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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The focus of the Learning and Teaching Investment Fund (LTIF) project was to develop a best practice model for graded assessment based on the RMIT grading policy in a competency-based framework in three programs within the School of Fashion and Textiles. The LTIF project sought to address the emerging needs of industry and employers by providing a clear pathway for students to articulate into degree programs. In addressing the teaching and learning needs of key industry stakeholders, the LTIF project is linked to RMIT 2010 Strategic Plan for commitment of lifelong learning experiences and through achievement of quality performance outcomes through effective teaching and learning.

The approach to the LTIF project was a collaborative and participatory with the research design based on action research and learning undertaken by the three project team members who worked together in planning the steps, milestones, and key deliverables to achieve the project outcomes. Action evolved identifying various grading practices under the AQTF within specific courses in the three programs and making appropriate changes to existing practices through staff developmental activities with consultation with appropriate key personnel and stakeholders from ODT, Strategic Learning and Development. Quantitative research methods were used to gain valuable insights from teachers and students in the three programs on the application of the graded assessment model. Results from the statistical analyses confirmed positive responses from students for the use of graded assessments as a feedback tool for before or after assessments. More importantly, the majority of the students preferred verbal feedback as the most useful for performance achievement. It was evident from the findings professional development is required for all staff members in the graded assessment practices and procedures; in particular competency based training and graded competencies, and the development of rubrics to support the assessments.

The four suggested RMIT University’s Graded Assessment Models did not reflect the diverse learning and assessment needs of AQTF Levels 4-6 and requirements for graded assessment at Diploma and Advanced Diploma levels (5-6) with articulation into the Higher Education and the needs of the Associate Degree programs. Further research lead to the development of a Graded Assessment Mixed Model that have included two examples of rubric templates in which Example 1: For the Diploma and Advanced Diploma (AQTF Levels 5 & 6) and the Example 2: For task orientated learning and where not all tasks need to be graded.

The Graded Assessment Mixed Model was accepted by the School of Fashion and Textiles Teaching and Learning Committee for implementation into the Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology, Advanced Diploma of Textiles Design and Development, Advanced Diploma of Fashion Textiles and Merchandising, Associate Degree of Fashion Textiles and Merchandising and the Bachelor of Applied Science programs.
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION and RATIONALE

The project set out to implement an appropriate model of graded assessment in accordance with the proposed RMIT policy for graded assessments within a competency-based framework aligned with the ATQF principles and framework for assessment across the three programs within the School of Fashion and Textiles.

- Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology (referred to as Fashion)
- Advanced Diploma of Textiles Design and Development (referred to as Textiles)
- Advanced Diploma of Fashion and Textiles Merchandising (referred to as Merchandising)

The project also set out to ensure that appropriate validation and consensus moderation was carried out adhering to the competence of learning and teaching practices reflective of increased teacher performance and feedback to students. The project also addressed the key feedback mechanisms for students linked to assessment practices in accordance and consistent with RMIT graded assessment policy.

2.1 Project Rationale

The project sought to address several key areas such as a strategic alignment with the RMIT 2010 Strategic Plan in that it addressed the teaching and learning activities with the needs of key industries through alignment with AQTF framework in meeting industry needs. Opportunities for lifelong learning were taken into consideration to enable students to achieve quality performance outcomes through effective quality teaching and learning. The intent of the project is to improve the pathways between vocational education and training and higher education programs.

As the three programs are delivered across three disciplines in the School of Fashion and Textiles, the graded model of assessment would benefit not only existing students studying in three programs but benefit increased numbers of students when applied in a university wide VET context.

The project provides for positive student experiences through constructive student engagement and improved learning experiences, outcomes and employment opportunities, with timely feedback on student learning. Assessment and feedback on student work is an essential commodity to improve learning and teaching through sustained quality standards in innovative assessment during the development of cross-program moderation and validation processes.
3.1 PROJECT OUTCOMES and IMPACTS

Project Outcomes are as follows:

3.1.1 The LTIF project report includes three case studies which relate to the three programs in School of Fashion and Textiles. Each case study outlines background information of courses, assessment practices, issues and problems, suggested courses of action, teacher and student feedback responses and findings from the quantitative research conducted in their programs. The related information in three programs is discussed within the main body of the report. (Refer to Appendices 1: Fashion, Appendix 2: Textiles & Appendix 3: Merchandising)

3.1.2 The Graded Assessment Mixed Model was presented to and accepted by the School Teaching and Learning Committee for implementation into the three program disciplines in 2011. It was noted by the Head of School that the support for the development of rubrics has been adopted by the Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology, Advanced Diploma of Textiles Design and Development and the Advanced Diploma of Fashion, Textiles and Merchandising, Associate Degree of Fashion Textiles and Merchandising and Bachelor of Applied Science.

3.1.3 Development of a mechanism for graded assessment to enhance feedback to students in a competency-based training framework. The Mixed Model examples of rubrics has been trialed and evaluated by staff members/teachers in the three programs and accepted as a mechanism to enhance student feedback under the CBT framework and consistent with the AQTF assessment and validation procedures. The Mixed Model of Graded Assessment is consistent with the principles and guidelines as set out in the RMIT Assessment policy within a competency-based framework.

3.1.4 The skills and knowledge of staff members/teachers directly involved in the graded assessment project were developed through group collaboration and participatory approaches to learning such as team discussions and meetings, as well as staff development sessions in the three programs. The project team members were able to mentor and coach individual teachers or groups of teachers in the development of graded assessment practices. Also, a staff workshop on RMIT policy directives for graded assessment, competency-based training, assessment and assessment moderation and the use of rubrics to support graded assessment was organised by the project team members for the program managers, program co-coordinators, staff members/teachers from three programs. (Refer to Project Management Plan: Section 6.1). Further considerations for all staff to be trained in competency based training and assessments, and graded assessment practices and procedures.
3.2 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the collaborative approach undertaken by the project team members as they worked together to achieve the project aims, objectives and outcomes. The research methodology identifies the methods used to gain information and feedback from teachers and students on their experiences with graded assessment practices. Results from the feedback responses are detailed in Section 6: Evaluation of Project Outcomes.

3.2.1 A Collaborative Action Research Approach

A participatory and collaborative approach was undertaken by the project team members working together to achieve the project outcomes in accordance with the project management plan including steps, milestones key deliverables and outcomes. The theoretical framework for the case study is outlined as a participatory action research with an emphasis on collaborative learning between project team members.

Participatory action research is a form of collective self reflective inquiry undertaken by educationists/staff members in order to improve social or educational practices (Cherry, 1999). The methodology allowed for spontaneous action and research outcomes identical with the adaptability to the situation. Participatory action research with its roots in social movements where knowledge is socially constructed provided a framework for the project team members to act as participants as well as observers in a social setting within an educational situation (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988).

The educational setting provided a backdrop for a theoretical framework applicable to the process of social change with improved learning, teaching and assessment practices. The primary responsibility of the project team members was to work co-operatively in cycles of planning the changes to their assessment practices to achieve improvements, undertaking the changing practices, an evaluation of the results of the changes and then reflecting on the outcomes and results. This was consistent with group activity as a main characteristic of action research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988).

3.2.2 Methodology

A quantitative research methodology was undertaken in this research project. Primary data collection methods and surveys were used to collect evidence from teachers and students on their experiences in working with graded assessment practices. Quantitative statistical methods were used to describe outcomes of the graded assessment processes and procedures and to judge the effectiveness of the approaches. According to Patton (1990) statistical analyses on evaluation enabled the project team members to gain valid information on how program management, staff members and students from three programs view the implementation of graded assessments and the use of rubrics as a scoring and feedback tool in order to gain in-depth and rich insights of their perceptions and experiences.

The project team members prepared two feedback forms using rating scale which contained questions related to teacher and student experiences with graded assessments. A rating scale was used to elicit information on the quality and achievement levels or criteria describing the elements of performance at each level and the dimensions of performance or assessment criteria. Similar information was used for both feedback forms so that teacher and students responses could be compared and contrasted for quality learning and teaching outcomes. Included in the feedback forms was a series of questions used to gain valuable information on the use of rubrics as a feedback tool and its application before or after assessments, as well as commenting on the most useful form of feedback.
3.2.3 Data Collection

Teachers and students in the three programs were invited to participate in the data collection for the research project. Total of participating numbers are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Teacher and Students Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Staff Members</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from the teacher and student feedback forms were entered into an excel database which resulted in graphical representations of data in preparation for data analysis. (Refer to Appendices

3.2.4 Strategic Priorities

This section outlines the following strategic priorities which are linked to the LTIF project outcomes and supports the research undertaken by the project team members on the implementation of training packages in their respective programs, the issues and problems associated with limited staff training. This has reflected in the conceptual understanding and implications of graded assessment models and practices. The project has advanced knowledge through staff development activities by holding individual staff meetings, workshops and project team meetings which is reflected in the project outcomes. The staff development through integrated learning activities related to the graded assessment project is considered to relate to the following strategic priorities.

RMIT 2010 Strategic Plan:

- Values – useful, connected, and passionate
- Priority 4 – Ensure flexible, useful pathways and learning opportunities for students
- Priority 6 – Attract, develop, reward and retain staff who will embrace the future with energy and creativity and who is focused on the needs of our student and our partners.
- Priority 7 – Develop facilities and systems to support and sustain excellence in education and research

RMIT 2015 Strategic Plan:

- Goal 3 –
- Priority 3 - Ensure RMIT staff can support a connected and responsive University by developing policies, processes and professional development to:
  - Support academic and teaching staff to deliver excellent education and research
  - Attract develop and retain staff who are focused on performance which will support RMIT University’s strategic objectives
3.3 Literature Review
This section covers background information related to the political, industrial and social changes that bought about a training reform to Australian education and training. The development of a national VET system underpinned by training packages certainly changed the VET area in terms of products, processes and relationships with various stakeholders. Although the training package model had a range of different features, there were inconsistencies in the clarity within the units of competencies, which had implications for curriculum development, the changing role of the VET teachers, assessment practices and student outcomes in our program.

3.3.1 Background
3.3.2 Policy Strategies
One of the major policy strategies that emerged was a key reform to Australian education and training systems with the introduction of the National Training Reform Agenda (NTRA). The concept of reform gave priority to increase at a national level, investment for training and envisaged improvement in the quality and co-ordination of national training arrangements. The key reform was supported by peak employer organisations in response to industry requirements of improving Australia’s productivity to compete in globalised marketplaces. Competency-based training and training packages were introduced as a vehicle to improve the skill levels of Australian workforce (Dawkins, 1988).
Governments and industry had stakes in the outcomes of training packages and viewed the new approach as the key to workplace reform. It followed that the development of training packages with evaluative procedures and the quality of training had to meet specific criteria in order to be acceptable to the range of stakeholders, government bodies, industry, and clients (ANTA, 2003).
Governments assumed that VET would play a key role in developing a highly skilled, productive workforce that would allow Australia to become more competitive from an international perspective. The intention of vocational education and training was to meet the demands of government and industry bodies through the promotion of effective training and legitimate assessment systems (Johnson & Chappell, 2001; Chappell, Solomon, Tennant & Yates, 2002; Chappell & Johnston, 2003; Curtin, 2004; Cole, 2005).

