, and through other channels.
6. Figure 2 reports the distribution of AHELO Modules A, B, C, D and E across participating countries as at 1 March 2011. This highlights the growth and design of the study, and the value of core management (Module E) and context data (Module D) for optimising the rigor and efficiency of the AHELO Feasibility Study.
Figure 2: Distribution of Modules A to E across participating countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total countries 16 16 9 7 7

7. Drawing from feedback received in late 2010, Figure 3 shows that the AHELO assessment instruments are being prepared and deployed in around 13 different languages (plus several variants of English, Arabic and Spanish).

Figure 3: AHELO testing languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Required second</th>
<th>Optional second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Flemish</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. These three diagrams highlight the international and cultural breadth of the AHELO Feasibility Study, which continues to unfold. This diversity calls for nimble and consistent approaches to management that maximise efficiencies while ensuring technical rigor and maintaining policy relevance.

**General coordination**

9. The ACER-led consortium has made significant progress:

- working with OECD, partners and experts to establish resources, infrastructure and operational procedures for AHELO;
- establishing technical plans and foundations for the project;
- setting foundations for framework and instrument development;
- designing and developing implementation systems; and
- communicating with a wide and growing range of stakeholders.

10. Figure 4 provides an overview of Module E schedule and progress. In this diagram ‘C’ stands for ‘Completed’. Work is on track. It is important to note that the schedule has been maintained during an increase in the scope of country participation, instrumentation and the maintenance of a robust technical approach.

![Figure 4: Module E schedule and progress](image)

11. As part of overall study management, the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) has:
• provided operational management and technical oversight of the project;
• been in frequent (often daily) communication with OECD to discuss international progress;
• advised OECD about operational work underway in countries;
• monitored and assured project financial accounts, including contractual and funding arrangements with ACER’s Consortium partners;
• negotiated Module D work plans, schedules, budgets and payment schedules with OECD, and prepared a contract;
• prepared detailed work plans for pre-implementation system and capacity development that were tabled at the fifth GNE meeting in October 2010;
• prepared two contract amendments for Module E to reflect resumption of Module D and the addition of new countries;
• prepared an annual budget update;
• prepared indicative cost estimates and scenarios for Phase 2 (implementation); and
• produced detailed operational plans for 2011-12 project management.

12. Since December 2010 ACER has worked with all organisations involved in study management to scope, define and cost scenarios for the completion of the AHELO Feasibility Study. Detailed papers and work plans have been prepared to assist OECD with planning and fundraising.

13. At the same time, ACER has maintained regular communications with Consortium partners – cApStAn, CHEPS, ETS, CPR, NIER, SONET, and the University of Florence – as well as with Expert Groups (Economics, Engineering and the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)), and with the Council for Aid to Education (CAE).

14. ACER’s coordination with other experts and stakeholders involved in technical or operational facets of the international work has included:
• participating in meetings of the Engineering Expert Group (Singapore) and Economics Expert Group (Paris) in October 2010;
• confirming membership and Terms of Reference for AHELO TAG;
• convening teleconferences with the TAG in September 2010 and December 2010;
• interviewing Chairs of Economics Expert Group, Engineering Expert Group and TAG, and then drafting the OECD AHELO Newsletter for OECD’s distribution to all on AHELO mailing list;
• high-level meetings with senior officials / ministers in India and Saudi Arabia to facilitate their participation as observers in the study;
• presenting the Quarterly Progress Report (for previous quarter) to the fifth AHELO GNE meeting in October 2010 in Paris;
• preparing for and participating in a 18 March 2011 AHELO fundraising meeting in Washington DC;
• organising a face-to-face meeting of the AHELO NPMs in Paris on 29 and 30 March 2011;
• working with OECD Secretariat to organise a face-to-face meeting of the Stakeholders Consultative Group (SCG) in Paris on 31 March 2011; and
organising a face-to-face meeting of the AHELO TAG to take place in Tokyo on 5, 6 and 7 April 2011 (a draft agenda is included as an Annex to this Module E Progress Report).

