

Contents

Aims	2
Method	2
Participant selection.....	2
Review process	2
Timeline.....	3
Results	3
Assessment task.....	3
Collaboration.....	3
Service and Experience Design.....	4
Student work.....	4
Collaboration.....	4
Service and Experience Design.....	5
Post-calibration	5
Reviewer confidence and feedback.....	6
Conclusions	8
Next steps	8
Acknowledgements.....	10
Appendix 1: Calibration of assessment participants.....	11
Appendix 2: Workshop agenda	12

Tables

Table 1: Workshop participant and institution numbers.....	2
Table 2: Calibration of academic standards timeline.....	3
Table 3: Comparisons of reviewers' scores on collaboration pre- and post-calibration	4
Table 4: Comparisons of reviewers' scores on service and experience design pre- and post-calibration	4
Table 5: Comparisons of reviewers' scores for collaboration by team	5
Table 6: Comparisons of reviewers' scores for service and experience design by team.....	6
Table 7: Results for pre- and post-calibration reviewers' confidence.....	7
Table 8: Assessment item volunteers.....	9
Table 9: Assessment item elements.....	9

Aims

The Calibration of Academic Standards (CAS3) workshop was held at The University of Queensland, St Lucia campus on Friday 20 July in conjunction with the CAUTHE Mid-Year meeting activities. The aim of the workshop was to calibrate the final two the learning standards for Bachelor level tourism, hospitality and events graduates: Collaboration and Service and Experience Design. The assessment tasks and student work samples were selected from a third or fourth year Event Management subject in a Bachelor of Business (Event Management) program. The task for Collaboration was a Major Event Scenario (group) and for Service & Experience Design, a Feasibility Report (individual).

Collaboration for Bachelor level tourism, hospitality and events graduates is defined as the ability to:

- Work together with key stakeholders to acquire and convey knowledge and ideas effectively to achieve shared goals in unambiguous contexts.

Service and Experience Design for Bachelor level graduates is defined as the ability to:

- Tourism: Apply knowledge and skills to design and deliver sustainable tourism services and experiences.
- Hospitality: Apply knowledge and skills to design and deliver hospitality services and experiences.
- Events: Apply knowledge and skills to design and deliver event services and experiences.

The workshop and calibration process aimed to determine:

1. What is the quantifiable difference in grader variability on the assessment of learning outcomes in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design?
2. Does participation in the workshops lead to reduced disparity in the assessment of the students' learning outcomes in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design?
3. Does participation in the workshops lead to greater confidence by reviewers in their ability to assess students' skills in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design?

Method

Participant selection

An invitation to CAUTHE's 33 Chapter directors and Affiliate members to participate in the calibration of assessment process yielded 16 participants from 13 institutions, including six universities, three technical and further education (TAFE) institutions and two private providers and organisations (Appendix 1). Total participant and institution numbers for all workshops is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Workshop participant and institution numbers

Workshop	Date	Threshold Learning Outcome	Participants	Institutions
CAS1	Aug 2017	Problem solving	13	11
CAS2	Feb 2018	Interdisciplinary Inquiry Professional Responsibility	20	13
CAS3	July 2018	Collaboration Service & Experience Design	16	13

Review process

Prior to the workshop, participants were divided into teams and asked to review and rate the validity of a de-identified assessment task, in terms of its ability to assess Collaboration and Service and Experience Design at AQF 7. They were then asked to review two de-identified samples of student work for the assessment task and assess whether the samples met (or did not meet) the threshold for that domain. The participants provided feedback and justification for their ratings using the *Qualtrics* online survey system. Once all reviewers had entered their evaluations, the results of all reviewers and their comments were shared with all team members. The tool reported key metrics (highest, lowest, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation) as well as all verbatim comments.

There were 16 respondents for the pre-workshop survey. The anonymised results were published and circulated to participants prior to the workshop as a key resource so that each participant could

compare their assessments with that of their peers. On average participants reported that the pre-workshop review took two hours.

The workshop involved participants discussing and reflecting upon their judgments and the justification for their assessment of the validity of the assessment task and the samples of student work. The aim was for this respectful sharing of results and the discussion about reasons for giving the grades would help the assessors achieve consensus in applying the Collaboration and Service and Experience Design domains.