3.3.3 Role of Vocational Education and Training (VET)
The focus of VET is to ensure future employability through its connection with industry as well as to being the driving force in skill development for high economic growth and national prosperity (Booth, 2001; ANTA, 2003). Likewise, Chappell (2000) believed that the reformation of education and training systems was an essential factor in economic rationalisation and changing workplaces. In addition, Chappell, Solomon, Tennant and Yates (2002) highlighted the critical role that VET played in providing a better-educated and highly skilled workforce that competed successfully in the international marketplace (Hawke, 2002).

The capacity to deliver quality products and services rests on the ability of the registered training providers to deliver and maintain consistency and best practice, while being entrepreneurial and innovative in meeting the industry training needs in the national VET systems (Mitchell & Young, 2001; Dawe, 2002; ANTA 2003). The role of RMIT University as a registered training organisation (RTO) therefore, is to deliver vocational education and training. RMIT, as a registered body, must meet specific standards and demonstrate compliance in order to deliver and assess nationally recognised training, and to issue nationally recognised qualifications.
3.3.4 The Role of VET Teachers

Significant policy changes and reforms to the VET system have challenged VET teachers and assessors because the national system changed from curriculum development under the guise of CBT to teacher-developed learning resources and strategies (Foley & Smith, 2002). The advent of training packages indicated change to the structural elements of a training framework, protocols and guidelines and, as Schofield (1999) stated, the premise of the new training system remained with the foundation of vocational learning.

Education was perceived as the linkage between economic rationalisation, international competitiveness and the development of human capital (Harris, Simons & Clayton, 2005). The impact of the changing contexts had altered the nature of vocational learning and, as such, the VET system must respond creatively in order to meet the requirements of such a diverse workplace. Educational changes have challenged VET trainers/teachers and assessors in their professional working life (from commercial imperatives and with social implications) as their roles have changed dramatically to accommodate the emerging needs of industry requirements and community expectations.

Research studies by Harris, Simons, Hill, Smith, Pearce, Blakeley, Choy and Snewin (2001) explored primarily the changing role of staff development within the VET system. Secondly, the study sought to identify the major challenges caused by external drivers of change that would most likely impact on VET teachers and trainers over the ensuing years to seven years. The study examined the current capacity of VET teachers and trainers to meet those challenges. One of the key finding was the emergence of training packages and although high numbers of VET teachers and trainers reported undertaking some staff development activity on training packages over the previous year however the number of hours spent on this activity was relatively lower than many other areas. It was found that a large number of VET staff had not attended any staff development activities related to the National Training Framework, including the complexities of implementation of training packages, and competency-based assessment despite the need for quality assurance compliance. Release time was generally only available for permanent staff. Contract staff generally could not access staff development and had to complete staff development in their own time. This evidence emphasised the important role of staff development for all VET staff whether permanent or non-permanent as an essential commodity so that they were familiar with the implementation of any new initiatives under the National Training Framework.

Building on earlier studies for VET staff development provision by Harris et al. (2001), Harris, Simons and Clayton (2005) investigated the changing environment and the implications of these changing work roles of VET teachers and trainers on the quality of VET provision. Findings from the study confirmed earlier findings of Chappell and Johnson (2003) about how the impact of the external drivers of change influenced the structure of work roles and responsibilities of VET teachers and trainers. Scarce resources and limited funding, but other tensions were a consequence of reductions in numbers of experienced full-time staff, employment of casual staff, and limited-term contracts that constrained professional development of staff. It would appear as though VET managers seemed more intent on funding and resource issues, checking compliance with government requirements, contracting staff, and chasing market share, than to improving the quality of teaching and learning, and the assessment of outcomes. Professional development activities appeared to have diminished in some educational institutions because of cost-cutting measures.

Hedley (2005) also found serious discrepancies between policy intentions and the quality of actual implementations. The interpretative framework of the CBT system created inconsistent practices in the change management processes of course delivery mechanisms, and assessment processes for judging workplace performance. She identified a lack of support materials available to trainers and
assessors to facilitate teaching, learning and assessment processes. These resources were essential commodities to support the standards of performance and skills development in the units of competencies, and assessment guidelines in the training packages.

In addition, Hedley (2005) argued there was a severe shortage of adequate knowledge and application of the CBT system and practices across all industry, education and training sectors. For example, assessment strategies as defined within units of competencies differed from the implemented assessment tasks. This was triangulated by asking both teachers and students. The apparent lack of knowledge about industry standards and misconceptions about those standards jeopardized the development and recognition of skills linked to workplace productivity and efficiency. The various sectors did not understand the critical requirements of course delivery and assessment procedures essential for a cohesive assessment program linked to workplace performance. She concluded that there is a considerable gap between policy-driven ideologies of competency-based training packages and the implementation of these policies by practitioners in workplaces, education and training sectors including the substantive role of the VET practitioner.

This view is consistent with Leary’s (2003) report that the irregularities and discrepancies within the training packages due to size, number and complexities had implications for quality processes of design and implementation. There were clear differences between each training package that related to the variance in size, format and complexity of units of competency. Variation in terminology leads to difficulties in interpretation, as there were no standard agreed meanings for key terms. There were differences in and between similar competency standards at the same AQF qualification outcomes across training packages. Underpinning skills and knowledge were inconsistent within the evidence guides: some clearly embedded and others not sufficient in depth. The flexibility in training packages is highly valued however, but inconsistent inputs can affect the delivery, assessment, and outcomes from training (Schofield & McDonald, 2004).

The shift to training packages appeared to have the desired responses as required by industry for training outcomes. The generation of training packages was considered as progress towards an effective training system. The flexibility within training packages allowed for customisation of training programs for specific outcomes, based on the assumption that the teachers and trainers could develop the required curriculum to achieve the outcomes. The interpretative requirements of curriculum posed challenges for resource development and assessment practices, especially in institutionalised settings in which the development of teaching and learning approaches should mirror workplace experiences. While training packages were perceived as a vehicle for change, there was some resistance by vocational education and training teachers and their managers because of a failure to ensure that the introduction of training packages was clearly understood by those who had to implement the proposed changes.

3.3.5 Assessment

Assessment within the National Training Framework is defined as the process of collecting evidence and making a judgment of an individual’s progress towards the performance requirements as set out in the relevant endorsed competency standard. To meet the AQF requirements a statement of attainment may be issued on completion of individual of units of competency. Flexibility within training packages provides for assessment carried out in the workplace (on-the-job) or in simulated work environments. Both on-the-job and off-the-job components provide for recognition of competencies (ANTA, 2003). Under the guidelines of National Training Framework (NTF), the four principles of validity, reliability, fairness and consistency must be complied with when conducting assessments, so that workplace assessments and other assessments meet the same standard (Schofield & McDonald, 2004). Assessment in VET is competency-based with benchmarks for assessments being the endorsed units of competency in training packages. In an educational context, assessment provides
information as to whether the learner has achieved the learning outcomes of the program (Schofield & McDonald, 2004).

### 3.3.6 Graded Assessments

According to the Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF), the flexibility in Training packages allowed for the recognition of graded assessments, when graded results are required by Higher Education (HE) sectors for the purposes of tertiary entrance scores, selection processes or articulation (Blom & Clayton, 2003). Essentially, graded assessments were supposedly recorded as a higher level of performance once competency has been achieved. Since the introduction of training packages, there has been much debate over the principles that underpin competency based assessments and whether graded assessment could exist within a competency based framework (Gillis & Griffin, 2005).

While most Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) used two levels of decision-making to comply with competency training and assessment procedures which are competent and not yet competent outcomes (Rumsey 1997). There had been considerable movement towards assessing and reporting levels of performance (Williams & Bateman, 2003). During this period of time, the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) provided no clear directive on graded assessments. Individual state and/or territory authorities’ policies could vary from strong support for grading to not supporting grading. Even where policy guidelines existed there was considerable variation in the way graded assessment was carried out (Schofield & Smith, 2004). At a registered training organisation level, there should be autonomy to develop local policies, procedures and guidelines, albeit within national/standards/guidelines that meet local needs and support the implementation of graded assessment.

Research studies by Williams and Bateman (2003) identified the range of practices in graded assessments that have emerged because of an absence of clear policy directives in vocational education and training. In consultations with key stakeholders they investigated (1) validity, reliability and consistency, (2) cross-sectoral concerns, (3) costs associated with graded assessments, and (4) changes in the national training environment that have affected graded assessment. They examined four different approaches with particular attention on Model 1: Western Australian model and Model 2: TAFE Queensland. They did not judge the extent to which registered training organisations were using graded assessment. All four models seemed to be criterion-referenced approaches and compatible with competency-based assessment, but differed considerably with respect to the quality of the feedback to students and their prospective employers. It appears that the two models were designed to deliver what the policy-makers specifically intended while still able to deliver what the policy-makers intended, gave greater consideration to the underlying purposes of assessment, its capacity to give students due credit for achievements, and to have more informative comment for both students and prospective employers.

Presumably, employers would like the possibility of making a sensible choice between several applicants who had all performed with distinction in their respective VET courses. Findings showed there were ‘instances’ of good practice were identified such as professional development of assessors, provision of policy and/or guidelines, provision of assessment tools, and grading schemas (outline/diagram/plan/rubrics) as well as validation processes. Lack of transparency in reporting was a major concern as well as the wide variation in how grading is applied leading to significant discrepancies in what the grades represent transparency in reporting is essential to make grades more meaningful to respective stakeholder. Results of the study proposed a set of principles and guidelines for graded assessment both at a national level which should provide guides on what should be graded, the number of levels of competency to be assessed and the purposes of the graded assessment (Schofield & McDonald, 2004: Gillis & Griffin, 2005).
3.3.7 Rubrics

According to Chappell (2000), learning has replaced teaching as an educational paradigm where the focus is now on the learner. The shift is away from the traditional perception of VET pedagogy to an application of learning as an active process in a supportive learning environment. Huba and Freed (2000) contended that assessments were tools to promote learning together and the development of rubrics would provide essential feedback to students on how their work compares to performance standards and how their performances can be improved.