15. In order to facilitate global communications and information sharing with diverse and growing individuals and groups ACER has:
   - provided daily management of the ahelo@acer.edu.au email account, responding to all queries within 24 hours;
   - maintained and updated detailed contact lists of all (around 300) stakeholders associated with the AHELO Feasibility Study;
   - hosted, maintained and expanded an efficient, transparent and secure centralised online communication wiki, the AHELO Exchange; and
   - coordinated travel for members of the Engineering Expert Group and TAG.

AHELO Assessment Design and Analysis Plan

16. All organizations in the Module E team will be involved in developing and delivering an integrated assessment design and an analysis plan. (Contract M09/57)

17. After consultation between all members of the ACER Consortium and CAE, and feedback from the OECD, ACER delivered final versions of the AHELO Analysis Plan and AHELO Assessment Design to the OECD in September 2010.

SUPPORTING COUNTRIES

General overview

18. Figure 2 provides an overview of country participation in the AHELO Feasibility Study as at 1 March 2011. All 16 countries are taking part in the contextual assessment, nine in the Generic Skills, and 14 in the Economics/Engineering strands.

19. Communications with, and support for, countries has been a frequent and vital element of managing the AHELO Feasibility Study, which has included:
   - hosting teleconferences with NPMs from all countries in September 2010;
   - convening a two-day face-to-face meeting of NPMs in October 2010;
   - hosting teleconferences with NPMs from all countries in December 2010;
   - welcoming the Slovak Republic to the AHELO Feasibility Study, participating in all strands;
   - welcoming Colombia to the AHELO Feasibility Study, participating in the Generic and Engineering strands;
   - drafting an NPM Manual consisting of more than 20 documents including, for instance: ‘Focus group guidelines’, ‘Data access and reporting’, ‘Approach and resources’, ‘Developing national
websites’, ‘Selecting and engaging institutions’, ‘Example letters of invitation’ and ‘Research Ethics’;

- posting the draft NPM Manual on AHELO Exchange for feedback from NPMs, the OECD and ACER Consortium partners;
- revising the NPM Manual in the light of comments by NPMs, the OECD and ACER Consortium partners;
- preparing a spreadsheet and online survey form for NPMs to use in recording focus group data;
- preparing instructions for using the spreadsheet and online survey form for NPMs, and incorporating these instructions into the focus group guidelines in the NPM manual;
- conducting training in qualitative testing with NPMs (by teleconference) in February 2011; and
- drafting both short and long brochures for the Economics Assessment and for the Engineering Assessment.

**Support for national management**

20. The pre-implementation phase of the AHELO Feasibility Study (instrument design and validation) has proceeded on a very intensive basis since October 2010 and is scheduled to finish in June 2011. An overview of general national management work is provided here.

21. Figure 5 provides a general/indicative mapping of the stakeholders in each participating country. A series of teleconference and face-to-face meetings have helped countries identify, engage and coordinate their engagement with these stakeholders.
22. In many instances ACER has worked with ministries from participating countries to identify AHELO National Project Managers (NPM) and provide general information regarding in-country resources and approaches required to support the development and implementation of the study. Countries participating in more than one strand have typically appointed a dedicated NPM for each strand, and communications have been maintained with each NPM.

23. In early 2011 NPMs took the time to complete and return a 2010 diary to provide information on the national positioning and flow of the study. These descriptions provided a highly useful complement to routine communications, indicating that:

- Most countries (particularly where national centres/managers had been appointed for some months) have invested in setting up new national infrastructure for AHELO.
- Most countries have nominated/contracted a NPM, established an office, attended international conference calls and meetings, and sourced people to undertake translation, adaptation and verification.
- Most countries had coordinated a number (often significant) of general meetings with institutions and other stakeholders. These included policy-level discussions along with scholarly publications and consultations.
Understandably given the novel nature of the study, NPMs have encountered diverse and unexpected challenges such as securing funding, identifying institutions, translating higher-order concepts, and aligning the work with other national initiatives. Resolution of these has required ongoing communication and discussion to find national solutions that accord with the international context.