In two teams of eight people, participants firstly established that the assessment task was valid for demonstrating achievement of the Collaboration domain. They then repeated the consensus reaching process through open discussion, benchmarking the two pieces of student work against Collaboration. Finally, participants repeated the consensus-reaching activity with a new anonymised sample of student work; exploring and discussing their results and reasons until there was agreement on the threshold standard for a graduate. This process was conducted over three hours in the morning. The workshop process was then repeated for the Service and Experience Design domain in the afternoon. The workshop agenda is attached in Appendix 2.

Timeline

The tasks, responsibilities and timeline for CAS3 is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Calibration of academic standards timeline

Task	Resp	Date
Send workshop invitation to CAUTHE Chapter directors & project participants	Penny	6 April 2018
Identify an assessment item and a range of (3) marked examples	Paul, Pierre	28 May 2018
Set up a survey space (Qualtrics) for feedback on assessment items prior to the workshop	Penny	15 June 2018
Open pre-workshop survey in Qualtrics & share the items (Dropbox)	Penny	30 June 2018
Deadline for reviews	All	18 July 2018
Publish and circulate aggregated results	Penny	18 July 2018
Calibration of Academic Standards (CAS2) workshop	All	20 July 2018

Results

Assessment task

Collaboration

Prior to calibration, when graded on a scale of 1 to 100, there was a **range** of 10 to 90 for the assessment item, with a **mean** of 56 and **standard deviation (SD)** of 26.9 (Table 1). However, the written survey comments and workshop discussion, did not reflect the disparity in the ratings.

General feedback was that the assessment task provides opportunities for students to demonstrate collaboration through undertaking tasks, as identified in the Standards (p14), including:

- understanding self and others – through self, group and peer-reflections
- understanding organisational aims, culture and structure – by providing a detailed assessment, analysis, and recommendations on the implications of hosting the event
- communicating ideas verbally and in writing – by submitting a report, requiring a logical narrative and a focus on a strong persuasive style
- engaging with others to work in teams – by the group nature of the assessment

However, it does not require students to 'work together with **key stakeholders** effectively to achieve shared goals'. The execution of the assignment aspires to collaboration, but there is nothing in the design that 'forces' the students to collaborate. The peer review activity does not provide assurance that the student has learned anything about, neither that they can demonstrate, collaboration. At this level, the extent and scope of collaboration should extend outside of their 'group' of fellow students. Further, while the task requires students to analyse an event, collaboration requires synthesis (creating or doing) i.e. 'working' together with key stakeholders.

While students use secondary data to acquire knowledge of the key stakeholders, collaboration with stakeholders was theoretical rather than actual. Participants discussed potential evidence of collaboration may include meeting minutes, a templated diary, client interview, simulation, industry speaker or video vignette. However, real evidence of collaboration with key stakeholders can only be developed through authentic assessment, which ‘forces’ students to develop a client relationship, negotiate client demands, develop qualities such as entrepreneurship and feel the ‘terror’ of hosting an event.

Table 3: Comparisons of reviewers’ scores on collaboration pre- and post-calibration

Activity	Task	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Differ	Count
Pre-calibration	Assessment item	10	90	56	26.9	80	13
	Student work 1	20	80	53	17.6	60	13
	Student work 2	11	71	47	16.6	60	13
Post-calibration	Student work 3	10	68	62	17.8	58	15

0-50 NA = Not Acceptable / 50-100 A = Acceptable

Service and Experience Design

Prior to calibration, workshop participants rated the assessment task with a **mean** of 64 (Table 2), and therefore valid for demonstrating achievement of the national standard for service and experience design. However, there was a high **SD** of 26.6 and **range** of 16 to 100 for the item.

Participants commented that the assessment offers a good platform for students to demonstrate their ability to ‘design’ a service experience, through research and application of theory (or the ‘mechanics’) of event design. However, it does not require a **delivery** of a service experience. The SWAY, which was designed to provide students the opportunity to describe or show how the event would ‘look’ (‘visualise’) and ‘feel’, could be further developed to require production of a ‘professional’ event brief to a potential (or real) client. In order to meet the standard for this domain, the marking guide should adequately reflect the requirement for student to demonstrate ‘service and experience design and delivery’.

