

DETERMINING FINAL RATINGS: GENERAL INFORMATION FOR TEACHERS

In the first half of November each year a final internal rating for each criterion is reported to TASC.

Over the year numerous assessment judgements have been made and recorded for each student's achievement against the criteria of a course. Teachers, on behalf of their school or college, report an A, B, C, *t* (evidence of achievement below C standards), or z (no evidence of achievement) for individual students on each criterion in the course they teach.

'How do I bring all the separate marks together into a single rating per criterion?'



The process of determining a final rating in each criterion is shaped by over-arching principles:

- *end-points in learning*. Assessments done later in the course are typically more important (carry more weight/significance) when determining a final rating than assessments done earlier. Achievement in a criterion is **not** averaged to determine a final rating
- *consistency of demonstrated achievement* (for example, a single A at the end of a course when most are C marks does not necessarily mean a final rating of A)
- *the relative weighting/significance of an individual task to the final assessment of that criterion* (for example, achievement of an A on a minor test does not carry the same significance as a C- on a major, 4 week project).

There may also be class- (or cohort-) specific considerations such as the degree to which a 'z' rating on major assessments of a criterion might 'cap' a final rating for that criterion (noting that one 'z' in a series of otherwise successful achievements against a criterion does not mean an automatic 'z' final rating).

The various factors or 'rules' used to derive the final rating for each criterion for reporting to TASC are called a *final assessment rubric*. TASC expects that this rubric is written/recorded and is accessible to relevant staff. Articulation of these 'rules' is important because it:

- removes single-person dependence - if the teacher was away when final ratings were due would someone else be able to derive final ratings as intended? If not, a student might be given incorrect final ratings
- ensures consistency, accountability, and transparency - the same rules apply to all students in the class/cohort.

There is no prescribed way to articulate a final assessment rubric. What is important is clarity - ask yourself:

"Do my records and systems have enough clarity and detail that – based on the evidence of the assessment record and final assessment rubric – another person could make the same final rating determinations that I would?"



*"I have a student who is sitting on a borderline between ratings
– what can I do?"*

Sometimes a student's overall achievement might result in a borderline between ratings (such as C+/B-). Only one rating (and without + or -) can be reported to TASC. Such a final determination can have a significant consequence if it impacts the final award (for example, in a course where if a C+/B- borderline is determined to be a B, and that means the student will gain a CA instead of a SA, or an HA instead of a CA). The significance is even greater in Level 2 courses where an SA is evidence that a student has achieved one or more of the TCE's 'everyday adult' skill set standards (for example, if a t+/C- borderline is determined to be a final C, leading to an SA award).

In such cases there are several strategies that can be used to inform teachers' professional judgements:

- Carefully check the assessment record related to that criterion: have you overlooked any assessments? Have you applied the final assessment rubric correctly?
- Are the student's major assessment tasks related to that criterion available? If so, undertake a review of them with a particular focus on evidence for the criterion's standards. There is great value in seeking support in such a review from a teacher of the same (or a similar) course
- Is it possible for the student to undertake an additional assessment task focused on the criterion in question? If so, devise or select a task with as wider range of the criterion's standard elements as possible
- If the relevant course had a Quality Assurance Meeting, what did the data report tell you about your school's assessments (comparable with other providers, 'too hard', 'too easy')?
- If the relevant course was at Level 3 or 4, what did last year's Ratings and Differences Report say about your school's internal assessment comparability with that of external markers?
- Are archived samples of borderline student work available? If so, reflect on how past judgements can inform your final determination
- If the determination involves a borderline where an SA is related to the TCE's 'everyday adult' skill set standard in reading and writing, or maths, the [Australian Core Skills Framework](#) (ACSF) is a very useful resource. Noting that a TASC Level 2 course's standards in maths, and reading and writing align with the ACSF numeracy level 3, and reading and writing level 3 (respectively) one can consider a student's achievement against the relevant performance features noted in the ACSF. While the ACSF performance features do *not* replace the standards in the course document, they do provide a very useful benchmark to inform teachers' professional judgements
- In making such decisions individual teachers do so on behalf of their school or college, so reach out for support and guidance: from fellow teachers and from school leadership; and from TASC via your TLO if necessary.