

- **MQCMS Arts process briefing**

-One page flow chart where all the information on Amendments to units, for Arts faculty can be found on <https://lt.arts.mq.edu.au/>

-20th October is central deadline for update to all unit proposals, Arts is earlier

Missing field template > Review cycle (endorsement by dept HOD or course director.) > CMS

-Department CMS training 2 hour workshops start on 3rd with Anthropology. Workshop format - sit down with everyone and get as much in system then and there, as possible.

Smaller departments can join other workshops if they wish.

-Action Point: Arts L&T to run some additional workshops and CMS drop-in. Dates to be circulated.

-PACE will also need to go through extra approval process. Endorsed by faculty, has to go to senate for approval.

-No formal department approval in the system itself. Dept. needs to collectively approve everything before it is uploaded online (prior to workshop upload).

-How to amend unit: log into CMS (anyone can, already open. BUT system only works on campus or off campus with VPN or Google authenticator). All 2020 new and continuing units are migrated to MQCMS.

The template can be found under “Preparing a Submission.”

- Learning outcomes: 8 out of the 12 departments reviewed learning outcomes prior to April 16, 2019 and these were migrated into new CMS. Your DA should have a copy of the spreadsheet. Can be cut and pasted into the template. Those departments who did not review LO's prior to April will need to do so now and enter into new CMS.

-A large volume of work going into this process because every unit has been migrated to MQCMS. From 2020 onwards units will only need to be added/edited at necessary.

-When creating unit outline, it should be with the unit in mind (not an individual convenor). It should be as universally teachable as possible to mitigate the need to edit it every year. Units have to be somewhat consistent in their delivery, regardless of who is teaching it.

-Quantity of assessments (as opposed to type) can also be changed, but percentage and time on task has to stay consistent between sessions within a given year. For example, two 30min quizzes worth 10% each in session 1 could become four 15min quizzes worth 5% each in session 2 (either way, a total of 20% weighting and 1hr time on that assessment type).

-Changes for S1 and S2 to be set by October of the previous year. If you want to make changes to the unit every year then it would need to go through the entire CMS process and endorsement again, every year.

-The CMS system has knowledge articles on each field to be completed and explains how the field is used. i.e. handbook, unit guide

-Participation mark cannot be merely attendance. There must be an assessable task for which students can receive a specific grade; not just pass/fail overall.

Concerns and Clarifications:

-Students that miss class are typically the only ones who have to provide some kind of (make-up) assessment, which creates incentive to attend the class. If that changes to a specific marked task for everyone then that will create a lot of work for the academics, and give no extra incentive to attend the class.

-Anything assessed must be able to provide feedback to the students; but feedback can come in many forms, like group or verbal feedback.

-Attendance can only be tied to a unit's participation requirement if there is a specific learning outcome that can be defended as linking to that attendance.

-Suggestions for ways participation could be assessed:

1. Weekly blog posts: at the end of the session you could specify 3 posts/weeks from 13 weeks that will then be submitted for assessment (to reduce grading time).
2. Make it a larger weighting if it is to involve a larger amount of work/grading time.
3. Provide students with half of their participation grade mid-way through the session so that they know if they need to improve for the second half.
4. In class: tick a student's name every time they participate in basic tasks. If they demonstrate higher performance/leadership in discussions, they can earn more ticks and

ultimately a higher participation grade. All marking is done within the tutorial itself. The only time it takes outside of class is reviewing notes and applying the rubric.

-Exams/essays/quizzes seem like clearer ways to assess whether a student has been engaging with the weekly content.

-There are approx. 30 different assessment types to choose in the CMS, but it is still possible to qualify these terms within a unit overview (e.g. “major research” essay, “short” quiz).

-Description of task must then have direct link to aforementioned learning outcomes.

-Must quantify time spent on that task: students’ individual times may vary, but there are knowledge articles to help estimate an indicative time that a certain task may be expected to take. Students know (based on credit point-based student workload model) how much time the unit is expected to take overall, but this helps break down the expectations of each individual assessment (to help students organise and prioritise tasks). Preparation time must also be factored in (e.g. expected study time for a quiz).

It is also a useful tool for academics, to ensure that students are not being over-assessed or given too many weekly readings based on the amount of time to be spent on the unit per week/overall.

-Because each students’ efficiency for a task may vary, quantifying the expected time spent may create false expectations and lead to complaints/appeals from students who were ‘assured’ a certain task could be completed within a certain timeframe.

-Students don’t tend to view tasks in terms of “time to be spent”.

-Severe over-assessment seems like a rare occurrence, and yet so much extra work will now be going into preventing it.

-Why are units that clearly exceed the expected 150 hours (such as PACE or Law Moot) given the same credit point value as other units?

-Not all essays require the same amount of effort even if the word counts are the same (e.g. some have a higher degree of research involved). Will this model invite unfair comparisons between assessments? A: There are guidelines about research as a factor for calculation, and it is possible to quantify a specific number of citations required if you wish.

-If the weighting of any given assessment exceeds 60% (maximum permitted in Assessment policy), that weighting will need to be justified.

-For Hurdle Assessments: how the supplementary task is given has to be clarified in the system (this in the unit guide). An assessment is only a hurdle if it's the only one in the unit that demonstrates one learning outcome, and therefore requires failing students to be given a second chance to gain that learning outcome. Some tasks that were previously categorized as hurdle tasks may need to be re-examined if it's difficult to provide a comparable supplementary task (e.g. for group tasks).

-Mechanisms for feedback to students on assessment (i.e. the form the feedback takes, such as a grade, model answer, written, verbal, etc.).

-How will this task be assessed? Select from either "Individual" or "Individual and Group" assessment (if group work is involved). If "Individual and Group", what component is individual and how it will be assessed?

-Does the assessment apply to all offerings (e.g. both internal and external cohort)? If not, the different assessments have to be comparable and relevant. Weighting must also be the same for all attendance modes .

-Before your dept workshop meeting: suggest collation of all units in a course, talk to the course director/HOD and make any changes to units. Most unit information can be copied directly from old unit guides (with some updating and editing based on new guidelines). The department will be able to view these unit proposals after they are submitted, but this will be your opportunity to reflect on desired changes and discuss them as a department.