

Setting Targets and Thresholds

Once Indicators for each Graduate Attribute have been identified you will be able to make decisions about the targets your program has for its graduates as well as decisions about thresholds for success.

Target: the *intended level of learning proficiency* on a given assignment or at the conclusion of a course or program.

Threshold: the *minimum acceptable level of proficiency* for success on a given assignment, course or program.

An example of how targets and thresholds could be incorporated into an assessment is shown below. It shows a rubric used to assess specific indicators, where the *threshold* and *target* descriptions are shown.

APSC-XXX (2010-2011) Example assessment overview for an assignment (e.g. final report)

Part I: Criteria for CEAB accreditation and assignment grade					
	1 <i>(not demonstrated)</i>	2 <i>(marginal)</i>	3 <i>(meets expectations)</i>	4 <i>(outstanding)</i>	Mark
Information Management <small>3.04-FY4: Gathers info</small>	No significant information used, not cited; blatant plagiarism.	Insufficient usage; improper citations.	Gathers and uses information from appropriate sources, including applicable standards, patents, regulations as appropriate, with proper citations	Uses information from multiple authoritative, objective, reliable sources; cited and formatted properly	/4
Project Management <small>3.11-FY1: Manage time and money</small>	No useful timeline or budget; missed meetings; inappropriate safety considerations	Poor timeline or budget; infrequent meetings; minor safety problems	Plans and efficiently manages time and money; regular meetings; safety considerations are clear	Efficient, excellent plan presented; detailed budget; potential risks foreseen and mitigated.	/4
Design process <small>3.04-FY1: Uses process</small>	No discussion of design process.	Generic design process described.	Describes design process used to design system, component, or process to solve open-ended complex problem.	Develops appropriate design process for project needs, with plans for analyzing progress and revising as needed	/4 x2 = /8
Design Evaluation <small>3.04-FY7: Compares solution</small>	No mention of functional specifications	Functional specifications are mentioned in parallel to design solution	Compares the design solution against the problem objective	Prioritizes functional specifications with justification of level of consideration in design solution	/4
Sustainability <small>3.09-FY4: Sustainability in decisions</small>	No consideration of societal or ecological impact.	Some sustainable considerations mentioned but no clear evidence of impact on decision making.	Incorporates sustainability considerations in decision making (societal and ecological)	Well-reasoned analysis of societal and ecological factors, with risks mitigated where possible	/4

threshold

target