A rubric is defined as ‘any rule, explanatory comment’ used in making a judgement of quality. In an assessment context, a rubric explains the scoring rules’, and explains to the students the criteria against which their work will be judged, and statements that describe levels of quality of performance (Huba & Freed, 2000). Griffin, Gillis and Calvitto (2004) advocated that the use of rubrics which defined quality of performance was central to a criterion referenced assessment interpretation approach which is defined as follows:

- Applied once competency is determined
- Professional development in graded assessment techniques and procedures should be provided for new and existing VET staff with the development and maintenance of a graded assessment system
- Competency standards in training packages for assessment should include information on the units of competency capable of graded assessment and guidance on how to develop the graded assessment schemas which reflect the content and specific criteria
- Appropriate validation processes such as consensus moderation should accompany a graded assessment system

Research studies conducted by Maxwell (2010) found the use of rubrics was instrumental as a tool to support competency based training and the graded assessment process. The development of rubrics has far reaching benefits for both teachers and students in a combination of effective teaching and learning strategies. Clearly the rubrics clarify student performance outcomes and expectations as well as a vehicle for student feedback together with assessment validation and moderation processes which support the assessment criteria within the AQTF for assessment expectations. More importantly, the use of rubrics assists with student articulation to higher education programs.

3.3.8 Contexts

3.3.9 RMIT University

According to RMIT University (2004), graded assessment is the ‘process of awarding learners a grade based on a higher level of performance once competency has been achieved. Learners are assessed against an additional set of criteria to determine how well they perform against particular assessment tasks’ (TAFE, Western Australian’s Approach, 2002).

In 2008, in accordance with the provision of Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF), RMIT University conducted a self-review project which revealed that graded assessment practices were being conducted within a number of VET programs without existing guidelines to inform these practices. The AQTF required that the university have place documented procedures to underpin the use of graded assessment in VET courses (where such grading occurs). The VET committee commissioned the development of a set of Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Graded Assessment in a Competency-Based
3.3.10 Framework to ensure alignment of these practices with the AQTF.

These Principles and Guidelines are referred to in the Procedures for Management and Results as the university’s instrument governing the practice of graded assessment in TAFE (endorsed 25 June 2009). The aim of these principles and guidelines is to promote ‘good practices’ within a competency-based assessment and consistent with the principles and standards for assessment in a competency-based environment in the AQTF.

These principles were based on existing graded assessment models and practices of Western Australia TAFE, TAFE Queensland, University of Ballarat, Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority’s model for scored assessment in VCE/VET programs and current practices identified within RMIT University (Submission to Academic Board, paper 154, item 6.7)

Four graded assessment models have been identified (3.1) from existing practices as appropriate for VET programs and the decision to apply an appropriate graded assessment model can be made at a program level in response to industry and employer preferences and to assist students articulating to degree programs. However, if an alternative model (3.3) is preferred, the model must address the principles and planning guidelines specified for graded assessment within the context of RMIT principles and guidelines. In planning for graded assessment, under guideline (2.7) it is recommended that a rubric is used to describe the dimensions and quality of performance subject to grading in an open, transparent and accountable manner (RMIT University, 2008).

Summary statement
The literature indicated the changing role of the VET pedagogies to accommodate the principles of the new training systems and highlighted the need for professional development for VET teachers to update their skills in new contexts of learning, teaching, and assessment. It suggested the potential value of research into the management of VET programs, the changing role of teachers in contributing towards an effective learning environment and the learning approaches that show how students learn effectively. It is evident that the RMIT graded assessment policy supports the consistency of good practice in competency-based assessment in a competency-based environment contained within the ATQF however further clarification is required for the interpretation and application of suggested Models for graded assessments for respective RMIT courses and programs.

3.4 Analysis of Factors
The following is an analysis of factors that were critical to the success of the approach and the factors that impeded its success that may provide assistance to other projects.

3.4.1 Background
Project aim was to develop a method of graded assessment for competency Based Training (CBT). It has always been a goal of having tools that could easily be adapted to meet the needs of Associate degrees as well. This would also give us the means of further bridging the gap between the perceived differences of the learning and assessment requirements of BBT and capability learning of Higher Education all within the vocational area of learning.

One of the most difficult issues the project team members had to work with and try and overcome was the conflict of awarding grades on % outcomes of assessment tasks and the holistic approach to grading where descriptions and values have to be measured as prescribed by CBT.

This issue was discovered in the early stage of the project. There was great disparity of grading systems and processes currently used across the three departments. It is important to develop tools that follow the ethos of CBT, where a learner must be deemed competent before a grading can be
applied. A percentage score of 50 or above is not a true indication that a learner is competent in all elements and Performance criteria for a given Unit of Competency (UoC).

The other major issue was the difficulty of developing a model that could cope with the diverse learning and assessment needs of AQTF levels 4-6, as well as being adaptable for Higher – ED, especially the associate degree needs. How tools would be useful for post graduate studies was not explored.

In research undertaken it was identified that departments who delivered courses that had UoC from AQTF Levels 3, 4, 5 & 6 that the graded assessment requirements were more diverse than for the department who only researched the requirements for graded assessment at Diploma and advanced Diploma levels (5 & 6).

This has lead to what the project team members believe is the need for a Mixed Model approach. Helen Smith, in discussions supported this concept and was interested to see the development and response from the Fashion & Textiles Learning and Teaching committee.

It has been found by all three departments that at Diploma and Advanced Diploma that the model would include an assessment rubric template that would allow trainers to simultaneously assess the competence of the learner and grade the competency. Example 1 attached.

This tool/rubric was not flexible enough and become difficult to apply in practical, task orientated based UoC at Certificate III & IV where some the elements and performance criteria are closed and directive. To assess these particular elements as anymore as competent is not necessary or practical and only require ungraded assessment to be undertaken. Only the elements and performance criteria that are descriptive and interpretative have assessment task(s) that require grading. Example 2 attached

3.4.2 Mixed Model for School of Fashion and Textiles

Criteria as listed in the Rubric MUST are specific to the course and required elements and Learning criteria students are to cover in the course. No percentages are to be included in the marking result. It is acceptable to use a percentage weighting for each assessable task.

3.4.3 Recommendations when using this model:

Rubric was most useful as a pre-assessment tool to be given to the students initially as a guide to the expectations of the assessment requirements and not as a feedback tool. Students stated that as a feedback tool a rubric is too generic and did not give enough information on their individual work. It is still important to have individual feedback to students.

Staff where possible should work together as a team when developing descriptors for the rubrics. If this is not possible staff using the rubric should moderate and have clear understanding of descriptors and requirements before implementing as an assessment tool.

LTIF Project found that if the students were involved in the development of the rubrics they found it to be very positive learning environment and had a far better understanding of the learning and assessment requirements.

Staff should undertake professional development in Competency based training and grading competency as required.
3.5 Analysis of Extent
As the graded assessment model has been trialed by project team teachers and other teachers in three programs and feedback from the teacher and student feedback forms highlights the importance of graded assessment practices for feedback before and after assessments. It is important that clear articulation pathways are made available for VET students to have access to Higher Education Programs and as such, the graded assessment model is transferable and could be applied across other RMIT VET programs.

4. Dissemination Strategies and Outputs
4.1 Materials and outcomes will be made available through: RMIT University Blackboard, ALTC Websites.

4.2 The project outcomes will be shared through the university through:

4.2.1 April 2011 Workshop – Presentation of project outcomes to peers and colleagues
4.2.2 RMIT Learning and Teaching Expo
4.2.3 Presentation to VET Link
4.2.4 Presentation at TAFE ATN Assessment Workshop at Curtin University

4.3 Presentation by the Chair of the T & L Committee to College of DSC Teaching and Learning Committee

5. Linkages
5.1. College of DSC Assessment Project. Barbara De la Harpe is the sponsor of the project which was to investigate, analyse and evaluate two key components of TAFE assessment.

(a) Graded assessment in a competency-based framework and (b) RPL Assessment Practices
The project has come at a critical time in VET with the introduction of skills reform and productivity pressures. It is anticipated that this project will identify areas where standardisation can be improved, support capability building and improve productivity outcomes with the identification of flexible assessment methodologies.


5.3 Dr Helen Smith, Senior Research Fellow, Design & Social Context. Consultations and advice given on the implementation of Model 1: Refer to Project Management Plan and meeting with project team members on the proposed project outcomes and considerations for a flexible graded assessment model (see Appendix 6)

5.4 John Milton, Senior Advisor, Strategic Learning, Learning and Teaching Development, Office Pro-Vice Chancellor. Debrief and meeting to discuss the challenges of the project, the project outcomes, and findings(see Appendix 5 ).

This section outlines the key steps as set out in the Evaluation Framework in the LTIF Project, refer to Table 2: Project Management Plan. The framework is used to evaluate this project reflects the design
and implementation of the graded assessment in the three programs which can be a model for other programs. Feedback was obtained through consultation with ODT, School Teaching and Learning Committee, staff and student groups on the effectiveness of the graded assessment model and its application as an assessment tool. The program managers are members of the Teaching and Learning Committee meetings which accepted the Graded Assessment Mixed Model for implementation in 2011 and as such the proposed evaluation was not conducted as set out in the LTIF project brief.

Table 2: Project Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Milestone - 2010</th>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LTIF approval</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>First meeting with the project team members</td>
<td>Review the project outcomes and graded assessment policy models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussions with project staff and related to graded assessment principles and guidelines</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Graded assessment at a program level or cluster of courses</td>
<td>Implications of the project on the three programs and their graded assessment practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meetings and consultations as a group and individually with project team members for collection of competency-based assessments</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Compilation of validity-based assessments</td>
<td>*Parameters of the project *Identifiable assessment tasks and assessment criteria *Mapping UoCs against assessment tasks *Issues and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meetings discussions with project team members and other teaching staff to identify grading practices under the AQTF</td>
<td>May-June</td>
<td>Consultations with individual program co-ordinators and meetings with project teams have identified graded assessment practices in their programs for semester 1 with the proposed action plans for Semester 2.</td>
<td>Individual actions plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Staff development workshop for Fashion, Textiles and Merchandising staff</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Policy directives Graded assessment in a competency-based framework Relationships between elements/performance criteria/evidence</td>
<td>Refer to Workshop Agenda (see Appendix 7) Preparation and training for the application of graded assessment in programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Monitor and support project team members and teaching staff in the assessment procedures, principles and guidelines | July - September - October | Implementation of graded assessment model for individual programs | Meetings with project team members on key areas of implementation issues relating to staff assessments
Preparation for the staff and student feedback.

| 6. Student feedback sessions | October - November | Evaluation of the graded assessment model through consensus moderation as a mechanism for student feedback. To determine the appropriateness of the graded assessment feedback in a competency-based training framework. | Student feedback obtained through surveys across three programs (see findings - Appendices 1, 2 & 3)

| 7. Staff feedback sessions on the model and its application in competency based training | November | Evaluation through the consultation of staff on the application of the graded assessment model | Staff feedback obtained though surveys across three programs (see findings - Appendices 1,2,3)

| 8. Presentation to the Teaching & Learning Committee | December 2, 2010 | Project team members request an extension from the T & L Committee with the intent of presenting their model at the first meeting of the T & L committee in 2011- Approval given to the project team by the committee | Approval given by the T & L Committee for the project team members to present their flexible model for graded assessment for endorsement at the first T & L Meeting scheduled for the new year (2011).
(see Appendix – copy of T & L Minutes) |
9. Final presentation of a Mixed Model for the School of Fashion & Textiles presented to the T & L Committee

February 23rd 2011

Project team members presented a Graded Assessment Mixed Model and two examples of rubrics for consideration and endorsement.