Table 4: Comparisons of reviewers’ scores on service and experience design pre- and post-calibration

Activity	Task	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Differ	Count
Pre-calibration	Assessment item	16	100	64	26.6	84	13
	Student work 1	10	72	52	16.8	62	13
	Student work 2	25	75	58	14.2	50	13
Post-calibration	Student work 3	11	65	39	14.1	54	15

0-50 NA = Not Acceptable / 50-100 A = Acceptable

Student work

Collaboration

There was a **range** from 20 to a high of 80 in the ratings for **student work 1**, with a **mean** of 53 and **SD** of 17.6. There was a great deal of consistency in the qualitative comments about the sample, particularly around the lack of engagement with key stakeholders. Comments included that a group of two is not sufficient to demonstrate collaboration, especially when the group (and the key stakeholder) is your best friend. The team reported that they worked cohesively and collaboratively, however their abilities for collaborating in a team may not really have been enhanced or challenged to grow, there was no requirement to move out of their comfort zone.

Student work 2 rated as a weaker piece of work, with a **mean** of 47, a **SD** of 16.6. The ratings were reflected in the comments that the assessment provided only a simple analysis and lacked coherence in the development of knowledge and ideas. There was no evidence of collaboration with key stakeholders. The peer-review however, provided evidence that the students may have learned more about collaboration, particularly ‘understanding self and others’ and ‘negotiating individual and collective interests’, through the experience. They reflected that they did not work well together, had different preferred working times, that one student compiled it at the end and they were disappointed that they did not meet the submission deadline.

Service and Experience Design

The ratings for **student work 1** ranged from 10 to 72 with a **mean** of 52 and **SD** 16.8. Comments included that students adequately addressed the event design aspect, but there was little or no consideration of how the event would **look or feel**. There was no demonstration of student's understanding of the connection in the SWAY between the items, research and experience. Others felt that the assessment design prevented students from fully demonstrating the service and experience design standard due to the absence of the requirement for delivery of an experience.

Student work 2 rated better with a **mean** of 58, with a large **range** in scores from 25 to 85 with a **SD** of 14.2. The difference in scores was reflected in the comments and discussion. Participant comments included that the student work shows a good application of events knowledge and ability to meet the 'design' component of the domain. However, there is no evidence of a link between the concept and the specific charity, therefore more consideration for the actual event and experience is required.

Participants commented that the assessment would potentially belong earlier in the program, as a scaffolding exercise in the development of this domain. Students could particularly use the SWAY element of this assessment as a bid or pitch for an event to a client. As a capstone, or final year assessment, an appropriate assessment would require students to stage a real event.

Post-calibration

Collaboration

Following discussion, participants were asked to review and rate assessment item **student work 3**. In relation to collaboration (Table 5), the work was rated higher with a **mean** of 62. The **SD** 17.8 was higher than the **SD** 17.6 and 16.6 for the student work 1 and 2 respectively, prior to calibration. By team, the SD remained similar for the red team and total overall, but decreased for the green team (Table 5).

The difference between minimum and maximum ratings was 58 compared with 60. There were 15 (rather than 13) respondents for this survey. Participant feedback reflected the previous comments that given the task does not require students to demonstrate engagement with key stakeholders, they have not demonstrated that they have met this standard. It could be speculated that the students have achieved collaboration amongst themselves, but there was no real evidence of this and no engagement with external key stakeholders.

Table 5: Comparisons of reviewers' scores for collaboration by team

Team	Student Work	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Count
Total	Sample 1 (Pre)	20	80	62	17.6	13
	Sample 2 (Pre)	11	71	47	16.6	13
	Sample 3 (Post)	10	68	43	17.8	15
Red	Sample 1 (Pre)	40	80	64	15.5	6
	Sample 2 (Pre)	11	61	44	16.8	6
	Sample 3 (Post)	10	52	31	15.8	7
Green	Sample 1 (Pre)	20	79	60	18.9	7
	Sample 2 (Pre)	15	71	49	16.1	7
	Sample 3 (Post)	30	68	53	11.9	8

Service and experience design

For service and experience design, **student work 3** was rated with a lower **mean** of 39 and a **SD** 14.1 (Table 5). This result represented an insignificant reduction from 15.1 and 14.1 in SD for the student work 1 and 2 respectively. The difference between minimum and maximum ratings was 54, compared with 50 and 62 for student work 1 and 2. There were 15 respondents for this survey. Interestingly, the reduction in SD by team was again greatest for the green team (Table 5).

Some participants commented that the student work adequately addressed the event design criteria. However, they felt that considering the constraints of such an assessment, the delivery an event experience was not able to be addressed. Others felt that the student did not show any understanding of the experience or delivery domain, and the SWAY did not adequately link the concepts.

