

Business

8th March 2021, 10.00 am - 12.00 pm

Online via Teams

Attendance: 2 delegates from 2 providers attended.

Vanessa Jordens (Middlesbrough College), Jackie Paylor (Hartlepool College of Further Education)

In addition, there was one external moderator: Lindsay Ogle

The facilitator was Patricia Oswald (One Awards Lead Moderator)

Apologies: none

Aims and Objectives of the event:

Aim: To provide opportunities for those involved in the assessment and/or moderation of the Access to HE Diploma to increase their understanding of assessment requirements, and to compare their assessment judgements with others delivering and/or moderating units in the same subject area.

Objectives:

To undertake activities which enable participants to:

1. Compare assessment judgements in relation to student achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria.
2. Compare assessment judgements in relation to student achievement of grade indicators.
3. Explore and confirm QAA and One Awards requirements for assessment.

Samples of student work chosen for the event:

1. Unit title: Management Functions – AB1/3/AA/01G - Essay
2. Unit title: Management Functions – AB1/3/AA/01G - Essay
3. Unit title: Marketing Environment – BA1/3/AA/04G - Report

The associated learning outcomes, assessment criteria and grade descriptor components were provided on separate sheets. The assignment briefs were not provided, instead a summary of the tasks was made available for participants.

Summary of feedback from delegates and moderators

Sample 1 – Management Functions – AB1/3/AA/01G - Essay

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC		Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	It was felt that the information was too generic. There was not a great deal of analysis in the first paragraph which had the heading for this AC but sufficient analysis could be found in the other parts of the essay to meet the criteria	Achieved
2.1	A detailed description of the main functions is present but again there is limited analysis. It was felt there should be more examples and application. The work was clearly referenced.	Achieved
3.1	It was felt that the student had not analysed the strengths and weaknesses sufficiently. In particular, the information on weaknesses was limited.	Fail

All the ACs refer to “an organisation”. Since, as seen above, very little application was present, it was suggested that the ACs should be altered to mention “a specific organisation”.

It was commented that the format was more like a report than an essay. It was felt that it would have been useful to highlight the ACs in different parts even though it was an essay. Also, the student had used more words on 2.1 than the other ACs so the response was not balanced.

It was suggested that this response should be internally moderated.

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
	It was noted that the QAA Grading Scheme regulations do now allow for grading judgements to be made until all ACs have been achieved, however, for the purposes of the session, grading decisions were discussed.	
1a	It was agreed that there was a grasp of the relevant knowledge base though it was better in 2.1 than 1.1.	Pass
7b, c	The arguments were limited and incomplete. It was not a very good response.	Pass

Sample 2 – Management Functions – AB1/3/AA/01G - Essay

AC		
5.1	The student had discussed the characteristics very well. The response was very interesting with good insight.	Pass
6.1	The importance of culture and staff working together had been discussed.	Pass
7.1	Achieved very well	Pass
7.2	Achieved	Pass

It was possibly easier for the students to achieve because the ACs had no reference to “analyse” or “evaluate”.

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	The student work showed excellent understanding. Some guidance would be given on format and spacing in feedback	Distinction
7a	It was consistently logical and fluent.	Distinction

Sample 3 – Marketing Environment – BA1/3/AA/04G - Report

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	The student had done a Swot and Pestle analysis. Discussion took place on whether the 7Ps should be mentioned but it was felt that the information as it stood was sufficient to achieve.	Achieved
3.1	The different processes of segmentation had been shown as well as the strengths and weaknesses for each one. They were addressed in depth but the work would have been improved if some conclusions had been made after each point, as well as having a final conclusion. It was felt, however, that scaffolding was shown.	Achieved
9.1	The marketing plan strategy could be more detailed. The student could have shown what would and would not work and how they would gather the information. Assessor could give word counts for the different sections in order to help the student as it was felt that the student did not have sufficient words left to cover this AC as well as the others.	Achieved

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	Excellent knowledge base	Distinction
2a, b	Facts were found, not theories. Could have used Porter here which would have covered theories. There could have been more application to working scenarios. If the centre had not added “facts”, it would have been a distinction. Could be used for Internal moderation or standardisation	Merit
7a	Introduction, middle and conclusion – in report format.	Distinction

Outcomes from discussion Covid-19 disruption

The facilitator led a discussion on the Covid-19 disruption. The following key points were raised:

1. All students were being tested in college as with the schools. After 3 tests in college the student could then get a home kit. Access students would be returning on the 25th March.
2. Some students had struggled because of mental health and self-discipline issues. It was hoped that face-to-face would help motivate some students to return and complete.
3. If it was felt that students were not going to achieve as well as expected. If this was the case, the course leader should discuss with the Co-ordinator and ultimately the Lead Moderator and the AVA.
4. It was suggested that Google Classroom might be a better platform than Teams for delivery.
5. In the current climate, if a presentation could not be delivered the choice of GDs and components could be adapted.

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. If possible, assessments should use real-world scenarios.
2. Consider the use of Google classrooms
3. Consider putting word count allocations against parts of the assignment brief to help the students balance the information provided as well as an overarching word count.

4. For presentations indicate the number of slides to be provided and give a word count for the associated handouts and notes. Always include observation sheets for presentations. Where possible the students should deliver the presentation.
5. One Awards to consider reviewing the Management Functions unit to include the word “specific in LOs 1, 2 and 3
6. Providers to suggest suitable samples for use in standardisation events. These could be signposted at sampling visits or in interaction with Moderators.

Date report written: 10th March 2021

Name of facilitator: Patricia Oswald