Mixed model was accepted by the committee including program managers in the three programs

February 25th

Confirmation by Keith Cowlishaw, Head of School. Fashion and Textiles

The Graded Assessment Mixed Model has been adopted by Diploma Fashion Design and Technology, Textile Design & Development and Advanced Diploma and Associate Degree of Fashion Merchandising and Marketing and B Applied Science streams. It is being used in both TAFE and HE sectors.

6.1 Analyses

The following section outlines the findings from the Fashion, Merchandising and Textiles teachers and student feedback responses as outlined in Appendices A, B and C.

It was evidence from the Fashion student responses that the Fashion staff had already knowledge of competency based training and assessment as well as the use of rubrics. The three student groups differed in their ratings and scores over the different categories, which may be caused by the different skills and knowledge between the three Fashion teachers. The Merchandising results showed differences between the student perceptions of the descriptors showed in the rubrics when compared to the teacher’s responses to the assessment and rubrics. The results indicated that some of the teachers did not link or consider the importance of the descriptors or the components of a unit of competency when development assessment tasks. Findings from the Fashion students reflected positive responses to the simple categories whereas the teacher responses showed variances in use of components within a unit of competency for the development of assessment tasks.

The results showed the degree to which the Fashion teachers had been working together with competency based training and assessments using RMIT Models 2 and 3 over the past few years. The Merchandising and Textiles teachers had only been developing graded assessments since the commencement of the project; however, it is evident that further training is required in competency based training, assessment tasks, the relationship between the units of competency, assessment criteria, performance level descriptors, and the developments of rubrics to support the assessments. Although there was a small sample of teachers, there was no indication of whether they were employed as full-time teachers, part-time or casual teachers, this could be reflected in their responses. It was very clear and apparent that students use the rubrics as a pre and post assessment as a useful tool, the most significant finding from the students emphasised the value and importance of verbal feedback as their most preferred method.
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Appendix 1: FASHION
Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology
FASHION DEPARTMENT

SYNOPSIS OF CURRENT STATUS – APRIL 2010

Fashion staff has already undertaken Competency Based Training (CBT) interpretation & implementation over several department planning days. The Fashion department was the first fashion & Textiles department to start delivering programs from the LMT National Training packages. All ongoing & contract staff have been through the process of unpacking training package unit of competency to ensure training and assessment reflect and achieve the require learning outcomes.

Staff have participated in moderation and planning to implement valid graded assessment into all courses.
Staff have, or are in the process of following the graded assessment practices based on CBT and not using a 50% pass mark. This required staff to identify the minimum requirements of learning each student must reach to be deemed competent for each course (a Pass mark). Staff also identified the competency standards and assessment requirements above this level which a grade higher than a pass mark is applied to.

Majority of courses have had assessment rubrics developed:-
• Design discipline area has developed assessment that reflects the ungraded or competent level of assessment. A rubric for the graded component of the assessment is then used for final grade.
• Some discipline areas are using a rubric for each assessment task
• Other discipline areas work on Project based assessments incorporating a cluster of courses. Assessment rubrics in this case are different and often become more complex due to the number of courses in a cluster and the learning outcomes that are required to be assessed.
Validation and moderation processes are in place with staff members conducting ongoing review and moderation.

Perceived Issues
Not all discipline areas have fully mapped their training to be able to conclude what is a competent level and then what is required to achieve a graded competency.
We have found it very difficult to develop a “one size fits all” process or template that works.
• There are different requirements depending on the course content, i.e. practical or theory based courses. If delivery and assessment is for clustered courses than the assessment rubric can become quite complex.
• Also there appears to be different requirements if assessment is for a project or for individual assessment tasks.
• Some courses and discipline areas find it easier to identify what is competent and than apply graded assessment after that, where others find it difficult.
• Depending on how the unit of competency is actually written, i.e if the learning elements are true learning outcomes or more of step by step processes, effect how the rubric is developed and how the graded assessment is undertaken, also taking into account the range statement and the critical evidence requirements.
Graded competency was discussed in detail. We then went through the process of looking at each course and what information is given to students regarding assessment requirements, how work is assessed and if any rubrics or other tools were used to ensure consistency when grading students submitted assessment.

As previously identified there is no consistency outside of each discipline areas on what methods and tools are used. This show and tell allowed for detail discussion on what was perceived to be good practice and if any gaps and missing information was discovered. Opportunity to review current practices and there was a consensus to try and further develop rubrics. Based on the survey results from students it was agreed that we should all try to give assessment criteria at the commencement of the course and definitely before the assessment process. Staff then broke into working groups to further develop requirements.

Opportunity for staff to review current practices, moderate, improve and implement changes for Semester 1, 2011

Initial findings of this project were outlined to fashion staff at December Planning days.

- Currently trying to map Assessment tasks to ensure they are valid and relevant to the actual unit of competency and not based on historical practices on how a discipline has been delivered and assessed

Project research has indicated only 60% of courses in fashion program are using rubrics as a means of clearly defining what skill and knowledge need to be demonstrated to be deemed competent and the further criteria to assess work at competent with credit, distinction or high distinction. Approx 10% of the rubrics descriptions are generic and superficial and would not adequately give students a true indication of what they would need to do be graded at higher level of competence.

Graded Assessment models currently being used in fashion department vary in format and content. 75% of Courses use model where students are deemed competent and a graded competency is applied to all assessment tasks. The other 25% of courses have ungraded assessment tasks and only one assessment task is used to apply the graded competency grade of Competent with credit, distinction or high distinction.

Fashion has tried to identify some best practice models of the formats templates currently being used within the department. Further discussions still need to be had on the need for consistency, the flexibility to allow for accuracy and relevance for different courses and assessment decisions, easy understanding for students and relevance usefulness for staff generally.

There is a lack of consistency in how students perceive assessment and feedback from staff member to staff
Graded Assessment Survey November 2010

71 students were surveyed on their views relating to graded competency and the use of rubrics as part of their assessment. 80% of respondents found that the rubric was useful as an indication of what is required of them before undertaking assessment tasks but on 3% found the rubrics useful as a feedback tool for assessment tasks.

Oral feedback was the preferred method of receiving feedback and written the second preferred option. As yet the qualitative data has not been correlated.
The following are the responses to staff feedback form

1. Please indications of the number of staff who participated in the feedback evaluation.
   Fashion Technology 2 Textile Design & Development 1 Merchandising & Marketing 0
   1 (a) Total number of staff asked? 3

2. Teaching levels 2010.
   Certificate 0 Diploma 3 Advanced Diploma 1

3. Number of staff familiar with or used rubrics for student assessment feedback for previous studies?
   Yes 1 No 2

4. Responses to questions based on experiences with assessments and the use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.

4.1 Summary of total Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Difficult</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>3 Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.9 Student knowledge/skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.10 Opportunities for student improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.11 Feedback on student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Same headings as the Results of the Student Feedback

4.1

4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

4.2
4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark

4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading

4.4.
4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks

4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment

4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels
4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation

4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses
4.9 Student knowledge/skills

4.10 Opportunities for student improvements

4.11 Feedback on student performance
Summary of the Overall Findings in a Pie chart (i.e. same of the

students)

5. Responses to the question relating to the degree to which items impacted on the development of your rubrics and grading.

Summary of Total Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Not Applied</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Elements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Performance Criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Range Statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Critical evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNANSWERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Gradings & Elements
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5.2 Gradings & Performance Criteria

**5.2 Performance Criteria**

![Graph showing performance criteria with categories Not applied, Rarely, Sometimes, and Significantly.]

5.3 Gradings & Range Statements

**5.3 Range Statements**

![Graph showing range statements with categories Not applied, Rarely, Sometimes, and Significantly.]

5.4 Gradings & Critical Evidence
5.4 Critical evidence

**Summary chart**

**FEEDBACK QUESTIONS**

1. Did you find the rubrics more useful as a tool before assessments were completed or undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

   Before **1**  After **2**  Both **0**  Unanswered **0**

2. Feedback is given by you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal most useful **2**
Written most useful 2
Rubrics most useful 3
Unanswered 0

Any further comments or suggestions?

One staff member said that they found rubrics harder to use at advanced diploma level.

Unanswered 0

Any further comments or suggestions?

One staff member said that they found rubrics harder to use at advanced diploma level.

Thank you for your valued time and feedback
### The following are responses from the student feedback forms

1. **Number of students currently enrolled in?**
   - Fashion Technology: 18
   - Textile Design & Development: 4
   - Merchandising & Marketing: 3

2. **Course level you are studying in this year 2010.**
   - Certificate: 3
   - Diploma: 18
   - Advanced Diploma: 1

3. **Number of students before they studied this program, that were familiar with or were rubrics used for assessment feedback for their previous studies?**
   - Please tick: Yes 7  No 15

4. **Please rank the following the questions based on your experiences with assessments, and use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Indicate grade scores contributing towards overall mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicate achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 identify your strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Provide feedback on your performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1 Weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks

**4.1 Clearly indicate weightings**

![Bar chart showing weightings](image)

4.2 Grade scores contributing towards overall mark

**4.2 Indicate grade scores**

![Bar chart showing grade scores](image)

4.3 Indicates achieving competency standards before grading
4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria

4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment
4.5 Clearly shows performance

4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation
4.7 Indicate positive approaches

4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses

4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills
4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements

- Provide feedback on your performance
4.12 Summary of Overall Findings

FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

Are rubrics more useful before assessments are undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?
5. Feedback is given to you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal 2
   (b) Individual written comments 5
   (c) Rubrics 1
   (d) All 33

Please comment on which form of feedback you find most helpful/useful and why?

Verbal most useful 27
Written most useful 16
Rubrics most useful 3
Unanswered 3

Any further comments or suggestions:

Thank you for your time.
The following are the responses from the student feedback forms.

1. Number of students currently enrolled in?

   Fashion Technology 23   Textile Design & Development 1   Merchandising & Marketing

2. Course level you are studying in this year 2010.

   Certificate 0   Diploma 24   Advanced Diploma 1

6. Number of students before they studied this program, that were familiar with or were rubrics used for assessment feedback for their previous studies?

   Please tick: Yes 11   No 16

7. Please rank the following the questions based on your experiences with assessments, and use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.