Table 6: Comparisons of reviewers' scores for service and experience design by team

Team	Student Work	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Count
Total	Sample 1 (Pre)	10	72	55	15.1	13
	Sample 2 (Pre)	25	75	58	14.1	13
	Sample 3 (Post)	11	65	39	14.1	15
Red	Sample 1 (Pre)	30	72	55	15.1	6
	Sample 2 (Pre)	44	71	58	10.4	6
	Sample 3 (Post)	11	45	28	10.5	6
Green	Sample 1 (Pre)	10	65	50	17.8	7
	Sample 2 (Pre)	25	75	58	16.8	7
	Sample 3 (Post)	25	65	46	12.0	7

Reviewer confidence and feedback

The calibration workshop, including reaching consensus on the pre-workshop rating exercise and reflecting on additional student work in the context of the agreed national learning standards, contributed to an enhanced understanding of standards that might apply locally.

Table 7 shows that the confidence rating pre- and post-calibration for 'somewhat agree' increased from 33% to 56% for collaboration and to 72% for service and experience design. However, for 'strongly agree' the confidence rating decreased from 53% to 33% for collaboration and 19% for service and experience design. The confidence rating for participants who strongly disagreed increased from 5% to 8% for both domains.

Nearly 90% of participants agreed that as a result of being involved with the process they were generally more confident in rating:

- the capacity of assessment task requirements to allow students to demonstrate the national learning standard in the two domains for in tourism, hospitality and events.
- students' ability in the two domains benchmarked against the national standard.

It was evidenced during the workshop discussions, participants found it difficult to come to a common understanding of the interpretation of the domains. This was reflected in the post-workshop survey feedback comments which included:

- 'If the assessment itself is not specifically geared to address that particular learning standard, then it's hard to ascertain to what extent the student work actually does meet that standard, as the student is not really aiming to meet that standard.'
- 'It seems that different people interpret these TLOs differently, thus there is a high chance that teachers will arrive at different overall grade. It might be useful to refine the boundaries of what these TLOs mean; this may help with the development of assessments and then the marking.'
- 'Clearly the problem we all experienced is that there is a considerable variation between academics on assessment standards as they apply to student work. There is still some work to do to ensure rubrics are tightened and clearer.'

Table 7: Results for pre- and post-calibration reviewers' confidence

Question	Strongly agree	Some what agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somew hat disagree	Strongly disagree
Pre-calibration (n=13)					
I am confident rating the capacity of assessment task requirements to allow students to demonstrate the national tourism, hospitality and events learning standard for Collaboration and Service & Experience Design.	5	7	0	0	1
I am confident that my feedback, explaining my ratings and offering suggestions, will be useful to the assessor.	7	4	1	1	0
I am confident rating tourism, hospitality and events student's Collaboration and Service & Experience Design ability as benchmarked against the national standard.	4	8	0	0	1
The pre-workshop activity, requiring me to reflect on the students work in the context of the agreed national learning standards, changed my understanding of standards for Collaboration and Service & Experience Design that might apply locally.	6	3	2	2	0
Having to enter my ratings as scale in the survey tool required me to formalise my judgement.	9	2	1	0	1
Having to write my feedback in the survey tool caused me to reflect on the reasons for my judgement.	10	2	0	0	1
Total	41	26	4	3	4
	53%	33%	5%	4%	5%
Post-calibration – Collaboration (n=12)					
Following the calibration workshop, I am confident rating the capacity of assessment task requirements to allow students to demonstrate the national learning standard for Collaboration in tourism, hospitality and events.	2	9	0	0	1
Following the calibration workshop, I am confident rating students' Collaboration ability benchmarked against the national standard.	2	9	0	0	1
The calibration workshop activity, including reaching consensus on the pre-workshop rating exercise and reflecting on a third sample in the context of the agreed national learning standards, changed my understanding of standards for Collaboration that might apply locally.	8	2	1	0	1
Total	12	20	1	0	3
	33%	56%	3%	0%	8%
Post-calibration – Service & Experience Design (n=12)					
Following the calibration workshop, I am confident rating the capacity of assessment task requirements to allow students to demonstrate the national learning standard for Service & Experience Design in tourism, hospitality and events.	1	10	0	0	1
Following the calibration workshop, I am confident rating students' Service & Experience Design ability benchmarked against the national standard.	1	10	0	0	1
The calibration workshop activity, including reaching consensus on the pre-workshop rating exercise and reflecting on a third sample in the context of the agreed national learning standards, changed my understanding of standards for Service & Experience Design that might apply locally.	5	6	0	0	1
Total	7	26	0	0	3
	19%	72%	0%	0%	8%

Conclusions

The results for both the collaboration and service and experience domains did not convincingly confirm the effectiveness of undertaking calibration to improve assessor consistency. The calibration activity resulted in wide variation in the ratings and possibly some confusion about the definitions of the domains.

