MODULE 4 · NOTES

Designing the Assessment

R A D C

Collaboration Competency for ESD: Designing, Teaching and Assessing Collaboration
Micro Certificate 2 · Assessing and Auditing the Collaboration Competency

LEARNING OUTCOME

By the end of this module, you will be able to: write a four-clause assessment brief that produces individual, non-divisible evidence of Collaboration.

1 Two briefs on the same topic

One assignment carries the Collaboration competency. Whether it assesses the competency, or only knowledge about it, is decided by what the brief asks for.

Assesses knowledge about collaboration	Assesses the competency
"Discuss the importance of stakeholder collaboration in sustainable water management, with examples."	"After the week 9 negotiation, submit: (a) a one-page statement of the position you argued against, written so its holder would accept it; (b) a concession log naming what you gave up, at whose prompting, and why; (c) one paragraph naming an affected group with no party at the table, and what including them would have required; (d) one paragraph on what you now understand differently."
A student who memorised the lecture and met nobody scores full marks. Nothing here supports four rubric levels except length and polish.	Four clauses, four criteria. It cannot be started without having been in the room.

2 The clause rule

Write the brief in four clauses, one per criterion. A criterion with no clause means students were never asked for that evidence, so its absence cannot be marked down. A clause with no criterion is work you asked for and will not mark.

Clause	Criterion	What the clause must require
(a)	1 · Representing other positions	A named opposing position, stated so its holder would accept the wording.
(b)	3 · Handling disagreement	An account of the disagreement and how it was worked through, including who was given room.
(c)	2 · Who is absent	An affected group absent from the process, and what including them would require.
(d)	4 · Individual contribution	What this student changed or conceded, at whose prompting, and what they now understand differently.

The clause order follows the way a student naturally writes the account; the criterion numbers stay fixed.

3 The individual evidence rule

A group report is evidence of a group. Attainment is recorded for each student, so every group task needs an individual submission attached.

Fixes that do not work	Fixes that do
• **A bare peer-rating percentage** measures popularity. • **A contribution split decided by the group** measures bargaining about marks. • **A group viva** produces one performance, not four judgements.	• **A revision log:** what changed, why, and at whose prompting. • **A reflective account written to set prompts:** two pages is enough. • **A justified peer assessment:** valid provided you mark the justification, never the ratings.

4 Three traps when marking

Trap	Looks like	Fix
Marking the group	The group report scores 78, so all five students are recorded as Proficient.	Attach a short individual output. Five students in one group routinely land on three different levels.
Marking sincerity	A warmly written reflection scores above a dry one.	Mark specificity and reasoning: the named input, the named person, the stated change. Never sentiment.
Marking the position	Rewarding the student who took the side you would have taken, or who spoke most.	Mark whether the opposing position was represented accurately and a concession actually made. Two students on opposite sides can both reach level 4.

Volume is the fourth temptation. Length, airtime and the number of absent groups named are not the measure; quality of reasoning is.

5 Placement, weight and threshold

Decision	Recommendation
How many components	One component, not several. Split Collaboration across three and none discriminates.
Weight	15 to 25 per cent of the course mark. Below 10 per cent students under-invest and the evidence degrades.
Attainment	Computed from the four Collaboration criteria alone. Other criteria may carry course marks; state this in the outline.
Levels	Mark all four levels. The rubric is not capped for Collaboration.
The group event	Not marked for the competency. It creates the conditions; the individual submission carries the judgement. The practice run carries no mark at all.

BEFORE YOU GO ON, APPLY THE ONE RULE

Could a student score full marks on this brief without using the competency? If yes, the assignment is the problem, not the rubric. Fix the brief.

Key points

- A brief answerable from lecture notes assesses knowledge, not the competency.
- Four clauses, one per criterion: no criterion without a clause, no clause without a criterion.
- Every group activity needs an individual submission; mark that, not the group product.
- Avoid marking the group, sincerity, the position or volume. Weight the component at 15–25%.

Activity: Workbench section 06; optional Worksheet W3. **Next module:** the rubric you mark the brief with.