   **4.1 Summary of Total Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Indicate grade scores contributing towards overall mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicate achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 identify your strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings</th>
<th></th>
<th>4.2 Indicate grade scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Indicates achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| 4.11 Provide feedback on your performance | 4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 3 |
4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria

4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment
4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation
4.7 Indicate positive approaches

4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses

4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills
4.9 Identify knowledge/skills

4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements

4.10 Identify opportunities

4.11 Provide feedback on your performance
4.12 Summary of Overall Findings

Bar Graph Table 4

Responses from Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicate grade scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Clearly achieving competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly shows performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly show relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Identify positive approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Identify strengths/weakness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify knowledge/skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Identify opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Provide feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

1. Are rubrics more useful before assessments are undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

   Before 17       After 3       Both 19       Unanswered 2

2. Feedback is given to you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal 2
   (b) Individual written comments 5
   (c) Rubrics 1
   (d) All 33

   Please comment on which form of feedback you find most helpful/useful and why?

   Verbal most useful 27
   Written most useful 16
   Rubrics most useful 3
   Unanswered 3

   Any further comments or suggestions:

Thank you for your time.
The following are the responses from the student feedback forms.

1. Number of students currently enrolled in?

Fashion Technology 30  Textile Design & Development 0  Merchandising & Marketing 0

8. Course level you are studying in this year 2010.

Certificate 0  Diploma 30  Advanced Diploma 0

9. Number of students before they studied this program, that were familiar with or were rubrics used for assessment feedback for their previous studies?

Please tick: Yes 11  No 19

10. Please rank the following the questions based on your experiences with assessments, and use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.

***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Indicate grade scores contributing towards overall mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicate achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly show relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 Provide feedback on your performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Clearly indicate weightings

4.2 Indicate grade scores

4.3 Indicate achieving competency
4.7 Indicate positive approaches

4.8 Identify strengths/weakness

4.9 Identify knowledge/skills
4.10 Identify opportunities

4.11 Provide feedback

Bar Graph for Table 4
FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

11. Are rubrics more useful before assessments are undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

- Before: 6
- After: 10
- Both: 12
- Unanswered: 2

12. Feedback is given to you in different ways.

- (a) Verbal: 16
- (b) Individual written comments: 14
- (c) Rubrics: 2
- (d) All: 3

Please comment on which form of feedback you find most helpful/useful and why?

- Verbal most useful: 16
- Written most useful: 14
- Rubrics most useful: 3
- Unanswered: 1

Any further comments or suggestions:

Thank you for your time.
### SCHOOL OF FASHION and TEXTILES

#### RESULTS OF STAFF & STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEYS – NOVEMBER 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors /categories</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Student Group (1) (22 students)</th>
<th>Student Group (2) (24 students)</th>
<th>Student Group (3) (30 students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (9) Good scored the second highest rating (8)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (9) Good scored the second highest rating (8)</td>
<td>Good (12) Very good (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>Moderate (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Good scored the highest rating (10) Very Good scored the second highest rating (10)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (8) Good scored the second highest rating (8)</td>
<td>Very good (14) Good (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>Moderate (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (10) Good scored the second highest rating (5)</td>
<td>Good scored the highest rating (10) Satisfactory (8)</td>
<td>Good (12) Very good (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>Moderate (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Good scored the highest rating (9) Very good scored the second highest rating (6)</td>
<td>Very Good scored the highest rating (11) Satisfactory (11)</td>
<td>Good (14) Very good (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>Moderate (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Good (9) Very Good (7)</td>
<td>Good (9) Very Good (6) Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>Very Good (12) Good (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>Difficult (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Good (9) Very Good (7)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (11) Very good (10)</td>
<td>Very good (12) Good (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Positive approaches to learning with</td>
<td>Difficult (1) Easy (2)</td>
<td>Very Good (9) Very good (5) Satisfactory (5)</td>
<td>Good scored the highest rating (10) Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory Very good (8) Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fashion Findings

A comparative study of the student responses from the individual student groups found variances and differences in the responses and scores. **Student group (3)** responses indicated overall high scores in a number of categories in particular, Categories (4.1)(4.4)(4.8)(4.9). The total scores across ‘excellent’, ‘very good’ and ‘good’ rated a total of 27 when combined together indicating the weightings or assigned assessment scores, the clearly described assessment criteria and the identifiable knowledge and skills were considered to be more than important to the student feedback performance levels.

The highest individual score rated 14 ‘very good’ in two Categories (4.2) and 4.9). These ratings indicate that the students in Group 3 found grade scores that contributed towards overall mark and identification of knowledge and skills to be a most important priority.

The responses from **student group (2)** rated Category (4.4) with a score of 11, ‘very good’ which is the highest individual score and indicated that the importance of clearly describing assessment criteria for performance levels. The highest collectively score was 19 when spread over three ratings, ‘good’, ‘very good,’ and ‘excellent’, indicated Categories (4.1) and (4.2) which indicated the importance of clearly indicating weightings or scores assigned to assessment task as well as indicating the grade scores which contributes towards an overall mark.
**Student group (1)** rated Category (4.3) with the highest score of 10, indicating that achieving competency standards before grading is the most important for student performance. A combined spread of scores totaling 23 found Category (4.2) to be the highest weightings which indicated that indicating grade scores towards an overall mark to be the most important.

When comparing the results of the difference groups, the collective responses and overall scores showed that **student group (3)** students had a higher level of understanding of the performance levels within the assessment tasks. This showed when comparing the spread of collated scores in the range of ‘good’, ‘very good’ and ‘excellent’ from Categories 4.1 to 4.11. **Student group (1)** showed lower scores spread across ‘good’ and ‘very good’ in the different categories range. **Group 2** students showed a comparative score spread across ‘good’ and ‘very good’ in the different categories range as **student group (1)**. **Student group (2)** students rated ‘poor’ with a collective score of 37 across all of the categories, student group (3) students rated ‘poor’ with a collective score of 12, **student group (1)** rated ‘poor’ with a collective score of 7.

The scores showed that **student group (3)** had the most rewarding experiences when working with assessment and rubrics across all categories. **Student group (1)** scores are spread more evenly across the different categories, whereas students in **student group (2)** are varied in their responses from the high scores to the lowest score responses.

The teacher responses indicated moderate to easy in the categories (4.1) to (4.7), with two teachers scoring easy in these categories. Category (4.3) was a moderate response scoring 3, categories (4.6)(4.7) and (4.10) showed a difficult response. The responses showed that one teacher out of three teachers found the criteria for performance levels difficult, and the motivational specifics and opportunities for student learning difficult to comprehend and understand in graded assessment or developing a rubrics for an assessment task. One staff member said that they found rubrics harder to use at advanced diploma level

**Fashion Feedback**

The staff responses to the question of feedback showed that they found feedback related to the rubrics useful before and after assessment however two of the teachers found both verbal and written to be most useful. Three teachers stated that they found the used of rubrics most useful for feedback tool. The collective responses from students (70) found that verbal feedback was the most useful, written feedback scores (46) responses and (9) found rubrics to be most useful.

**Analysis : integrated into Report Section 6.1**

Loraine Grant: 1/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1 2010</th>
<th>Courses - Implementation</th>
<th>Graded Assessment Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| February       | 1. YEP Program – Product development courses (Three units of competencies for this project) | (a) Used Model 1 graded assessment - rubrics were developed for a range of group-based assessment tasks Levels of performance descriptors are developed for each assessment task and presented in a rubric.  
- Competency and grading are undertaken simultaneously  
- Grades determined against a number of assessment tasks  
(b) Results entered into a database and calculations were made to obtain a graded weighting and % scores.  
(b) The staff members/teachers in the program thought they were working with Model because of how they interpreted these guidelines.  
(c) Clarification from Helen Smith confirmed that the graded assessment model that the YEP staff members were using did not adhere to the RMIT guidelines. Issues with interpretation and application. |
|                | 2. Assessments moderated by a group of five teachers | |
| Semester 2 - July | 3. Continuance of YEP | As above – group assessments |
|                 | 4. Textile Research | Individual student assessments using Model 1 Graded Assessment model – rubric developed with assessment criteria and quality of performance or achievement levels. |
|                 | 5. Advanced CAD | Individual student assessments |
|                 | 6. International Marketing | Peer Assessment using rubrics for oral presentations and group work |
### 1. Specific courses in the program

YEP, Advanced CAD, Textile Research and International Marketing – five units of competencies

### 2. Development of rubrics – grading criteria, descriptions, interpretations & calculations

YEP staff members designed the assessment tasks and rubrics

### 3. Assessment moderation – results & outcomes

1. **YEP staff members** found the descriptors within the rubrics open to interpretation. Grading was limited because grading calculations were restrictive. Score line was weighted as a middle % i.e. 55% 60% 65% and not scaled across grading levels. Scores open for interpretation, some descriptors were not relevant to the unit of competency. Some of the descriptors were outside some of the group members’ range of expertise and capabilities. Assessment tasks and rubrics should be developed by a group of teachers who have a clear understanding of the relevant descriptors and performance dimensions. Problems with interpreting rubrics for assessment tasks with elements of creativity.

2. **International Marketing (Yuping)**

   (a) Peer assessment for oral presentations – specific content – technical knowledge should be removed as students were often carried away by creativity of the work or good presentation skills rather than the correctness of the information.

   (b) Peer assessment for group work contribution: good students will seriously assess each other, other students will simply give each other full marks as they need the marks to pass the subject. As a result good students obtain fewer marks than ‘bad’ students in this assessment component.

### 4. Teachers – problems & issues with UoC, evidence guide, range statements, grading criteria.

Teachers did not develop rubrics from elements and performance criteria. Rubrics should be developed after the assessment tasks and assessment criteria for UoC are established – rubrics should not be developed first before assessment tasks.

**December 16th 2010**

YEP Team meeting: Assessments for the YEP were discussed, and number of assessment tasks were reduced, and an example of rubrics template was shown to the project team outlining the changes to the quality performance levels as required by the RMIT policy changes, % were not shown. The rubric template was given an approval by Helen Smith. The project team will use this template for their graded assessments.
The following are the responses to staff feedback form

13. Please indications of the number of staff who participated in the feedback evaluation.

   Fashion Technology     0       Textile Design & Development   0       Merchandising & Marketing   6

1 (a) Total number of staff asked? 7


   Certificate 3       Diploma 1       Advanced Diploma 6

15. Number of staff familiar with or used rubrics for student assessment feedback for previous studies?

   Yes 1       No 5

4. Responses to questions based on experiences with assessments and the use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.

4.1 Summary of total Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Difficult</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>3 Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– descriptions for determining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Positive approaches to learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with high degree of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Student individual strengths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Student knowledge/skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Opportunities for student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Feedback on student performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks

**4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks**

![Chart showing weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks]

- **Difficult**
- **Moderate**
- **Easy**
4.2 Grade scores contributing towards overall mark

**4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark**

![Bar chart showing grade scores for difficult, moderate, and easy tasks.

