

Business Studies

6 December 2018, One Awards, Peterlee

Attendance: 8 delegates from 5 providers attended.

Paylor	Jackie	Hartlepool College of Further Education
Davies	Carol	Hartlepool College of Further Education
Morrel	Lauren	Hartlepool College of Further Education
Murray-Webster	Fred	Calderdale College
Scaife	Deborah	Calderdale College
James	Richard	Stockton Riverside College
Robin	Nick	Nisai Group
Barlow	Jackie	Middlesbrough College

In addition there were 2 Diploma Moderators, Sandra O'Rourke and Glenn Steel. The facilitator was Patricia Oswald, One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies:

Rachel Dunn, Diploma Moderator

Carol Davies, Hartlepool College of Further Education

Julie Todd-Davis, Hartlepool College of Further Education

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:

Sample 1: Business Contract Law - Presentation

Sample 2: Team Building – Briefing Paper

Sample 3: Team Building – Briefing Paper

The associated learning outcomes, assessment criteria and grade descriptor components were provided on separate sheets. The assignment briefs were not provided.

Summary of feedback from delegates and moderators

Sample 1 – Business Contract Law

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	The legal terms 'offer' and 'acceptance' were explained	Pass
1.2	Evaluation was basic but just sufficient for a Pass	Pass
1.3	The legal principles of offer and acceptance had not been applied. The principles had been explained instead (see above). Too descriptive	Fail
2.1	The differences between implied and express contract terms were explained	Pass
2.2	The differences between warranties, conditions and innominate terms had been distinguished	Pass
2.3	Legal principles had not been applied to problem scenarios	Fail

Discussion took place on whether a presentation was the best method of assessing these Assessment Criteria (ACs) and the evidence which would be required for presentations i.e. a witness testimony from the assessor and possibly peer observations. Two centres said that all presentations were recorded. It was agreed that whether or not to record was up to the centre but the Diploma Moderators might find they may not have time to listen to recordings. One delegate felt that because there were no in-presentation references this would have to be checked for plagiarism. The rest of the delegates did not agree with this because the bibliography referred to websites and text books and it would be unusual to find plagiarism in a presentation. In addition, it was felt that the unit should be revised to include case law.

Grading judgements using GD components

In normal circumstances the student would be required to produce a resubmission prior to grading taking place. However, for the purposes of the meeting, grading was discussed.

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2 a	Facts and theories. It was agreed that the assignment did not show the use of theories	No Grade
	Discussion took place on the fact that the other components of 2 had not been used. The Facilitator agreed to follow this up with the One Awards Head of Quality who agreed that further components from “either b and/or one or more of the items from c” should have been chosen in line with the guidance on the Grade Descriptor.	
7b and c	It was felt that the assignment was only worth a Pass at the most because the ideas were limited and it was not a very good response.	No Grade

Sample 2 – Team Building

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Little comparison was evident of leadership characteristics. Would it be better for the AC simply to say “Compare”? Do Compare and Contrast not mean the same thing? Does the AC map to the LO?	Fail
1.2	No analysis – too descriptive	Fail
2.1	No evaluation	Fail
3.1	No comparison	Fail
3.2	No analysis	Fail
3.3	Some comment – more detail would be expected for Level 3	Borderline

- The student relies on one source. The Appendix is longer than the text and then Team Dynamics and Team Interactions are tagged on at the end
- It was felt that the word count was insufficient to cover all the ACs.
- The use of a scenario would assist the student to apply the knowledge required by the ACs.
- The command verbs are not used in the briefing.
- It was not clear what is meant by a briefing paper.

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2a and c	Makes use of relevant ideas with good insight. For a Business unit it would be more relevant to replace “ideas” with “model” and “insight” should be replaced with “analysis”	Fail – see above
7c	Not a very good response	

Sample 3 – Team Building Level 3

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Some comparison and contrast of leadership characteristics bur more evidence should be provided	Borderline
1.2	Some analysis with enough examples though weak on their effect on organisational context.	Pass
2.1	Some evaluation of leadership styles though only the last paragraph discusses the negative effect of a leadship style	Borderline
3.1	The content was just sufficient and the delegates felt the student was penalised by the number of words allowed.	Pass
3.2	See above comment on number of words.	Borderline
3.3	Comments are sufficient for a Level 3 assignment	Pass

It was felt it was interesting that the students indicated where the ACs had been met even though it was supposed to be a “briefing paper” but this would not affect the assessment. (See above)

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2a and c	See comments for the first Team Building assignment regarding the choice of components for GD2	P/M
7c	It was definitely not an “excellent” response. The delegates were divided on the grading of both GDs and further discussion did not change any one’s decision. Both the Diploma Moderators thought both GDs were Passes	P/M

Outcomes from discussion on Draft Assignments

The facilitator led a discussion on the policy and practice of providers in relation to allowing draft assignments. The following key points were raised.

1. What is your policy on allowing draft assignments? Why this is your policy and when was it last reviewed?

- Not all delegates had seen the Drafts policy or knew when it was due to be revised. Currently no drafts are allowed.

2. What are the problems with allowing drafts?

- The extra work involved
- Marking twice
- What can actually be said about drafts?
- Could lead to grade polishing if not implemented properly
- Should be the exception but would students start asking for it for all units?
- Problems when submitting work through a VLE?
- Will students complain if they have had feedback and still do not get the Distinction they would like?
- Good assignment briefs and clear contextualisation would help to ensure that drafts were not necessary.

3. What are the advantages of using drafts?

- Confidence building for students returning to study.
- Help alleviate panic.
- Nip a problem in the bud if used with ungraded units before going on to graded ones.

- Clarity is essential in terms of ensuring equity of support for the students
- The possibility of handing in a draft should be clearly indicated on the assignment brief.
- Drafts should be attached to the work for external moderation
- The centre policy on drafts should be clear in the Student Handbook
- Would provide clarity for progression tutors or learning resource centre staff who do not understand the Access to HE regulations and should not be giving extra help.
- Workshops could be useful for Access tutors to give general guidance.
- Drafts could be shown on tracking form which would assist grade profile analysis
- Many of the benefits of the use of drafts could come from good formative assessment tasks.

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. Delegates to review their drafts policies in teams and ensure that QAA and AVA guidance on support arrangements are followed.
2. Identify on the assignment brief if drafts are going to be used.
3. Ensure the command verbs of analyse and evaluate are used in the assignment brief, as appropriate in relation to the ACs.
4. Ensure that the type of task matches the assessment criteria and learning outcomes.
5. Ensure that the contextualisation of grade descriptor components is accurate and clear so the students understand what they have to do to achieve a merit or a distinction.
6. The Lead Moderator will contact the Access to HE Manager about reviewing the specifications for Business Contract Law and Team Building.
7. The Lead Moderator will contact the Head of Quality about the application of GD2. **This was done on the day the report was written.**

Date report written: 7 December 2018

Name of facilitator: Patricia Oswald