

Health including Biology 2 February 2021 Via Teams

Attendance:

6 delegates from 4 providers attended.

Jill Hedley (Northumberland College)
Kate Gibbon (Middlesbrough College)
Cath Fortune (Middlesbrough College)
Gillian Morgan (Redcar & Cleveland College)
Michelle Kelso (Redcar & Cleveland College)
Lesley Larkin (Calderdale College)

In addition, there were 3 external moderators, Anne Binks, Angela Ince and Dawn Benn (last hour). The facilitator was Patricia Oswald, One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies:

Marie Andrew (Stockton Riverside College)
Michael Sleeman (Derwentside College)

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: Health Promotion – Information Leaflet

Unit title: Contemporary Issues in Health Care – A3 Media Article

Unit title: Human Biology Genetics - Essay

The associated learning outcomes, assessment criteria and grade descriptor components were provided on separate sheets. The assignment briefs were not provided but a summary of the tasks was available.

Summary of feedback from delegates and moderators

Sample 1 – Health Promotion (Information Leaflet)

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Some analysis but no depth - just bullet points. More explanation than analysis. A lot of direct quotes. Level 2 type of writing. Part of the problem is the format which does not lend itself to analysis. There is a focus on being creative rather than the content which links to the GDs and the components chosen.	Borderline
1.2	Various perceptions of health looked at but the student has not really considered their own perception. Page 3 has a comment but it would have been better to give an example of their own and link it to one of the different models.	Borderline
2.1	More detail is provided here. The student has included different aspects within the different concepts. Some examples given but the information provided is again more at Level 2. It was felt that the student had put more emphasis on the layout than content. The response is very basic, an improvement would see concepts linked together rather than treated separately. Could have brought in the holistic concept to give a good overview.	Borderline
2.2	Little or no evaluation present. This command verb often causes difficulties. Need to look for strengths and weaknesses within the changing concepts. Student has not evaluated the effects on health and how the factors link. There is a focus on including pictures which are referenced but the other points are not. Some of the language is clumsy and quite subjective. There is a detailed reference list provided so some research has taken place. Students are asked to focus on mental health which is good because the time period is a long one - 150 years. However, there is no real depth. Student has not shown how treatment has changed over the years. Again, there is a problem with the constraints of the format i.e. 16 pages. Some pages could have been used for a detailed evaluation. Tutor could have given a word count even though it was a booklet. The assessment criteria are challenging. This unit specification has just been altered this year.	Borderline

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2a and c	The student has spent time including images which link with GD 2c. Is this the best GD component to choose? GD 5 also includes reference to images and so there is an overlap. It is best not to choose similar components from different GDs as this can skew the result. The question on how creativity could be assessed was raised. It was felt that this could be a reference to IT skills. It was considered that GD2 could be used with reference to content and GD5 to format. In this case, with GD2, two very different components were put together. It was felt that the content was only a Pass but a higher grade could be given for creativity. Since a decision had to be made it was felt that content overrode creativity.	Pass
5	Images and language chosen. There were a lot of typos. The images were not always relevant.	Pass
7a	There was discussion on whether the booklet was logical and fluent. The order had been given by the tutor. Language has to come into this particularly at Level 3. Both DMs thought it was Merit – the student did what they were asked to do.	Merit

Sample 2 – Contemporary Issues in Health Care (A3 Media Article)

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	The format is not necessarily appropriate but the students have no control over this. Using an introduction and conclusion with subheadings is more like a report. The assessment was not suitable. The article was not an appropriate one for a doctor's surgery. The content includes more description than explanation. 2 relevant issues have been chosen. Discussion took place on whether breast feeding linked to health care. It was agreed that this was an appropriate situation. All agreed the student had achieved.	Pass
1.2	Very brief explanation. Some imbalance with more words used for the first AC than the other ACs put together but sufficient for the student to achieve.	Pass
2.1	Explained what published material was, as guided by the assessor, but this is not necessary to meet this AC and	Borderline

	these words could have been used to improve the detail of the evaluation. Only one strength and one weakness were identified.	
2.2	There is an overlap with 1.1. There is no need for a conclusion leaving more space for evaluation. The tutor could give a word count for each part which would lead to the student's response being more balanced. The introduction is not required.	Pass

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	Very good understanding of the 2 issues. Well written. Relevant issues chosen. Style of task should not hinder the student.	Merit
7a	It moves nicely; consistently logical and fluent. Follows a set pattern.	Distinction

Sample 3 – Human Biology: Genetics (Essay)

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	Sufficient explanation given to meet the AC. The format is more similar to a report with headings and pictures rather than an essay. No referencing of academic sources. Repetition of facts. Language and structure not very good. Not much depth.	Borderline
3.1	Very weak. Not an examination of the issues. Some rhetoric with a an example about gene edited babies. The feeling was that the assignment consisted of sentences which they have picked up from elsewhere and added. Below level 3 standard. Participants agreed that a resubmission is required.	Fail

Grading judgements using GD components

Because this assessment would require a resubmission, consideration was given to the GDs used but no grading judgements were made.

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
4d	A question was raised about this GD and the meaning of the "Use of <u>new</u> information". Because of the developments in this field, it was felt that this was a good GD to use. It was felt that it was important for the students to do some research themselves and also that the tutor could present new information as a source.	
7b	This is an appropriate GD to use.	

Outcomes from discussion Course Contingency Planning

The facilitator led a discussion on Course Contingency Planning in response to the disruption caused by COVID-19. The following key points were raised:

- Providers can offer flexibility in delivery pattern.
- More tutorials can be timetabled, although providers reported that the students' main focus is on what they need to do to achieve.
- Consideration could be given to streamlining assignments i.e. merging 3 assessments into 2.
- In the case of Health Promotion where presentations are required, it was suggested that these could be changed to posters which could be displayed along a corridor. This was dependent on students being able to come into college and be socially distanced down the corridor in small groups.
- The possibility of using breakout groups within Teams to look at a variety of presentations was also suggested. These could be recorded for the Diploma Moderator. It was reported that this was going very well in one College.
- Timed controlled assessments can be scheduled to be completed over a longer period. One provider has implemented this and, after initial nerves, the students reported they enjoyed having questions to answer rather than pulling together a big assessment involving research. Students can use notes and books but the class sessions which have been held on-line are removed. This is good experience for university. Many students say they prefer this method of assessment and it helps them organise their learning.

- The work some students are submitting is of a poor quality and it is sometimes difficult for assessors to judge objectively against the ACs whilst taking account of the students' extenuating circumstances. These cases can be discussed at standardisation and via internal and external moderation.
- Providers are advised to retain clear records of student extenuating circumstances in case of appeals against grading judgements (representations).
- In theory students studying via distance learning might not have been so adversely affected by COVID as they would not have been coming into College, but many of the students have other challenges such as home schooling, extra work shifts and illness.
- Provider participants reported that universities have raised their entry requirements this year and all offers made to students so far require more than just passes
- Participants discussed the possible reasons for the higher offers and were advised to contact the universities about specific cases if the process was felt to be unfair. The Head of Quality at One Awards meets weekly with QAA and other AVA representatives to discuss issues arising and will raise the question to establish if this is a national trend or relating to specific universities.

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. Choose suitable types of task to assess the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria. Variety is important but not just for its own sake.
2. GDs need to be chosen to match the assessment method and tasks
3. Be flexible this year with the demands placed on students. Make reasonable adjustments and adaptations but ensure the validity and integrity of the qualification is not harmed.
4. Emphasise the importance of the use of academic sources and, in particular, the development of referencing

Date report written: 5 February 2021

Name of facilitator: Patricia Oswald