4.3 Indicate achieving competency

**4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading**

![Bar chart showing competency standards for difficult, moderate, and easy tasks.]
4.4 Clearly describes the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks

4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks

4.5 Clearly shows quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment

4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment
4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with a high degree of motivation

4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation
4.8 Identify individual strengths /weaknesses

**4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses**

4.9. Identify knowledge/skills

**4.9 Student knowledge/skills**

4.10 Identify Opportunities for student improvements
4.10 Opportunities for student improvements

4.11 Provide feedback on performance

Summary of the Overall Findings in a Pie chart
6. Responses to the question relating to the degree to which items impacted on the development of your rubrics and grading.

### Summary of Total Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Not Applied</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Elements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Performance Criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Range Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Critical evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNANSWERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Gradings & Elements

### 5.1 Elements

![Graph showing responses distribution for 5.1 Elements]
6.2 Gradings & Performance Criteria

5.2 Performance Criteria

6.3 Gradings & Range Statements

5.3 Range Statements

6.4 Gradings & Critical Evidence
FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

16. Did you find the rubrics more useful as a tool before assessments were completed or undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

Before 1 After 1 Both 3 Unanswered 1

Comments from staff
Both- before as it gave the students and teachers very good indications of the gradings and assessment requirements. Students commented that grading noted gave them some indications of their levels of work and assessments.

I only found the rubrics to be useful in assisting me to clearly identify exactly what I wanted to assess and map across to the elements and performance criteria.

Both, as rubrics provided the guidelines for the assignments but also were a useful tool for feedback.

Rubrics were more effective as a feedback tool after the assessments were completed.

17. Feedback is given by you in different ways.

(a) Verbal 1
(b) Individual with written comments 3
(c) Rubrics 1
(d) All 2
(e) Unanswered 1

Please comment on which form of feedback, do you find prefer to use and why?

Verbal most useful 1
Written most useful 5
Rubrics most useful 1
Unanswered 1

Individual/ w/written comments to me is the best way of giving feedback, because its personalized and the student can always go back to the written feedback. Comments cover some aspects of the performance of the student that may not necessarily be included in the rubrics.

My preference is for individual feedback with written comments. This gives more flexibility for comment and to grade an assessment more accurately.

Written provides a means of detailing all points

Verbal feedback based on rubrics (comments sheet) and written comments.

Thank you for your valued time and feedback
The following are the responses from the student feedback forms.

1. Number of students currently enrolled in?

   - Fashion Technology: 0
   - Textile Design & Development: 0
   - Merchandising & Marketing: 41

18. Course level you are studying in this year 2010.

   - Certificate: 0
   - Diploma: 1
   - Advanced Diploma: 40

19. Number of students before they studied this program, that were familiar with or were rubrics used for assessment feedback for their previous studies?

   Please tick: Yes 14 No 27

20. Please rank the following the questions based on your experiences with assessments, and use of rubrics as a tool for feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Indicate grade scores contributing towards overall mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicate achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Provide feedback on your performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 6 |

4.1 Weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks

4.1 Clearly indicate weightings

4.2 Grade scores contributing towards overall mark

4.2 Indicate grade scores
4.3 Indicates achieving competency standards before grading

4.4 Clearly describes the assessment criteria

4.5 Clearly shows performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment
4.6 Clearly shows relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels

4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation
4.7 Indicate positive approaches

4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses

4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills
Identify opportunities for improvements
Provide feedback on your performance

### 4.11 Provide feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.12 Summary of Overall Findings

**Bar Graph for Table 4**

- **Responses from Students**: 25
- **Descriptors**: 4.1 Clearly indicate weightings, 4.2 Indicate grade scores, 4.3 Indicate achieving competency, 4.4 Clearly describes, 4.5 Clearly shows performance, 4.6 Clearly show relevant, 4.7 Identify strengths/weaknesses, 4.8 Identify knowledge/skills, 4.9 Identify opportunities, 4.10 Identify opportunities, 4.11 Provide feedback
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FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

1. Are rubrics more useful before assessments are undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

   Before 17   After 3   Both 19   Unanswered 2

2. Feedback is given to you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal 2
   (b) Individual written comments 5
   (c) Rubrics 1
   (d) All 33

Please comment on which form of feedback you find most helpful/useful and why?

   Verbal most useful 27
   Written most useful 16
   Rubrics most useful 3
   Unanswered 3

Any further comments or suggestions:

Thank you for your time.
## RESULTS OF STAFF & STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEYS – NOVEMBER 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors/categories</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Very good scored the highest rating (19) • Good scored the second highest rating (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>• Difficult (2) • Moderate (2) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Very good scored the highest rating (19) • Good scored the second highest rating (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>• Difficult (2) • Moderate (2) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Very good scored the highest rating (18) • Good scored the second highest rating (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>• Difficult (2) • Moderate (2) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Good scored the highest rating (16) • Very good scored the second highest rating (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>• Difficult (3) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Very good (17) • Good (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>• Difficult (4) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Very good (21) • Good (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>• Easy (3) • Moderate (2)</td>
<td>• Good (16) • Very good (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>• Difficult (2) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Good (17) • Very good (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Student knowledge/skills</td>
<td>• Difficult (4) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Good (17) • Very good (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Opportunities for student improvements</td>
<td>• Difficult (3) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Good (18) • Very good (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Feedback on student performance</td>
<td>• Difficult (2) • Moderate (2) • Easy (2)</td>
<td>• Good (13) • Very good (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merchandising Findings

The results of the teacher and student feedback showed variances and differences between the students’ perceptions of the descriptors outlined in the rubrics compared to the individual teacher experiences with assessments and rubrics.

The overall highest score for the students’ responses is Category 4.1 with a combined total of 36 which means that weightings and scores for the assessment tasks are the most important for student performance and achievement levels. Whereas the teacher responses (3) show this category proved difficult to allocate grade scores and weightings while others teachers (2) this appeared to be easy.

The highest individual student score is Category 4.6 with a rating of 21 responses. This indicates the importance of showing the criteria for higher performance levels for student achievement and expectation of performance. Again, teacher responses showed this was the most difficult (4) to compile the appropriate highest performance level criteria.

The summary of total responses by the teachers showed a spread of scores for ‘difficult’ showed a total 32 responses, ‘moderate’ showed a total of 13 responses and ‘easy’ showed a total of 21 responses which would indicate that most of the teachers found difficulty in describing the elements of performance at each level.

The teacher responses to the questions related to the unit of competency, the development of the assessment tasks and the rubrics.

5.1 Summary of Total Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Not Applied</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Elements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Performance Criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Range Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Critical evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNANSWERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses showed that one teacher did not consider the range statement, one teacher rarely, and another sometimes used the range statement. Most teachers did refer to the elements, three teachers referred to the performance criteria, and only four teachers referred to the critical evidence. Two teachers did not understand any of the components of a unit of competency.

The overall staff feedback responses clearly show the lack of knowledge as indicated by two of the staff members, shown in Table 4.1 Summary of Total Responses when compared with the responses as shown in 5.1. It also significant that a number of teacher responses relating to 5.3, 5.4 also indicates that the teachers did not apply or rarely refer to when preparing an assessment task.

Feedback: Merchandising

Most of the students (17 and 19) stated that they found the rubrics an effective tool for pre and post feedback. Three staff had the same results. The most useful form of feedback is verbal feedback for the majority (27) students. Whereas two teachers stated that they preferred written feedback. One teachers confirmed that that before and after feedback gave students positive indications of the expected grading levels and requirements for the assessments. The students preferred grading because these gave the students indications of levels of work and assessments. Another teacher found that the rubrics assisted with the mapping of elements and performance criteria. Two teachers confirmed the use of rubrics for as a useful tool for feedback.

Analysis: integrated into Report Section 6.1
Appendix 3: TEXTILES
Advanced Diploma of Textile Design and Development
TEXTILES

Graded Assessment in a competency based framework:

Textile Design and Development:

Where we started; overall issues and problems:

- Teachers are over assessing – marking performance criteria more than once or too many assessment tasks
- No standard templates available for rubrics, assessment etc
- What is a rubrics???
- How to work out weighting in graded assessment – what is graded, what isn’t and how much % should be allocated to each task??
- Trouble with matching performance criteria to assessment tasks
- Some staff have had very little professional development on graded assessment
- Some of the basic technical first year subjects end up being mostly graded as HD as the task can really only be assessed as can or can’t the candidate do it – no level of performance?
- Teachers are using different assessment models – this may be confusing to students
- How much written, verbal feedback is required in graded assessment?
- Some teachers’ assessment may not be AQTF compliant due to some of the issues listed above

What did we do next?

- Looked at current assessment practices in particular units of competency and attempted to introduce the use of Rubrics as a way of describing the dimensions and quality of performance.
- Encourage staff to revisit their unit of competency, especially required skills and knowledge and the evidence guide, as it provides advice on assessment
- Check if it’s clear to the student what unit is being assessed and is the title and code included?
- Introduce the idea that not all tasks have to be graded, but assessors must be very clear to students what is and isn’t being graded.
- Is the assessment criteria that will be used to assess the quality of the students’ performance clear, unambiguous, explicit…. (this is where rubrics come in)
• Try to get away from over assessing by mapping performance criteria with assessment tasks.

• Provided staff with examples of different rubrics and discussed how they can be used

**What staff said about Rubrics:**
“The rubrics were a useful tool. They forced me to really consider the most important factors to assess and more importantly exactly what I was assessing. Once developed they also provide clear feedback as to where the students could improve”

“If students have read the rubrics handed out at the beginning of the project they can cross reference their final grade along with written comments and an at a glance summary of all their completed assessment tasks”

“We were pleased with the use of the rubrics for graded assessment - basically it simplified the grading process”

**What students say about Rubrics:**

*All students like to receive the rubrics before assessment takes place.

“I like to see it before, it helps us to see what is important, and then when it’s filled out by our teacher I can focus on what I need to improve on”

“Before, as it’s useful to understand how we will be assessed and it makes clear what we have to do to reach high grades”

“Rubrics are a sound and fair way of assessing all students. They help give you an understanding of why you got a particular grade”

“I think as a tool for formal assessment the rubrics is very useful. It allows for easy indication as to weather you are fulfilling course requirements. For myself I find it effective because I can, at a glance, know how I’m doing”

“I like rubrics, they show me what I need to do and what I can achieve with the efforts I put in. It does show that the extra effort is worth it”

**Conclusion:**

Staff have indicated that rubrics are only useful if students read them. My suggestion is to read through them with students at the beginning of the class, explain how they work, how you use them, how they can help identify levels of performance, have a discussion about assessment with students; allow time to ask questions Students have requested through feedback that they would like consistency amongst staff in relation to assessment. “It would be good if all teachers were explicit in communicating what the assessment criteria is and all students took the time to take the information on board”.