There are several factors which affected the results for collaboration. In order to reliably and validly assess the standards, the assessment task must do more than 'hope' that the students collaborate. Further, the nature of the task needs to demonstrate evidence of achievement of collaboration **with key stakeholders**. The calibration process was ineffective in improving assessor consistency for rating the student work samples due to inherent weakness in the task i.e. that no engagement with external key stakeholders was required.

Authentic assessment that 'forces' collaboration and engagement with key stakeholders is arguably the only way to address this domain. Completion of group, individual and/or peer review templates does not provide sufficient assurance that students have learned anything about and does not provide assurance that they have demonstrated achievement of, collaboration.

Confusion about the definition of the domain was caused by the wording in the Standards. In the examples of tasks that demonstrate collaboration (p14), the words 'with key stakeholders' are assumed, but not stated. Participants were therefore unsure about its necessity.

Participants' rating of the student work for service and experience design was also affected by the inadequacy of the assessment task. Students were not required to **deliver an event experience**; therefore they were unable to demonstrate achievement of the Standard. However, participants reflections in the post-calibration survey considered 'the constraints of the assessment', rather than the wording in the Standards.

The exercise highlighted the issues that arise when trying to retrofit and existing assessment tasks into the TLOs. In summary, the calibration process determined:

1. There was a quantifiable difference in grader variability on the assessment of learning outcomes in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design.
2. Participation in the workshop lead to no significant reduction in the disparity in the assessment of the students' learning outcomes in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design.
3. Further work is required, including the development of assessment items which are 'fit for purpose'.
4. Participation in the workshop generally lead to increased confidence by reviewers in their ability to assess students' skills in Collaboration and Service and Experience Design.

The results suggest a need for minor clarification of the domain descriptions in the Standards and also for the development of 'exemplary' assessment samples, which can be used to help participants better understand the TLOs. These actions will help improve the effectiveness of future calibration and peer-review processes undertaken by the CAUTHE College of Peers.

Next steps

Participants are keen to continue the process and the current timing of the meetings ie at the annual conference and mid-year meeting. The next workshop will be held in on Monday 11 February, prior to the CAUTHE 2019 conference.

They requested that the workshop be a peer-review activity for which triads develop and present a 'fit for purpose', exemplary or idealised assessment for each domain in each field. There will be a process of peer-review of these newly developed assessment items prior to the workshop. Participants volunteered to develop an assessment item (Table 8) which will include the elements outlined in Table 9 each for a particular domain and in a given field.

Table 8: Assessment item volunteers

Learning Domain	Tourism	Hospitality	Events
1. Service and Experience Design	Niki Macionis	Andrew Carruthers	Laurie Murphy (TBC)
2. Interdisciplinary Inquiry	Pierre Benckendorff (TBC)	Paul Whitelaw	Aaron Tham
3. Collaboration	David Beirman	Lachlan Kelly	Anastasia Yeark
4. Problem Solving	Mieke Witsel	Andrew LE	Laurie Murphy
5. Professional Responsibility	Marcela Fang	Sharon Hebdon	Elspeth Frew

Table 9: Assessment item elements

The assessment item will:

- Be at AQF level 7, preferably a final year subject
- Focus on one domain
- Worth no more than 50% of the subject assessment
- Have a 2,500-word limit or equivalence if not text based
- Include student instructions and marking guide
- Include a clear statement about the TLO being addressed in the task

Timeline

Prior to the workshop

1. Participant volunteers (Table 8) will produce an 'idealised' assessment item (instructions Table 9) for their nominated field of study and domain and upload the item to the online Peer Review Portal no later than mid-December.
2. In online triads the three volunteers from each domain (row) will review the items and discuss by teleconference during January, to 'compare, contrast and assess' their assessments as they are currently configured, AND seek to develop a further improved assessment that takes the best of each (and little of the weaknesses) to produce a 'truly ideal' (exemplary) assessment for that DOMAIN.
3. After the domain triads have completed their work, the five volunteers for each field of study (columns) will work together to 'compare, contrast and assess' their assessments as they are currently configured, AND seek to develop a set of guidelines around developing 'multi-domain' assessments – ie. capstone units for that FIELD.