NPMs have devoted considerable energy in advising institutions in the study and engaging their participation, liaison with national ministries, and translating project materials.

24. Given the significant differences in wages and costs of living between the countries participating in the AHELO Feasibility Study, it is not possible to give an estimate of the costs involved in each individual country's participation in the pre-implementation phase of the study. General advice was provided and discussed in October 2010 (Figure 6) to help estimate the funding required to conduct national activities associated with the pre-implementation of the AHELO Feasibility Study.

**Figure 6: Indicative human and financial resource requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC roles</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Expert(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Coders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. An indicative schedule showing the broad timeline for the in-country conduct of Phase 1 of the AHELO Feasibility Study is in Figure 7. Working within the constraints of the project it has been necessary to modify and adapt the schedule in different national and even institutional contexts. Such variations are discussed with country representatives to meet national needs and also enable integrated and efficient coordination and overall delivery of the international work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 7: Pre-implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select national centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select national project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish national processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate institutional sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominate institutional coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review international approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review national contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review emerging contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare national reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review feasibility reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review preliminary instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review source version and guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation and translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic quality control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train institutional coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution/faculty workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Where and as necessary, ACER prepares documents for the NPM Manual (Figure 8 shows the first 20 of 24 documents in the NPM Manual) to ensure consistency, transparency, validity and efficiency. An example is NPM Manual document number 12, which provides an overview of strategies and practices for selecting and engaging higher education institutions in the AHELO Feasibility Study.
27. As noted, several resources were developed to assist NPMs design, implement and record qualitative and quantitative data from the institutional focus groups. Teleconference meetings with Module B and C countries in mid February have helped to introduce and familiarise NPMs with these materials, to get an update on national preparations and contexts, and to plan for subsequent steps in national management of the study.

28. Capstan will be in charge of linguistic quality control for the AHELO Feasibility Study. This will involve translation, adaptation and verification processes designed to maintain cross-national comparability of assessment materials (Modules B and C). (Contract M09/57)
Translation and adaptation guidelines

29. With a view to compiling the AHELO Translation and Adaptation Guidelines, cApStAn staff:

- isolated salient points from guidelines that worked well in other surveys and that apply to AHELO material and context;
- selected examples from past experience that illustrate the points the guidelines make;
- drafted a memo about characteristics that are specific to AHELO;
- summarised operational and procedural aspects that AHELO NPMs need to be aware of; and
- compiled this into one document, then edited this document by cutting out redundant or less useful information, until the format was deemed appropriate and the document was found fit for purpose by an internal review committee.

30. The AHELO Translation Guidelines are based on the OECD PISA document *Translation and Adaptation Guidelines for PISA 2012* (NPM(1010)4e_ENG.doc), which relied upon existing literature on international test adaptation (Hambleton, 1994; Hambleton and Patsula, 1998 and 1999; Jeanrie and Bertrand, 1999, Hambleton, 2002). Similar guidelines developed for IEA studies were also consulted (O’Connor and Malak, 2000; Kelly and Malak, 2001 – see AHELO Assessment Design for references), and the practical guidelines draw on experience acquired through the translation verification of OECD/PISA, IEA/TIMSS, IEA/PIRLS, IEA/ICCS, IEA/TEDS-M, OECD/TALIS, UNESCO/LAMP, UNESCO/WEI, ESS, SHARE and OEC/PIAAC materials.

31. The AHELO Translation Guidelines were posted on the AHELO Exchange to assist countries with their translation, adaptation and verification activities. They were made available to NPMs on 25 January 2011, two weeks before the WebEx training sessions on translation and adaptation of AHELO instruments.

