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Outline

1. Regulatory context ✓
2. Setting learning standards ✓
3. Implementing learning standards ✓
4. Assessing learning standards
Disciplinary groups

- Architecture
- Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities
- Building and Construction
- Business, Management and Economics
- Creative and Performing Arts
- Education
- Engineering and ICT
- Health
- Law
- Science

Sector wide approaches

- Quality Verification System - Group of Eight initiative. Individual unis publish results (e.g. USyd)
- Assessment Moderation - Funded by OLT (SP10-1843). Led by K. Krause and G. Scott
- Assuring graduate capabilities fellowship - Funded by OLT. Held by B. Oliver

http://disciplinestandards.pbworks.com
Assessing learning standards

1. Perceptions – employers, graduates, professional bodies
   eg. AGS/CEQ; professional body accreditation

2. Common test – ACER, CLA, AHELO
   “many graduates already subjected to skills testing for employment”

3. External moderation – UK, Go8, Krause, ABDC-Prof Bodies
   “Assessment is largely dependent upon professional judgement and confidence in such judgement requires the establishment of appropriate forums for the development and sharing of standards within and between disciplinary and professional communities”  (Tenet 6: Price et al, 2008)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>QVS</th>
<th>Krause-Scott et al</th>
<th>Achievement Mat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bach + Mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEI grouping</strong></td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>11 across</td>
<td>Start 10 across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers</strong></td>
<td>1 academic</td>
<td>1 per discipline partner</td>
<td>2 aca/professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calibrated</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data selection</strong></td>
<td>Stratified</td>
<td>Stratified</td>
<td>Randomised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size</strong></td>
<td>5% HD/D/C/P/F</td>
<td>1 HD/D/C/P/F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products</strong></td>
<td>Unit inputs/outputs</td>
<td>Unit inputs &amp; outputs</td>
<td>Limit to thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
<td>Quality assurance (QA)</td>
<td>QA &amp; Quality Enhancement (QE)</td>
<td>QA &amp; QE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Ground-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement Matters Project

Aims

1. Evidence of accounting academic standards
   - External, double-blind, peer-reviewed
   - Benchmark against national consensus (Bachelor & Master)
   - All HEP types

2. A model process for obtaining and using evidence
   - Assessing inputs & outputs
   - Quality enhancement & assurance

3. Professional learning and capacity building

Rationale: Improve, self-regulate, avoid perverse options

Adelaide, Curtin, Deakin, Griffith, Monash, RMIT, Southern Cross, Sydney, USQ, UWA, UWS
Achievement Matters - Method

• 2011-2013
  • Pilot (10 unis) + 4 cycles (expanded participation)
  • Pilot refines process (calibration, data collection, home application)

• Cycle steps
  1. Participating providers nominate 2 peer reviewers; choose task(s) to evidence national learning standard under focus; implement processes for data collection
     • Outputs: student work (minimum of 5 pieces) per standard, randomly selected
     • Inputs: diverse tasks
     • All data de-identified and reviewers anonymised
  2. Independent data coordinator ensures data and reviewer anonymity
Achievement Matters - Method
Cycle steps 3-10

3. Reviewers calibrate meaning of ‘standards’ and task validity
   • consensus moderation via 3 stage activity (pre-, at, post-workshop)
   • 20 peers (+ control group and professional group)

4. Software (SPARKPLUS) used to collect & distribute peer reviews

5. Profession evaluates inputs

6. Peers independently evaluate inputs, outputs & process

7. Data aggregated and returned

8. Post review debrief & learning

9. Participating providers implement any changes

10. Disseminate to wider community
Reaching consensus on assessment task validity
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Implement
Calibrating and grading to the standard
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Apply
- to assignment if student
- to marking if faculty
I’m confident rating assessment requirements and students’ work
Reviewer confidence pre-F2F

Multi Assessor Summary

Select Group: All Students

SPECIFICS

1. I am confident rating the capacity of assessment requirements to allow students to demonstrate the national threshold learning outcome for written communication.

2. I am confident rating students' written communication ability benchmarked against the national standard.

3. I am confident that my feedback, explaining my ratings and offering suggestions, will be useful to the assessor.
Calibration – task validity

Individual results pre-workshop
- Min & max (n=26)
- Mean ± 1 SD

Group results at workshop
- Small groups (n=5)
- Consensus
Calibration – UG student 1

Individual results pre-workshop
- Min & max (n=26)
- Mean ± 1 SD

Group results at workshop
- Small groups (n=5)
- Consensus
Calibration – PG student 1

Individual results pre-workshop
• Min & max (n=26)
• Mean ± 1 SD

Group results at workshop
• Small groups (n=5)
• Consensus
Confirmation – PG student 5

Individual results at workshop
• Min & max (n=20)
• Mean ±1 SD

Group results at workshop
• Small groups (n=5)
• Consensus
Participant feedback

Having to enter my feedback into SPARK caused me to reflect on the reasons for my judgement.

I expect this project will help establish national agreement on academic standards between accounting degree providers and with employers.
Impact on academics

Q4: The activity, requiring me to reflect on the students' work in the context of the agreed national academic standards, changed my understanding of academic standards for written communication that might apply locally.
Outline

1. Regulatory context ✓
2. Setting learning standards ✓
3. Implementing learning standards ✓
4. Assessing learning standards ✓
5. Learned
6. Q & A
Learned

1. Ownership of ground up & joint development
2. Renewed focus on program in curriculum renewal
3. Differentiate niche from others
4. Rethinking assessment (eg. capstone, authentic)
5. Refined language eg. teaching vs learning standards
6. Not an island eg. influence policy; joint custodianship
7. Must harmonise with professional accreditation
8. Biased judgements unless calibrated
9. Collaboration builds capacity around assessment (ie. QE & QA)
😊 Thank you