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1. User Presentations

SURFnet, Jenny de Werk
- Active in 6 areas, incl. Testing & Test-driven learning
- Project to experiment with QTI import/export based on limited functionality
- QTI is too complex and broad
  - Requires deep technical understanding
  - Only need a subset of QTI
- Findings: deep knowledge required, subset needs to be defined (MM: levels1), vendors tend to solve by adapting software

DEPP, Thierry Rocher
- Student monitoring
- Need to share items with other institutions and researchers
- Challenges: practical implementation, authoring tool transformation, ensuring trends
- PCI with Geogebra integration

Lux MEN, Amina Kafai
- Student monitoring
  - Student / Class / School / System level
- National standards for each learning cycle
- Collaborating with France and Canada on math curriculum
- Challenge: lack of knowledge of QTI standards

CETIS, Wilbert Kraan
- Active in 4 areas: NW & Technology, R&D, Best practices
- Did lots of interop. testing for QTI 1.x
  - \( \rightarrow \) can we revive that for QTI 2.2?
- Jisc sponsored QTIworks
- Make a better SaaS assessment platform
  - or make QTI easier to integrate; proposed aQTI approach
- Make QTI easier to integrate into VLEs

Cambridge Assessment, Matt Richards
- Non-profit, 350m GBP revenue, 2,200 employees
- Using QTI for both on-screen and paper-based tests
- Key issue: maturity of adoption (many vendors have heard of QTI, some support some of it)
- Are thinking of multi-level interop., like the EBA model

Noordhoff Health, Jeroen Habets
- 74 staff, Houten and Berlin
- 120 e-learning courses for health care
- 12K items
- Developments: need to be flexible, easy to integrate; did LTI rollouts, QTI an option too?

ThiemeMeulenhoff, Patricia Duindam
- Dutch learning design company, educational publisher for K12, HE, Vocational
- QTI issues: need user-friendliness for both content and application developers
- Need low learning curve
- Otherwise dev. cost is high
- Did extensive survey of available QTI authoring systems
• Chose to not use QTI, but still considering it internally
• Will re-evaluate QTI for future work
  o Decrease complexity, learning curve
  o Facilitate extension mechanism (MM: PCI?)

Xstructuring, Birgit Strackenbrock
• Using different tools: Onyx, Wintoets, Questionmark
• Complex structure, difficult to customize/extend, mapping/conversion difficult
• PCI possible but too complex to develop (Javascript requirement)
• Wishes: easy to use and specialize/customize (a la DITA)

CvTE, Nynke de Boer
• QTI didn’t cover all their requirements
  o Not pixel perfect
• Improve ease of use, interoperability
• Ultimate goal: get rid of DEP (as it would be covered natively by the specification)

Cito, Mark Molenaar
• Cito: National Center for Educational Measurement
• Almost 50 years, 600 employees; a bit less heritage, already funky building ;-) 
• Work closely with and under responsibility of CvTE
• Worked with IMS standard from 2002, truly contributing since 2010
• Interest in multiple standards: QTI, LTI, Caliper and integration of these
Not one-system-to-rule them all; we need standards to truly make best-of-breed solutions possible for the end-users

Paragin, Remko Nolte
• develop RemindoTest assessment system
  o formative, summative, certifications
  o QTI 2.1 based
• Lack of interop. between authoring tools
• Multiple interpretations
• Styling is difficult
• QTI is HARD, multiple interpretations, no services, using metadata a problem (e.g. for adaptive testing), exchanging results not widely adopted

Trifork, Thomas Zeeman
• Proposed QTI improvements:
  o integration with external algorithms (for adaptive testing)
  o scaled scoring
  o separation of item and test result
  o improved support for responsive design

Uni Amsterdam, Nils Siemens
• summative and formative
• integration with LMS
• Personal view on QTI: teachers have their own (course-specific) context (e.g. Math), fit QTI to use with these context

Itslearning, Frøydis Hamre
• K12 schools in Norway now have PC or tablet for each student
• Challenges:
  o customers still on older versions: QTI 1.2, hard to convert/migrate
  o not enough certified / compliant products on IMS website
  o too much XML → performance impact
  o not easily accessible for new users, non-techies
• Number of minimal interaction types to claim compliance unclear (MM: levels!)
ICE, Kristel Schaap
- Content specialists on NT2/DCET, created a system TOA (2009); used in secondary/vocational education
- Working on new system with Sanoma Learning
- No hands-on experience with QTI, will need to adopt it because of NT2

Kennisnet, Jeroen Hamers
- Public organization for Education & ICT
- Provide NL national ICT infrastructure
- Use meaningful metadata (actionable URI’s of curriculum data), not just text

OUP – Oxford University Press, Jasper Smith
- Non-profit, similar mission to Cambridge Assessments
- Lots of silo’d data, propr. systems; need standards to bring silos together
- QTI is confusing, insufficient high-level documentation, steep learning curve; too complex & not complex enough

Teelen, Andries Bosma
- Offering Word to QTI module
- QTI technical documentation is very good
- Problems
  - Scoring
  - Complex interactions difficult to move between systems
- Require
  - Rule or matrix-based question selection in random assessments
  - Question fidelity (similar look), easy integration of utilities/tools (e.g. calculator)
  - Real workflow using existing open standards…

BPS, Sven Morgner
- Cooperation of 10 universities in Saxony
- Mission is to enable interop. and sustainability in education
- Would like to have more sample content to test interop. between products
- More default templates and guidelines for common use cases
- Support extensions (e.g. custom operators), use of variables, etc.

EPSO, Markus Nussbaum
- Constrained by existing propr. system (Prometric, not QTI compliant)
- Want to build their own system (item bank) to host content from different vendors; still deliver with the Prometric system

Readspeaker, Rick Buchter
- Text to speech software
- User of LTI from IMS for integration of speech synthesis
- Started in Sweden, now 60 offices around the world
- Deliver text-to-speech for CBR
2. User Presentation Summary by Mark Molenaar, Cito

- Learning curve of QTI is high; general lack of knowledge
- Not extensive/extensible enough
  - GeoGebra, tools like calculators, speech synthesis, custom types
  - Custom operators
  - Styling
- Should be easier to use, integrate & implement
- Interoperability troublesome; no common ground
- Documentation limited & too technical
  - More samples, use cases, reference content and implementations
  - Too complex and not complex enough
- No general services, only the message
- Using metadata is a problem, e.g. for adaptive testing
  - Needs to be more meaningful & actionable
- We want adaptive testing (whatever that is…)
  - Algorithms, branching, rule-based selection
- Able to fit the context of teachers, different courses
- Conversion is a nightmare, don’t start a new one…