

General Standardisation, 14 November 2018 One Awards, Peterlee

Attendance:

8 delegates from 7 providers attended.

Cavagin	Fay	Gateshead College and One Awards Moderator
French	Emma	Gateshead College
Sims	Denise	Gateshead College
Gibson	Dan	Tynemet College
Alderson	Zoe	New College Durham
Marriott	Jo	New College Durham
Martin	Jason	New College Durham
Irons	Alastair	One Awards Moderator

The event was facilitated by Patricia Oswald, One Awards Lead Moderator

Apologies:

Angela McLean, Tynemet College
Tania Porteous, Newcastle City Learning

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:

Unit title: History – Social and Cultural Development - essay

Unit title: Human Biology – Project

Unit title: Study Skills Level 3 - Report

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 – History Social and Cultural Development

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Detail of historical development provided with examples of changes both positive and negative in depth.	Pass
2.1	It does link historical development to societal changes e.g. impact of machinery and daily roles in relationship to health population and communications. Does not mention the Chartists or Peterloo or the development of transport and the role of women.	Pass
6.1	Two philosophical ideologies included with some analysis but it could be more woven into the work. It is difficult to assess completely without the full AP3.	Pass

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2 a and c	Very good level of analysis but could be improved with key dates and commentators. Some parts are more descriptive	M
5	Strong structure – flows well but less strong on referencing in text and some inaccuracies.	M
7b	‘Consistently unambiguous’ was this the best GD to choose? Some delegates thought it was short in historical arguments. Some spelling and grammar errors which could affect the ambiguity of the work.	Borderline D/M 4 considered it was a D and 4 thought it was

		an M
--	--	------

Additional point raised - Is the word count too small for the number of LOs and ACs being assessed?

Sample 2 – Human Biology

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	Information for this AC was found on p4. Detailed explanation given.	Pass
2.2	Details of blood (function and structure provided). Information for this AC was on the last page.	Pass
2.3	Very descriptive – no analysis	Fail
3.1	Explanation given of structure, however the links to function are a little vague – room for expansion. Some diagrams are not linked to the text.	Pass
3.2	Again, no analysis – explanation is too generic.	Fail
4.1	Explanation of the nervous system, endocrine control systems explained.	Pass
4.2	The linkage is not there between the different systems. Further information required on “how”.	Borderline fail

The delegates felt that it was not clear what the assessment method was. The assessment was described as a project and it was implied that it should be divided into different chapters. The sample of work was difficult to follow because of the lack of headings in the main text. It was felt that this assignment was assessing too many LOs and ACs. Some centres would have covered this in 3 assignments. There was a feeling that a certain amount of cut and paste had taken place.

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1b	Due to the majority view of the delegates that the sample of work had failed to meet the ACs, it was decided not to make grading judgements and to conclude that a resubmission would be required. This is the only option when one or more ACs are failed.	
2a and c		
7a		

Sample 3 – Study Skills Level 3

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
6.1	A detailed mind map was produced showing intentions – only one plan.	Pass
6.2	Detailed and clear evaluation – recognised the problems of mind maps. Considers what worked well and what not so well. No time line for the plan was shown no recommendations were made.	Pass
7.2	Report produced with conclusions rather than recommendations which would be the normal format for a report.	Pass
8.2	Bibliography produced for the report using 4 different sources providing the prospectus is seen as being different from a book.	

The ACs have been split from the LOs for this assessment which is not considered appropriate and this unit should be revised in line with the revision of the Level 2 unit.

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 has seen the Drafts policy or knew when it was due to be revised. Currently no drafts were 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?
- Timing of the draft
- How many times could a draft be submitted?
- Problems when submitting work through a VLE – only one submission is allowed
- 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. Explain the assessment strategy in the AP2 and identify if drafts are going to be used and the reasons why.
3. Do not split ACs from LOs
4. Ensure students are clear on the command verbs of analyse and evaluate.
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. Ensure that all staff understand that grading cannot take place if some ACs have not been met and grading cannot be based on a “feeling”.
7. The Lead Moderator will contact the Access to HE Manager about reviewing the Study Skills unit.

Date report written: 15 November 2018

Name of facilitator: Patricia Oswald