Translation, Adaptation and Verification (ATAV) workbooks

32. cApStAn has worked closely with Module B and Module C teams to prepare AHELO Translation, Adaptation and Verification (ATAV) monitoring workbooks for both the AHELO Economics Assessment and the AHELO Engineering Assessment. cApStAn first carefully read the (almost) final version of the Module B and C assessment instruments, taking account of the following parameters:

- **Translatability**: consists in identifying, from the linguistic perspective, terms or expressions in the English source version that may give rise to a translation, adaptation or cultural issue further down the line; and to examine whether the issue can best be solved by (i) modifying the source version or (ii) by drafting a specific guideline for that item;

- **Legibility**: in the case of Engineering and Economics items for undergraduates, traditional legibility indices are of limited use. cApStAn organised an internal mock cognitive laboratory: two members of cApStAn staff – one with advanced knowledge of Engineering, one who was trained as a business engineer – tried to perform all the tasks and took notes e.g. on the prompts that led them to use a given strategy to answer a question or the reason why the key (or certain distracters) was/were deemed attractive. Hesitation when facing potential ambiguities was also recorded;

- **Empirical input**: there are a number of features in test materials that are known to have a potential impact on psychometric characteristics e.g. proportional length of key and distracters in multiple choice items, lexical or syntactic patterns in response options in multiple choice items, use of passive voice, double negation in sentences, clarity of reference chains, literal matches between
stimuli and items. A stock list of occurrences of such features in the AHELO assessment instruments was drawn up and important issues were earmarked for inclusion in the ATAV; and

- **Transposition**: a selection of results from this multi-faceted scrutiny was sent to test developers for feedback. Then the item-per-item guidelines were entered in the ATAV monitoring workbooks.

33. The ATAV workbooks were posted on the AHELO Exchange to assist countries with their translation, adaptation and verification activities. These were made available to NPMs on 25 January 2011, two weeks before the WebEx training sessions on translation and adaptation of AHELO instruments.

**WebEx training**

34. WebEx technology was used to virtually train NPMs and trainers of translators to apply AHELO translation and adaptation guidelines in their countries, and to use the ATAV to document their adaptations as the work progresses.

35. There were two identical training sessions at different times of the day (to accommodate all time zones). The presentations included:

- an introduction with a refresher on the overall Translation-Adaptation-Verification process, requisites for translators and reconciler, and tips on how to organize a Translator Training Session; and

- a set of slides with translation tips and traps, and examples from the AHELO materials: this presentation can be used (with minimal customization) to replicate a training session.

36. The training sessions ended with examples of hands-on exercises and lively rounds of questions and answers. The entire sessions were recorded, and the link enabling participants to view the session again at leisure was sent to attendees immediately after the session.

37. A ‘translation training kit’ was also made available right after the session for distribution in advance of or during a training session for translators:

- Translation and Adaptation Guidelines;
- Economics ATAV;
- Engineering ATAV;
- A Word file for carrying out a translation exercise for Module B – Economics;
- A Word file for carrying out a translation exercise for Module C – Engineering; and
- Confidentiality agreement form.

**Verification**

38. Verification, the next step in the translation process, will take place in March/April 2011. Once double translation and reconciliation have been completed by participating countries, NPMs will send the reconciled version of the instrument to cApStAn.

39. Translation verification will involve each translation being checked by a verifier (linguist with expert knowledge in linguistic quality control of surveys and data collection instruments) and a domain expert (lecturer in Economics or Engineering). Verification feedback will be documented in the ATAV.
workbook, and corrections/suggestions will be entered in track changes in the national versions of the items.

40. NPMs will then decide whether to accept or reject or further modify the corrections and suggestions from the verification. Once NPMs have processed corrections and suggestions from the verifiers, they will upload the final versions of the items and the updated ATAV for a final check (in PDF format). This involves checking whether crucial corrections are correctly implemented and/or checking the rationale for rejected corrections and verifying late edits made by the country.

