

Academic staff rubric to evaluate design quality of subject assessment methods

Criteria	Good practice	Developing
<p>Assessment tasks and criteria are aligned with learning outcomes, and across campuses, modes and/or study periods, of high cognitive order, and weighted appropriately</p> <p>PRINCIPLE: VALIDITY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment tasks and criteria evidence achievement of knowledge, skills and dispositions targeted in subject learning outcomes (and relevant course learning outcomes) Assessment tasks are of high cognitive order, as aligned with the Australian Qualifications Framework Assessment task weightings reflect relative importance of learning outcomes and student workload expectations Assessment task types and weightings are aligned across campuses, modes and/or study periods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment tasks are not conducive to assessing subject learning outcomes (and relevant course learning outcomes) or tasks and criteria are somewhat aligned with learning outcomes, however, there are knowledge, skills and/or dispositions that are not assessed and/or there is unnecessary duplication Assessment tasks are of low cognitive order, lacking alignment with the Australian Qualifications framework Assessment task weightings do not reflect student workload expectations or relative importance of learning outcomes (i.e. demonstration of lower order outcomes weighted too highly or higher order applications afforded inadequate weighting) Assessment task types and weightings do not align across campuses, modes and/or study periods
<p>Assessment tasks are authentic (see JCU assessment list), aligned with core learning activities and, where appropriate, stimulate a wide range of active responses</p> <p>PRINCIPLES: AUTHENTICITY, INCLUSIVITY</p>	<p>Assessment tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are authentic (i.e. similar to the real work done in professional or further learning/research contexts) and motivating Are integrally and explicitly aligned with core learning activities Stimulate a wide range of active responses where appropriate (i.e. allowing students to make connections with their own experiences, exercise choice, work collaboratively and/or utilise diverse technologies) 	<p>Assessment tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack relevance to the real work done in professional or further learning/research contexts Are somewhat aligned or misaligned with core learning activities (i.e. bolted on afterwards) Allow students limited or no opportunity to make connections with their own experiences, exercise choice, work collaboratively and/or utilise diverse technologies
<p>Assessment tasks take student and marker workload into consideration, are distributed across the study period, and allow opportunities for timely and consequential feedback</p> <p>PRINCIPLES: INCLUSIVITY, TRANSPARENCY</p>	<p>Assessments tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take student and marker workload into consideration Are distributed across the study period Fulfil formative/<i>assessment for learning</i> purposes (in addition to summative purposes), and build on each other, where appropriate, to maximise opportunity for students to receive timely and consequential feedback Incorporate self, peer and/or industry/client assessment, where appropriate 	<p>Assessment tasks do not allow opportunities for timely and consequential feedback, given that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Largely located at the end of the study period, fulfilling summative/<i>assessment of learning</i> purposes Excessive in workload expectations Highly disparate in nature Reliant entirely on marker feedback albeit conducive to incorporating elements of self, peer and/or industry/client assessment
<p>Assessment task specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources are available, clearly articulated and aligned</p> <p>PRINCIPLES: TRANSPARENCY, RELIABILITY</p>	<p>Assessment task descriptions/specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources (e.g. annotated exemplars) are available, clearly articulated and aligned, supporting student understanding and marker judgement of assessment</p>	<p>Assessment task descriptions/specifications and criteria lack alignment; standards are not articulated; and there are no or limited supporting resources, resulting in a lack of clarity for students and impacting marker reliability</p>

Academic staff rubric to evaluate design quality of subject assessment methods

Criterion 1. Assessment tasks and criteria are aligned with learning outcomes, and across campuses, modes and/or study periods, of high cognitive order, and weighted appropriately

Higher Education Standards 1.4.3. Methods of assessment are consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed (and) are capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved.

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy

4.1.1. Courses will be designed with clear demonstrable learning outcomes including those which are of high cognitive order as described in the Australian Qualifications Framework.

4.4. Where a subject is offered across different campuses and/or modes and/or teaching periods within the one calendar year, the learning outcomes will be the same, and other than in exceptional circumstances, there will be no variation in assessment type or weighting.

Criterion 2. Assessment tasks are authentic (see [JCU assessment list](#)), aligned with core learning activities and, where appropriate, stimulate a wide range of active responses

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy

6.4. Within each subject, a range of assessment tasks will be designed to enable, motivate and challenge students to extend their learning in ways that demonstrate a higher order engagement with the discipline.

4.2. All teaching and learning activities, resources, assessment and criteria for grading, and learning outcomes (including graduate attributes) will be aligned so that courses and subjects are explicitly coherent.

5.3.1. Assessment is designed to encourage students to demonstrate their own learning, and to make connections with their own experiences.

Criterion 3. Assessment tasks take student and marker workload into consideration, are distributed across the study period, and allow opportunities for timely and consequential feedback

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy

5.4.1. A 3-credit point subject will have the number of assessment items appropriate to the year level and to the quantity and quality of learning outcomes for the subject, and that takes into consideration the 130 hour student workload expectations. In most cases, this will be a maximum of four assessment items.

5.4.2. Assessment must be varied, distributed and weighted across the duration of the study period in order to create manageable workloads for staff and students and to enable timely feedback for students.

8.7.1. Staff will be responsible for provision of early feedback on learning activities to allow students an opportunity to withdraw without academic penalty and to improve performance before further assessment.

8.7.5. Staff will be responsible for considering a variety of feedback methods, e.g. individual and generic/group; face-to-face; written, electronic; peer, self, external, group review.

Criterion 4. Assessment task specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources are available, clearly articulated and aligned

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy

4.2. All teaching and learning activities, resources, assessment and criteria for grading, and learning outcomes (including graduate attributes) will be aligned so that courses and subjects are explicitly coherent.

5.2. For all assessment students must be given the grade that their individual work deserves, based on a clear set of criteria or scales.