At the workshop

1. The morning will be devoted to the domains – each triad will present their work to the larger group and the group will develop principles around best practice assessments for domains and maybe an ideal assessment for a DOMAIN.
2. The early afternoon will be devoted to the field – each group will present their work to the larger group and the group will develop principles around best practice assessments for domains and maybe an ideal assessment for a FIELD i.e. should we do capstones or not?
3. The late afternoon will be devoted to 'next steps' – what do we want to do next? Can we consider forming a 'collaboration and benchmarking team' who will 'experiment' with a couple of different assessment approaches – capstones v single domains v multiple domains (and which ones). These groups could then work towards presenting their 'new' assessment regimes at the next MYM for debate and discussion – or possibly industry critique.

4. The project team will develop a template and instructions for the development of the assessment items. The team will write a letter of invitation for Chapter directors (and invited colleagues) to participate in the workshop and/or volunteer to develop an assessment item. The project team will hold a teleconference during September to provide an update and kick start the next phase of the project.

Acknowledgements

The project leaders and project manager would like to acknowledge the participant who anonymously contributed the assessment piece and samples of student work for this exercise.

The project team would also like to thank Dr Mieke Witsel, Southern Cross University, for leading one of the workshop teams, especially given the exceptional personal effort required on this occasion.

Appendix 1: Calibration of assessment participants

Participants were invited from CAUTHE Chapter member institutions, many of whom were involved with the previous [Setting the Standard: Establishing Threshold Learning Outcomes \(TLOs\) for TH&E](#) and [Meeting the Standard Peer-Review of Assessment and Calibration](#) projects.

Red team

1. Associate Director Paul Whitelaw, William Angliss Institute (Lead)
2. Dr David Beirman, University of Technology Sydney
3. Mr Andrew Carruthers, Holmesglen Institute
4. Associate Professor Elspeth Frew, La Trobe University
5. Mrs Penny Jose, CAUTHE (Secretariat and Project Manager)
6. Ms Jane Gentle, THE-ICE
7. Mr Andrew LE, International College of Management Sydney
8. Dr Aaron Tham, University of the Sunshine Coast
9. Ms Esther Teo, Academies Australasia Polytechnic (Survey only)

Green team

10. Dr Mieke Witsel, Southern Cross University (Lead)
11. Ms Marcela, Fang William Angliss Institute
12. Ms Sharon Hebdon, Holmesglen Institute
13. Mr Lachlan Kelly, International College of Hotel Management
14. Ms Elise Lawrence, THE-ICE
15. Dr Niki Macionis, The University of Queensland
16. Associate Professor Laurie Murphy, James Cook University
17. Ms Anastasia Yeark, Kaplan Business School

Appendix 2: Workshop agenda

Meeting the Standard: calibration and peer-review project

Calibrating Academic Standards Workshop 3:
Collaboration and Service and Experience Design

Registration: from 8:30am. General Purpose North 3 (39A-208)Map ref I5, St Lucia campus.
The University of Queensland Brisbane

**Please arrive early for a prompt 9:00am start.

Workshop: General Purpose North 3 (39A-209)

Date: 20 July 2018, 9:00am-4:00pm

Agenda

Friday 20 July 2018

9.00 – 9.15am	Welcome (Paul Whitelaw)
9.15 – 10.00am	Session 1 Collaboration – Assessment task validity
10.00 – 10.30am	Session 2 Collaboration – Student work samples 1 and 2
10.30 – 11.00am	Morning tea Room: 39A-208
11.00 – 12:00pm	Session 3 Collaboration – Student work sample 3 Post-calibration survey and results
12.00 – 1.00pm	Lunch Room: 39A-208
1.00 – 2.00pm	Session 1 Service and Experience Design – Assessment task validity
2.00 – 3.00pm	Session 2 Service and Experience Design – Student work samples 1 and 2
3.00 – 3.15pm	Break
3.15 – 4.00pm	Session 3 Service and Experience Design – Student work sample 3 Post-calibration survey and results
4.00pm	Afternoon tea Room: 39A-208