Rubrics still need to be supported by oral and written feedback – they are only one way of demonstrating a student’s progress.
Students have indicated that they find verbal feedback extremely valuable. Rubrics must be reviewed after use – they will get better with age and easier to use each time they are modified. **Future goals** – Consistency amongst departments, all staff using rubrics, more professional development.
The following are the responses to staff feedback form

1. Please indicate the number of staff who participated in the feedback evaluation.
   Fashion Technology 1 Textile Design & Development 4 Merchandising & Marketing 0

1 (a) Total number of staff asked? 4

2. Teaching levels 2010.
   Certificate 1 Diploma 4 Advanced Diploma 1

3. Number of staff familiar with or used rubrics for student assessment feedback for previous studies?
   Yes 2 No 2

4. Responses to questions based on experiences with assessments and the use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.

   ** Each one of the questions listed below should have a separate pie chart

4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Difficult</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>3 Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Student knowledge/skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Opportunities for student improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Feedback on student performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks
4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark

4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading
4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks

4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment

4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels
4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation

4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses

4.9 Student knowledge/skills
### 4.10 Opportunities for student improvements

![Graph showing difficulties in student improvements]

### 4.11 Feedback on student performance

![Graph showing feedback on difficulties]

5. Responses to the question relating to the degree to which items impacted on the development of your rubrics and grading.

***** each one of these questions should have a separate pie chart?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Not Applied</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Elements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Performance Criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Range Statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Critical evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** please write up the qualitative responses to the following – may need to count as well?

**FEEDBACK QUESTIONS**

1. Did you find the rubrics more useful as a tool before assessments were completed or undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Unanswered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● RMIT University
2. Feedback is given by you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal 1
   (b) Individual with written comments 1
   (c) Rubrics 1
   (d) All 2
   (e) Unanswered 0

Please comment on which form of feedback, do you find prefer to use and why?

Verbal most useful 2
Written most useful 0
Rubrics most useful 1
Unanswered 0

TO LORAIN: Therefore the most useful form of feedback is verbal feedbacks.

Any further comments or suggestions?

Thank you for your valued time and feedback
5.1 Elements

- Not applied
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Significantly

5.2 Performance Criteria

- Not applied
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Significantly

---

RMIT University
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5.3 Range Statements

5.4 Critical evidence
The following are the responses from the student feedback forms.

1. Number of students currently enrolled in?
   - Fashion Technology: 0
   - Textile Design & Development: 5
   - Merchandising & Marketing: 0

2. Course level you are studying in this year 2010.
   - Certificate: 0
   - Diploma: 5
   - Advanced Diploma: 0

3. Number of students before they studied this program, that were familiar with or were rubrics used for assessment feedback for their previous studies?
   - Please tick: Yes 1, No 4

4. Please rank the following the questions based on your experiences with assessments, and use of rubrics as a tool for feedback.
   ***Each one of the following questions should have a pie chart & the same headings as the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Very Good</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicate weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Indicate grade scores contributing towards overall mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicate achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly describe the assessment criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly show performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly show relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Indicate positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Identify your strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Identify your knowledge/skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Identify opportunities for improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Provide feedback on your performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
again will discuss with you the writing up of the qualitative findings

Bar Graph for Table 4

4.1 Clearly indicate weightings

4.2 Indicate grade scores
4.3 Indicate achieving competency

4.4 Clearly describes

4.5 Clearly shows performance

4.6 Clearly show relevant
4.7 Indicate positive approaches

4.8 Identify strengths/weakness

4.9 Identify knowledge/skills
4.10 Identify opportunities

4.11 Provide feedback

TO LORAIN: you can find the attached chart in the excel sheet for a bigger overview.

FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

1. Are rubrics more useful before assessments are undertaken or after as an effective feedback tool?

   Before 4  After 0  Both 1  Unanswered 0

2. Feedback is given to you in different ways.

   (a) Verbal 1
   (b) Individual written comments 1
   (c) Rubrics 0
   (d) All 3

   Please comment on which form of feedback you find most helpful/useful and why?

   Verbal most useful 4
   Written most useful 1
Rubrics most useful  0

Unanswered  0

TO LORaine: Therefore the most useful form of feedback is verbal feedbacks.

Any further comments or suggestions:

_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time.
## ADVANCED DIPLOMA OF FASHION TEXTILES & MERCHANDISING

### RESULTS OF STAFF & STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEYS – NOVEMBER 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors/categories</th>
<th>Staff (4)</th>
<th>Students (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Clearly indicated the weightings or scores assigned to assessment tasks</td>
<td>Easy (3)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate (1)</td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good scored the second highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Indicated grade scores that contributed towards overall mark</td>
<td>Easy (3)</td>
<td>Excellent (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate (1)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good scored the second highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Indicated achieving competency standards before grading</td>
<td>Moderate (2)</td>
<td>Very good scored the highest rating (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy (1)</td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult (1)</td>
<td>Good scored the second highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Clearly described the dimensions of performance for assessment tasks</td>
<td>Moderate (2)</td>
<td>Satisfaction (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy (2)</td>
<td>Excellent scored the highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very good scored the second highest rating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Clearly showed quality performance levels or descriptions of criteria for assessment</td>
<td>Moderate (2)</td>
<td>Very good (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy (2)</td>
<td>Good (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Clearly showed relevant criteria – descriptions for determining performance at higher levels</td>
<td>Moderate (4)</td>
<td>Very good (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Positive approaches to learning with high degree of motivation</td>
<td>Difficult (3)</td>
<td>Good (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate (1)</td>
<td>Very good (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Student individual strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Student knowledge/skills</td>
<td>Moderate (4)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Textile Findings**

The results of student responses showed that Category (4.1) and (4.3) rated the highest scores which indicated the students found that the weighting of the scores assigned to assessment tasks and achieving competency standards before grading was most important for performance achievement levels. Overall the student responses showed they were satisfied with use of the rubrics with a rating score of (12) for satisfaction.

The scores from the teacher responses showed that some of the tasks in the Categories (4.1)(4.2) were considered to be eat, and the more complex assessment descriptors proved to be moderate to more difficult particularly in the Categories (4.6)(4.7)(4.8.)(4.9) and (4.10).

The teacher responses as listed in Q5. of the Staff Feedback Forms showed that four teachers found that the elements were significant in the development of the rubrics, two teachers rarely use the performance criteria, three teachers sometimes referred to the range statements, and one rarely referred to the range statement. Two teachers sometimes referred to the critical evidence, and one teacher rarely referred to the critical evidence statement in a unit of competency.

**Textiles Feedback**

Three of the teachers preferred while four of the students preferred verbal feedback instead of written no responses for rubrics as a form of feedback.

**Analysis: integrated into Report Section 6.**
Appendix 4 Graded Assessment Mixed Model

SCHOOL OF FASHION AND TEXTILES GRADED ASSESSMENT MIXED MODEL 2011
BRIEF
The aim of this project is to learn about the technical considerations involved with printing a repeat pattern.
It will involve accurately converting a swiss repeat into artwork on film that can be exposed photographically. Advanced workstation set up, including table prep, stop setting, strike off and selecting appropriate substrate. You will also be required to develop colourways and construct a professional swatch book.

ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Not Yet Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpret production requirements</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apply screen printing procedure</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Produce Textile printed sample</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Signed……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… Final Grade:

Loraine Grant: 1/3/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria:</th>
<th>NYC</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CDI</th>
<th>CHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printed Length 40%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 1 completed length of fabric, 2 metres in length</td>
<td>Inadequate demonstration of printing processes, technique and mediums appropriate to selected substrate.</td>
<td>Adequate demonstration of printing processes, technique and mediums appropriate to selected substrate.</td>
<td>Good demonstration of printing processes, technique and mediums appropriate to selected substrate.</td>
<td>Very good demonstration of printing processes, technique and mediums appropriate to selected substrate.</td>
<td>Exceptional demonstration of printing processes, technique and mediums appropriate to selected substrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Print is positioned in middle of fabric printed straight – leaving equal amount of selvage on each side.</td>
<td>Inadequate analysis to determine quality and modifications to printing techniques, processes or materials</td>
<td>Adequate analysis to determine quality and modifications to printing techniques, processes or materials</td>
<td>Good analysis to determine quality and modifications to printing techniques, processes or materials</td>
<td>Very good analysis to determine quality and modifications to printing techniques, processes or materials</td>
<td>Exceptional analysis to determine quality and modifications to printing techniques, processes or materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Selvedges are completely clean</td>
<td>Inadequate print quality on all levels</td>
<td>Adequate print quality on all levels</td>
<td>Good print quality on all levels</td>
<td>Very good print quality on all levels</td>
<td>Exceptional print quality on all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Print quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Swatch Book 40%** |     |    |    |     |     |
| □ Header with name | Swatch book is unsatisfactory. Demonstrates unprofessional construction including layout of text and finishing | Swatch book is adequate. Demonstrates professional construction including layout of text and finishing | Swatch book is good. Demonstrates skilful and professional construction including layout of text and finishing | Swatch book is very good. Demonstrates skilful and professional construction including layout of text and finishing | Swatch book is exemplary. Demonstrates highly skilful and professional construction including layout of text and finishing |
| □ Care instructions and fibre content on back of header | Insufficient care instructions and print information on back | Good care instructions and print information on back | Detailed care instructions and print information on back | Very good understanding of colourways | Highly detailed care instructions and print information on back |
| □ 4 Colourways cut to size ,straight and appropriately finished | Unsatisfactory understanding of colourways | Adequate understanding of colourways | Good understanding of colourways | Very good understanding of colourways | Exemplary understanding of colourways |

| **Technical File 20%** |     |    |    |     |     |
| □ Technical file demonstrates unsatisfactory documentation. Does not include all required technical information and specifications. | Technical file demonstrates satisfactory documentation. Includes most required technical information and specifications. | Technical file demonstrates good documentation. Includes all required technical information and specifications. | Technical file demonstrates very good documentation - is mostly clean, neat and logical. Includes all required technical information and specifications. | Technical file demonstrates exceptional documentation - is clean, neat and logically organised including all required technical information and specifications. | Technical file demonstrates overall exceptional documentation - is clean, neat and logically organised including all required technical information and specifications. |
| □ Section of strike off cut down and labelled, quality standards met. | Printing process, technique and medium used are not analysed or documented | Printing process, technique and medium used are briefly documented to determine necessary modifications to printing | Printing process, technique and medium used are analysed to determine necessary modifications to printing | Printing process, technique and medium used are thoroughly analysed to determine necessary modifications to printing | Printing process, technique and medium used are thoroughly analysed to determine necessary modifications to printing |
| □ colour swatches and recipes included for length and colourways | Fabric Swatch included with statement about fabric selection. | | | | |
GRADED ASSESSMENT MIXED MODEL FOR AQF Levels 3 & 4

EXAMPLE 2: For task orientated learning and where Not all tasks need to be graded.

