

Science

11th November 2019, 1.30am - 4.30pm

One Awards, Peterlee

Attendance:

3 delegates from 3 providers attended:

<i>James Wells</i>	<i>(Stockton Riverside College)</i>
<i>Jane Skelton</i>	<i>(Hartlepool College)</i>
<i>Linda McKnight</i>	<i>(Middlesbrough College)</i>

The facilitator was Sue Scheilling, 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.
4. Consider issues around the theme of 'contingency planning for Access'

Samples of student work chosen for the event:

Unit title: Core Science – essay and information booklet

Unit title: Human Biology – academic posters

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 Core Science (essay and information booklet)

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Not particularly detailed but AC achieved	Achieved
1.2	AC requires an explanation of the roles played within a stated process. Identification was included but not the roles played. The sample addressed 2 different processes and the AC required one or the other.	Not achieved
2.1	AC required roles to be explained. This was not evident.	Borderline not achieved
3.1 3.2 3.3	ACs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 covered the production of an information booklet. All delegates considered that the task outlined failed to allow the student the opportunity to achieve the ACs as the fit was inappropriate. Delegates did judge that the student had completed the task set but not achieved the ACs attached	All not achieved

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2a,c 7c	Grading not attempted as ACs not met	

Sample 2 – Human Biology Academic Posters

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	AC required structure and function. Delegates found this was evidenced for some cells but not others.	Borderline
1.2	AC requires the importance of cells combining and this was judged not to have been attempted.	Not achieved
	Delegates considered that the assessment task made it quite difficult for students to achieve the ACs. However, it was accepted that this judgement was made without knowledge of the brief given to students	

Grading judgements using GD components

GD		Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
	GDs not considered	

Outcomes from discussion Course Contingency Planning

The facilitator led a discussion on Course Contingency Planning. The following key points were raised.

Task 1 - Reflection on difficulties experienced in recent years

- Staff turnover, either one or very few tutors with specific subject knowledge, lack of ownership, effects on students when members of staff have been struggling with health or other problems for some time.
- Delays in marking leading to lack of feedback for students, Delay in IM preventing timely feedback to assessors leading to mistakes carrying on.
- Results not recorded therefore no ongoing evaluation

Task 2 - Suggestions for the following events

New tutor brought in quickly

- Dedicated person in the College to help explain Access
- SOS service from One Awards – moderator comes in and brings tutor up to speed.
- One Awards could produce a video that explains the essentials for practice in relation to Access.
- Mentoring service provided by One Awards (often easier to ask questions away from colleagues)
- A help section with common questions and answers (on web site)

Only tutor delivering unit is absent

- Schemes of work on line (also course guides)
- Possibility of bank of recorded lectures
- Modification to timetable/assessment plan (best if considered at early planning stage with 'what ifs')
- Initial plans to include some 'miscellaneous' time for staff and possibly early completion date. Both would allow some adjustment time.

Scripts whereabouts unknown

- TCA assessments
- Electronic submission
- Scanning scripts into cloud. Other personnel could then access this

Trackers falling behind schedule

- Value of communication and regular meetings
- Everyone to be involved with tracking results
- Open , supportive and transparent culture

Late resubmissions

- Management of resubmission process strongly embedded
- Short resubmission deadlines clearly stated
- Late successful resubmissions clearly capped at a pass
- Value of emphasising this with students at an early stage
- Discussed the need to prepare students for constructive criticism and resilience (expected by HE)

Major transport issues/weather etc.

- On line VLE – accessing work at home
- Management of phone contacts/ text systems

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. The assessment tasks chosen must allow the students every opportunity to achieve the ACs
2. The ‘verbs’ within the ACs are very important when designing assessments.
3. Consideration of contingency planning is useful for Access tutors.
4. The AVA could potentially develop further measures to assist providers when staff (unfamiliar with Access) are brought in suddenly.
5. The AVA ‘themes’ are helpful and allow assessors to improve their practice

Date report written: 13th November 2019

Name of facilitator: Sue Scheilling