

## Computing and Technology

2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021, 2.00 - 4.00pm, Online via Teams

**Attendance:** 4 delegates from 3 providers attended.

John Earland (One Awards), Cheraine Griffiths (Middlesbrough College), Steve Sowerby (Hartlepool College of Further Education) and Ian Telford (Newcastle College).

In addition, there were two external moderators: Richard Hind and Alexis Notman (Middlesbrough College),

The facilitators were Patricia Oswald (One Awards Lead Moderator) and Dave Pickersgill (One Awards Diploma 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: Online Digital Video Production – KJ2/3/AA/08G  
Blog post of online distribution for digital video production
2. Unit title: Information Technology Systems – CN1/3/AA/01G  
Report entitled 'Applications of Information Technology'
3. Unit title: Information Technology Systems – CN1/3/AA/01G  
Presentation, with notes, on Computer Communication and Network Topologies

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 – Online Digital Video Production – KJ2/3/AA/08G**

- 1500 word blog post titled ‘Online Distribution for Digital Video Production’ involving research into the range of online distribution for digital video production.

### Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

<b>AC</b>	<b>Comments from delegates and moderators</b>	<b>Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail</b>
1.1	<p>Delegates felt that the AC was achieved although there were some doubts regarding the thoroughness of the explanations.</p> <p>There was some concern and discussion regarding possible plagiarism (as evidence, an unattributed quote from a 2012 document available on the internet was discovered during the event). Discussion regarding the tone of blogs followed. It was felt that, in a blog, full academic referencing was not required. However, a comment (for example: as seen in XXX journal) would be helpful. A reference list should be expected as a separate document and plagiarism should always be challenged.</p>	Pass

## Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	Subject knowledge was apparent. However, this was felt to be of a pass standard, not merit. A very good grasp of the knowledge base is not demonstrated.	Pass
7a	The script was felt to be a 'challenging read.' The fluency was deemed not to be adequate, and there seemed to be a lack of logical grasp. There were also several spelling errors/typos in the script which impacted on the fluency of the script.	Pass

### **Sample 2** – Information Technologies Systems – CN1/3/AA/01G

- Report entitled 'Applications of Information Technology.'
- Two sections: 1000, 500 words.

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators on the task overviews.	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
	<p>Delegates felt that AC1.2 could be achieved via the second task.</p> <p>With regards to Task 1, although point 3 requests an evaluation, it does not give sufficient guidance. Mentioning flowcharts does not help. The assignment brief could give more detail. Comparisons should be made and the student should specify what makes it worthwhile.</p> <p>The importance of clearly written assignment briefs which allow students to achieve the ACs was emphasised. Students should be guided to consider the AC.</p>	
1.1	The student provided a large amount of clear, detailed and well-written information. However, there was little, if any, evaluation. The use of flow charts did not help. Hence, delegates felt that the AC had not been achieved. Evaluations should show the strengths and weaknesses of the applications considered.	Fail
1.2	The script clearly distinguishes between applications and system software, hence clearly achieving this AC.	Pass

## 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	The script demonstrated a very good/excellent grasp of the relevant knowledge base.	Merit/ Distinction
7a	The script is structured in a way that is consistently logical and fluent.	Distinction

This unit is due for review at the end of March. The indicative content gives clear guidance. It was suggested LO1 should be changed from “Be able to understand” to “Be able to evaluate.”

It was noted that if AP3s were not clear, students could reasonably argue that they have been misled as they have carried out the tasks to a high level of accuracy and quality without achieving the AC. These points should be identified via internal and external moderation processes.

### **Sample 3 – Information Technology Systems – CN1/3/AA/01G**

- Structured presentation (with notes) on Computer Communication and Network Topologies to be used in the training of a computer technician.
- 600/1000 words

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
	It was noted that the task overview referred to a ‘presentation.’ The format (Keynote, PowerPoint, Presi ...) was not specified. This is good practice.  An indicative word count (600/1000) was provided. There was some discussion regarding the need for a word count in a presentation. Some delegates felt a time limit for the presentation was more appropriate.  It was suggested that the presentation slides had lost the images that were in the originals. However, the notes provide a good indication of what these were.	
3.1	All AC were felt to be achieved.	Pass
3.2		Pass
3.3		Pass

## Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	Delegates commented that this was a comprehensive piece of work in which complex concepts were concisely explained.	Distinction
2a, b	There was a short discussion on GD2 and the, possibly confusing, use of 'and/or' in the QAA documentation.	Distinction
7a	The notes provided were structured in a way "that is consistently logical and fluent".	Distinction

## Outcomes from discussion Covid-19 disruption

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

- All providers have had multiple staffing issues. These include family/staff illness and technical issues regarding the delivery of courses online.
- Students were taking part in remote classes and working at home. The reasons have included: (i) lockdown, (ii) children isolating and (iii) childcare issues (carer is ill or self-isolating).
- A range of IT applications were in use. For conferencing these included: CANVAS conference, Google classroom, Microsoft Teams and Zoom. In addition, VLEs were used to provide learning material, including recordings of online lessons.
- Some providers were able to provide remote access to specialist hardware for students. However, this relied on a robust broadband connection which was often not available. Other providers were using readily available applications instead of the specialist applications which are only available onsite (for example, GIMP as a substitute for Photoshop).
- Many students were missing practical/laboratory work and the use of specialist equipment (for example: games software and media hardware). Some providers were rescheduling such classes towards the end of the academic year in the anticipation that it would be possible to deliver such classes at that time. If this is not possible, they are anticipating the possible need to request for unit adjustments (as outlined in recent QAA and One Awards updates).  
<https://www.oneawards.org.uk/access-to-he/ahe-info-providers/ahe-coronavirusupdates-2021/>

- Some students were enjoying the new-found flexibility in their studies. They felt they did not need to attend physically in order to achieve. The increase in remote learning was leading to more independent students: a good preparation for Higher Education.
- From 8<sup>th</sup>.March, providers will follow the recent Government guidelines (HM Government: 'COVID-19 RESPONSE – SPRING 2021' CP 393). Many were anticipating a phased/partial return with the priority being given to students whose programme were practically based.

## **Agreed recommendations from the event**

1. If possible, assessments should use real-world scenarios.
2. Always use the command verbs, from the ACs.
3. Grade Descriptors should be correctly utilised. For example, GD2 must include 'and/or b with c.' If this is not achieved, QAA regulations are not met.
4. One Awards to review LO1 in the following unit: Information Technology Systems – CN1/3/AA/01G.
5. Providers were requested to be pro-active in suggesting suitable samples for use in standardisation events. These could be signposted at sampling visits or in interaction with Lead Moderators.
6. All providers to continue to comply with Government guidelines with respect to Covid-19.

**Date report written:** 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021

**Name of facilitator:** Patricia Oswald and Dave Pickersgill