PROGRAM: C5220 DIPLOMA OF APPLIED FASHION DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY

COURSE TITLE: Interact & Network with Fashion Industry Participants

RMIT CODE: EMPL5599C NATIONAL CODE: LMTFD4006B

Compulsory Ungraded assessment tasks that must be completed prior to the graded assessment tasks. (Assessment tasks 1,2 & 3 must all be completed successfully to be deemed competent and pass this course). Complete minimum 60 hours Workplacement including submitting Workplace documentation of: Workplace agreement form, Host Report, Time sheets (Original Hard Copy) & Journal (via blackboard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graded Assessment tasks</th>
<th>High Distinction/ HD</th>
<th>Distinction/ CDI</th>
<th>Credit/ CR</th>
<th>Pass/ PA</th>
<th>Fail/ NN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A very detailed informative report on a wide range of roles of different fashion industry participants. Report contains extensive information on how the company relays information on design and production concepts and requirements used by company. Demonstrating a high level of research and analytical presentation of the information sourced while</td>
<td>Report contains information on the roles the immediate fashion industry participants worked with at the work placement and included people within the organisation and some people external to the company, i.e. suppliers or manufacturers. Report contains information</td>
<td>Report contains information on the roles the immediate fashion industry participants they worked with at the workplace and included some of the other people within the organisation which they did not work with. Report contains information -relaying design and</td>
<td>Report contains the basic information on the roles of only the immediate fashion industry participants they worked with at the workplace. Report contains basic information -relaying design and production concepts and requirements used by company that they observed as</td>
<td>Report does not contain information on the roles of the immediate fashion industry participants they worked with at the workplace. Report does not contain basic information -relaying design and production concepts and requirements used by company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workplace industry Report

Pass/ PA Competent

Fail/ NN Not Competent
| Personal Resume | Resume - Information was accurate & concise. Student demonstrated a wide range of skills to communicate their capabilities of training and qualifications undertaken as part of their studies to a potential employer. Included a range of graduate attributes outside of their training and qualification to potential employer. Resume was formatted in a professional and engaging format with clear attention to detail. | Resume - Information was accurate clearly understood and relevant. Student demonstrated a range of skills to communicate their capabilities of training and qualification undertaken as part of their studies to a potential employer. Included some graduate attributes outside of their training and qualification to potential employer. Resume was formatted in a logical and easy to understand way. | Resume -Majority of information was accurate clearly understood and/or relevant. Student demonstrated a range of skills to communicate their capabilities of training and qualification undertaken as part of their studies to a potential employer. Format presentation could be viewed and printed to be presented to a potential employer. Resume was formatted in an appropriate and easy to read way. | Basic resume - contained minimum information in basic format. Not all information was accurate clearly understood and/or relevant. Student demonstrated a range of skills to communicate their capabilities of training and qualification undertaken as part of their studies to a potential employer. Format presentation could be viewed and printed to be presented to a potential employer. | Poorly produced resume - basic required information incomplete. Student failed to demonstrate adequate skills to communicate the capabilities of training and qualification undertaken as part of their studies. Format presentation could not viewed or would not be able to be printed and presented to a potential employer. |

Comments

Signed: ____________________________________________________________
Mixed Model for School of Fashion and Textiles

*Information to be used and considered when rubric is developed as part of mixed Model for School of Fashion and Textiles*

A student must be deemed competent against all elements of the U of C before graded competency can be awarded. If a student is NOT competent in ANY element of the U of C cannot be deemed competent for the whole U of C.

Criteria as listed in the Rubric MUST be specific to the course and required elements and Learning criteria. Not generic terms but relevant to what students are to cover in the course.

No percentages to be included in the marking result. It is acceptable to use a percentage weighting for each assessable task.

**Recommendations when using this model:**

Rubric was most useful as a pre-assessment tool to be given to the students initially as a guide to the expectations of the assessment requirements and not as a feedback tool. Students stated that as a feedback tool a rubric is to generic and did not give enough information on their individual work. It is still important to have individual feedback to students.

Staff where possible should work together as a team when developing descriptors for the rubrics. If this is not possible staff using the rubric should moderate and have clear understanding of descriptors and requirements before implementing as an assessment tool.

Project found that if the students were involved in the development of the rubrics they found it to be very positive learning environment and had a far better understanding of the learning and assessment requirements.

Staff should undertake professional development in Competency based training and grading competency as required.
Challenges of the Project

Identify the conceptual viewpoints that are in place that are posing challenges for the implementation of the project outcomes

- There is a conceptual block by some staff on the training package and its content.
- Unit of Competency – inconsistency in unpacking/matching assessment to elements, performance criteria, range statement and critical evidence
- Grading competency verses % Assessment
- Rubric development – staff understanding and ownership
- Staff engagement in the whole process
- Consistency across department on what is being handed to students

Project Outcomes

Report Purpose

- What are the requirements of the report
- What worked well in the project?
- What processes/practices did the project team agree were positive?
- What things were useful and practical?
- See the report a way to focus – tangible practices that can be carried out templates/examples
- Professional Development Plan
- Identify fundamental areas that need to be endorsed. Maximum & minimum practices that have been identified.
- Practical practices
- Flexible approach
- Rubric development

Findings

Do the proposals & recommendations constitute a model? Have we done enough in terms of guidance and development? Or is it more of a:

- Framework with:
- Principles/good practice
- Goals
- Recommendations put forward by John Milton: Information - Needs to be: Concise Clear, Accurate, Implicit and explicit experience

Project implications as discussed between the project team members soon after the meeting with John Milton.

- Project outcomes to date have been positive from students and staff across all three departments.
• The outcomes of the project have had to be adjusted along the way due to the updating and changing process relating to Graded competence at RMIT. Originally we started working around the 4 Models as prescribed on the RMIT website.

• One of the key areas that will need to be addressed in the current practice is the ongoing use of % marks as the Pass fail and higher grades still used by many teachers. No percentage scores should be written on any rubric (this is not referring to % weightings of different assessment tasks).

• There is a lack of consistency in how students perceive assessment and feedback from staff member to staff member and course to course.

• Some staff had found it difficult to develop criteria for graded Rubrics that clearly express the assessment requirements. And many still struggle with the concept of graded Competence.
LTIF – Graded Assessment project

Meeting: Wednesday 1st December

Attendees: Helen Smith, Loraine Grant, Mandy Penton & Lucy Adam

Recommendations

Helen Smith at the meeting suggested that she thought the better option was for the project to develop a model that did not necessarily have to reflect any of the current models. We discussed the possibility of developing a model that allowed for a range of different assessment methods and rubrics to be used depending on the assessment task rather than dictating one prescribed model to be used for all. Helen thought that this “Mixed Model” would be effective providing we have strong explicit guiding principles on the what/where/how of the model. Important when developing the model that it is flexible enough to be able to adapt to the ongoing review and changes that will be undertaken by RMIT in relation to graded Competence

Professional development in small groups for staff to work through graded competence issues and Rubric development, specific to the courses they are delivering. This is an opportunity to refer back to the units of Competency and make sure all required outcomes are being addressed. Develop terminology and examples that will assist staff. The training would also be relevant also for HE course and developing rubric against capabilities.

LTIF report on progress achieved to date presented to T & L on Thursday 2nd December, and requested an endorsement from the committee to pursue a flexible model until early New Year.

Project team would like the opportunity to articulate our School of Fashion & Textiles Model and we also request a further opportunity to present this model at an L&T meeting in early 2011. Helen Smith and Leslie Shaw have also requested that they come to present to outline the processes currently being implemented across RMIT and how the F&T model would fit into these processes
1. ATTENDANCE

Present: Program manager, two program co-coordinators, 18 staff members from fashion, textiles and merchandising. Two DSC members.

Welcome:

2. ITEMS

2.1 Policy directives; project– Loraine Grant
   • Implications for programs
   • Action plans

2.2 Graded assessment in a competency-based framework – Mandy Penton
   • Competency-based training
   • Assessing competence first
   • Clustered units
   • Relationships between descriptors of elements/performance criteria range &
   • Assessment criteria & evidence guide
   • Different assessment tools
   • Moderation of assessment

2.3 Using rubrics to support graded assessment in a competency-based environment
   • Presentation of research outcomes by Sherridan Maxwell

2.4 Practical applications – Loraine Grant
   • Templates, ratios, descriptors, clarifiers

2.5 Student engagement – Lucy Adam – presented a graded assessment rubric for Peer assessment

3. General
LEARNING & TEACHING COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting 10/2010

Minutes of meeting 9/2010 of the School of Fashion & Textiles' Learning & Teaching Committee held on Thursday 2 December 2010, 10.30am

Chair: Grant Emerson
Secretary: Fiona Gavens

1. ATTENDANCE

1.1 Present:
Grant Emerson (Chair), Fiona Gavens (Secretary), Julia Raath, Lucy Adam, Emma Lynas, Robyn Lyons, Carmen Pricone, Peter Bonnell, Dr Rajiv Padhye, Olga Troynikov, Loraine Grant, Verity Prideaux, Kent Williamson, Jane Conway, Pat Jones, Mandy Penton, Rhonda Ingwersen

1.2 Apologies:
Keith Cowlishaw, Chris Clark, Antida Liistro, Jenny Underwood, Tina Guglielmino, Kylie Budge

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of Meeting 9/2010 of the School Learning & Teaching Committee held on Tuesday 21 October 2010 were confirmed, subject to amendment that Peter Bonnell was present.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

3.1 Guiding principals Workshop
It was agreed that the workshop was very useful, but that more teachers needed to attend.

3.2
It was agreed it should be held again in a different time slot, and be advertised more widely.

NEW BUSINESS

3.3 LTIF project – Graded Competency
The following reports were tabled by Loraine Grant, Mandy Penton and Lucy Adam:

3.4 Progress Report on Graded Assessment for Competency-based Programs
Fashion Department – Synopsis of current status April 10

3.5 Graded Assessment in a competency based framework – Textile Design and Development

Loraine Grant: 1/3/2010
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The three teachers presented their major findings and gave examples of their work. It was a very positive process and they recommend further development of a “Mixed Model” with a major Rubrics component, which will provide consistency throughout the School of F & T (HE & TAFE).

It was agreed that the Learning and Teaching Committee progress with the recommendations as outlined in the presentation, and progress to the next phase. It will be a key theme for L & T in 2011.

Agreed.

Lorraine Grant is to advise Helen Smith, and Grant is to invite her to address the L & T Committee on the topic.

Grant congratulated everyone on their good work and their collaboration.