DATA PRODUCTS AND WRITTEN REPORTS

41. To support data analysis and assist with effective international dissemination of the results from the AHELO feasibility study, the partners involved in Module E will produce a draft AHELO Feasibility Study Report. (Contract M09/57)

42. ACER has drafted a preliminary AHELO Feasibility Report (currently around 70 pages) for discussion with the AHELO TAG in April 2011. ACER has also drafted a report on the emerging assessment of feasibility to circulate to the GNE, NPMs and the TAG for March/April 2011 meetings [EDU/IMHE/AHELO/GNE(2011)8].

43. As well, a series of documents and presentations were prepared for discussion of AHELO in several participating countries, including at a fundraising meeting on 18 March 2011 in Washington DC.

DELIVERABLES

44. Since September 2010 ACER and Consortium partners have delivered the:

- AHELO Assessment Design, including the identification of the best methods/analyses to assess the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural validity of the results of the various instruments;
- AHELO Analysis Plan, including specification of the research questions posed by the various dimensions of the AHELO Feasibility Study, proposed analyses to address them and the establishment of quantifiable criteria to assess success in these various dimensions;
- Translation/adaptation guidelines for NPMs;
- Two quarterly reports on progress against the agreed project timetable; and
- an annual budgetary update.
ANNEX – TAG DRAFT MEETING AGENDA

MEETING DETAILS

Location: National Institute for Educational Policy Research, Japan  
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8951

Time: 09:00 Tuesday 5 April to 12:30 Thursday 7 April

Contacts: Satoko Fukahori (+81-3-6733-6833)  
Hamish Coates (+61 423 475 605)

ATTENDANCE

Membership: Peter Ewell, Vaneeta D’Andrea, Paul Holland, Motohisa Kaneko, Lynn Meek, Keith Rust,  
Frans van Vught, Robert Wagenaar

Attendees: Roger Benjamin, Hamish Coates, Daniel Edwards, Satoko Fukahori, Diane Lalancette, Alex  
McCormick, Sarah Richardson, Don Westerheijden

AGENDA

Tuesday 5 April, 09:00 to 16:30, and dinner

1. Welcome and introductions (9:00-9:30)
2. Meeting attendance and apologies (9:00-9:30)
3. Confirmation of agenda (9:00-9:30)
4. Module E, A, B, C and D progress briefing (9:30-10:00)
5. Module D (10:00-11:00)
6.  Morning tea (11:00-11:30)
7.  Module D (11:30-13:00)
8.  Lunch (13:00-14:00)
9.  Module D (14:00-15:00)
10. Afternoon tea (15:00-15:30)
11. OECD update (15:30-16:30) (Karine Tremblay/Richard Yelland by phone)

Please join us for dinner at 19:00 at Gonpachi at Nishi Azabu
(www.gonpachi.jp/en/nishi_azabu/home/location)

Wednesday 6 April, 09:00 to 16:30

12. Day two welcome, day one recap (9:00-9:30)
13. Module A, B, C, D and E progress report (9:30-11:00) (Roger Benjamin; Tom van Essen by phone)
14. Morning tea (11:00 to 11:30)
15. Feasibility evaluation (11:30 to 13:00)
16. Lunch (13:00 to 14:00)
17. Phase 2 planning (14:00 to 15:00)
18. Afternoon tea (15:00-15:30)
19. Phase 2 planning (15:30-16:30)

Thursday 7 April, 09:00 to 12:30

20. Day three welcome, day two recap (9:30-10:00)
21. Technical review of project focus and scope (10:00-11:00)
22. Morning tea (11:00-11:30)
23. Next steps (11:30-12:30)
24. Any other business (11:30-12:30)
25. Future meetings (11:30-12:30)
26. Lunch (12:30-1:30)

ATTACHMENTS

1. AHELO Technical Advisory Group Biographies
2. AHELO Technical Advisory Group Terms of Reference
3. Draft Contextual Dimension Framework
4. Progress reports, Modules A, B, C, D, E
5. Analysis Plan
6. Assessment Design
7. AHELO Design and Plans
8. Draft Feasibility Report
9. Economics Assessment Frameworks
10. Engineering Assessment Frameworks

Please treat all materials as confidential

Please print and bring along all materials