

Business and Computing

13th November 2019, 9.30am-12.30pm

One Awards, Peterlee

Attendance:

4 delegates from 3 providers attended.

Jacqui Paylor (Hartlepool College):
Nichola Loughran (Middlesbrough College)
Lex Notman (Middlesbrough College)

In addition, there were 2 external moderators, Glenn Steel and Lex Notman.
The facilitator was Patricia Oswald, One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies:

Michelle Taylor (Newcastle College)

Aims and Objectives of the event:

To provide opportunities for those involved in the assessment and/or moderation of the Access to HE Diploma to increase their understanding of the planning and grading process and to compare understanding with others delivering units in the same diploma subject area.

Objectives:

To provide opportunities for those involved in the assessment and/or moderation of the Access to HE Diploma to increase their understanding of the planning and grading process and to compare practice with others delivering units in the same diploma subject area.

Planning Documentation chosen for the event:

Diploma Assessment Plan (AP1) Computing
AP1 Business

Unit Assessment Plan (AP2) Web Page Design (2 samples)
AP2 The Marketing Environment
AP2 Spreadsheets
AP2 Innovation and the Entrepreneur

Assignment Brief (AP3) for the above units

Summary of feedback from delegates and moderators

AP1 Computing

AP1 Business

AP1 Computing – good range of practical applications and the delivery of all Level 3 units will prepare the students well for HE. The choice of units enables the students to consider different routes to Higher Education. Scheduling stops bunching of assessments.

AP1 Business – good variety of assessments spread over the year which will allow for reflection and the building of skills. Clear strategy giving reasons for the structure and timing of the assessments. Skills developed progressively. Reflection on previous year has resulted in changes.

AP2s Web Page Design

Sample 1 had no strategy – assessment methods were suitable. The use of GD3 was correct.

Sample 2 - some improvement in strategy but had an incorrect interpretation of GD3.

AP3s Web Page Design

Both AP3s make use of scenarios which is good practice.

Sample 1 - ACs are indicated in the text to help the students but the page break at the end of task1 should be better placed so that the ACs are clearly linked to task on the previous page. Correct use of GDs

Sample 2 – Reference to a “Junior Web developer” is relevant to the students. Some attempt at contextualisation but still using the words “very good” and “excellent”. Incorrect use of GD3.

AP2 Marketing Environment

No need to write out all the ACs in the assessment column – the number is sufficient. Strategy gives reasons for method and how it will prepare students for HE. The choice of the electric car shows currency and it is built round a relevant business idea. However, the question was raised as to why students would be taking the part of a Marketing Consultant and why the assessment method is a briefing paper.

AP3 Marketing Environment.

The layout of the assessment is not clear with the LOs and ACs on the front page and then the ACs repeated again on the second page. This could confuse the students. The GDs do not use the QAA wording correctly with the exact wording of the GD written first with the contextualisation underneath. Contextualisation is detailed but is still using “very good” and “excellent”. GD2 had been used correctly. All 3 GDs are used for this assessment. All GDs are not required for every assignment.

AP2 Spreadsheets

The heading does show that the documentation has been updated since last year. No unit assessment strategy. Attempt made to differentiate between the Assessment Method and the Evidence of Assessment columns. The GD3 has been incorrectly used.

AP3 Spreadsheets

A scenario is used to involve the student and the use of a “junior systems developer” is appropriate. The AP3 is very clear and could probably be worked through easily if the assessor was ill (See below). Each task builds on the previous one giving a coherent structure. ACs are clearly indicated in the text to help the students. In the mapping LO has been used instead of AC. The incorrect QAA wording has been used. See information above but a good attempt has been made to contextualise without using the wording of the GD.

AP2 Innovation and the Entrepreneur

Some clear attempt at a strategy. It is not necessary to repeat the detail of the AC in the first column. Clear difference between the 2nd and 3rd columns. GD components are not shown. The command word “evaluate has been changed to “explain”. The assessment methods are very practical.

AP3 Innovation and the Entrepreneur

The mapping to the unit is repeated on pages 1 and 2 and is not necessary. The ACs are clearly linked to the different parts of the task. Good attempt at contextualisation though still using some of the wording of the GDs. Incorrect use of GD3 – only the first component used.

Outcomes from discussion Course Contingency Planning

- All delegates had problems with staff absence and agency staff. If possible, an agency member of staff should buddy with an expert in Access but this could be difficult with staff shortages.
- It was very difficult to get staff to teach Programming and Accounting in particular.
- At a minimum new or agency staff should look at the videos on induction and contextualisation on One Awards website.
- One moderator wondered if it would be possible to record teaching sessions which could be used again. It was felt that this was not possible in FE.
- Course delivery – different teachers might have different expectations and different personalities. Teams needed to work together and share resources.
- All delegates reported that resources were put on line and in some instances students could work through those on their own. An example of a very clear AP3 was the spreadsheet one.
- Marking could be discussed in staff room and work jointly marked. Checks could be made against previous grades.

- No problems occurred with lost scripts because they were all held in on-line storage or the Cloud
- Return of scripts – it was sometimes difficult to return according to the timetable. Two centres feedback on-line. One graded paper scripts.
- The LM stated that scripts could be returned to students before internal moderation providing it is stated that they were subject to IM in the same way as students are told grading is subject to external moderation. Concern was expressed about what would happen if grades were lowered. It was agreed that very few occasions occurred when moderators changed grades after a discussion so this was not really a risk.
- All centres had regular meetings to track results and traffic light students who might need extra help. Resubmissions were also tracked in this way.
- Transport and school closures caused more problems than the college closing

Agreed recommendations from the event

- Improve the strategy in the AP2s to give the what, the why, the when and less on the how.
- Check understanding of rules on GD2s and 3s.
- Make sure the exact QAA wording of the GDs is used with contextualisation underneath.
- Do not simply repeat the “very good” or “excellent” wording in contextualisation.
- Identify ACs alongside tasks to aid the students’ understanding.
- Use “should” when something needs doing and “could” if it is not absolutely necessary.
- Ensure columns 2 and 3 on the AP2 are not simple repetitive.
- Use current scenarios eg electric cars
- Ensure the all documentation is proof read
- Ask for a unit specification to be reconsidered if a LO or AC is not working

Date report written: 14 November 2019

Name of facilitator: Patricia Oswald