

Health

19th November 2019, 1.30am-4.30pm

One Awards, Peterlee

Attendance:

12 delegates from 8 providers attended

Elaine Allcock	Darlington College
Claire Quinn	Gateshead College
Denise Sims	Gateshead College
Robyn Cairney	Hartlepool College
Peter Carr	Middlesbrough College
Judith Booth	New College Durham
Rachael Leonard	New College Durham
Ros Henderson	Newcastle City Learning
Marie Andrews	Stockton Riverside College
P Parker	South Tyneside College
D Richards	South Tyneside College
L Bent	South Tyneside College

In addition, there were 2 external moderators, Margaret Juniper and Anne Binks. The facilitator was Sue Scheilling One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies:

Ann Inkson Sunderland 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.
4. Explore the AVA theme of contingency planning for Access

Sample of student work chosen for the event:

Unit title: Human Biology: Health and Illness - Report

The associated learning outcomes, assessment criteria and grade descriptor components were provided on separate sheets. The assignment brief was not provided.

Summary of feedback from delegates and moderators

Sample 1: Written report

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Student had 'explained' as required and included major features. Delegates considered it a little brief but agreed it was achieved.	Achieved
2.1	This AC generated a lot of discussion in relation to the level of physiological detail included in the student's evidence. The LO was 'understand how normal human physiology can be affected by disease'. Delegates agreed that what was included was correct but explanation did lack scientific detail. Delegates wondered if this was a first or subsequent assignment for this unit and considered that may have influenced their eventual decision. The possibility of resubmission was considered. Eventually delegates reached a consensus that it was just met.	Achieved
2.2	This AC mirrored that in 2.1 but related to a different type of disease. Delegates voiced the same concerns and it was difficult to reach a consensus. Eventually a small number of delegates would have asked for a resubmission of this AC	No consensus Majority would have judged it to be achieved

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
	Assuming that the resubmission had been successful	
4e	The narrative for merit and distinction was considered. Delegates considered that the work did not warrant a merit grade which required outcomes to be accurate and	Pass

	appropriate. This linked to the lack of scientific detail, as described above.	
7a	The student's work was well presented and delegates appreciated the effort in the way evidence was submitted. It was considered logical and fluent and although concern was expressed with some of the ACs they considered that the academic skills in relation to structure and fluency of work was demonstrated. At this point the value of specific feedback on the evidence provided for the ACs was discussed.	Merit

Outcomes from discussion Course Contingency Planning

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

- Challenges occur in relation to staff non availability/lack of familiarity with the Access model.
- Availability of rooms where there are large groups
- Groups where time in College is reduced e.g. evening groups
- Timetable for assessment – submission/ marking/IM/return to students. At any point scripts could be missing for different reasons.
- Internal moderation – IMs need to be knowledgeable about Access and anything that delays IM affects the student 'journey'.
- Trackers – problems arise if not current. Analysis cannot be carried out and possibility of errors increase.

Possible strategies

New tutor brought in or staff non availability

- Problem identified as accessibility of relevant material/information to help the tutor
- AP2s could be used as a vehicle for understanding the course (one delegate writes these with that scenario in mind).
- New Gateways each year containing all up to date information (safeguards against use of obsolete material of unit specifications etc.)
- Delegates recognised that 'how to access information needed' would be major problem for new staff. Suggested creation of a 'start pack'. In difficult times there may not be a colleague to help initially.
- Adjustments could be made to the assessment plan to ensure students continue with their studies during the absence of key staff.
- Time for contingency planning could be made available. Currently this is not always the case. The possibility of the AVA identifying, with quality managers, how lack of time can impact on quality.

Issues with scripts

- On-line submissions and on line backup of all work submitted
- Tracking
- Accessibility for staff and measures to encourage timely entering of results, if staff are late entering them.

Resubmissions

- This generated a lot of discussion on achievement of ACs and time allowed for resubmissions. Delegates reported that good entries in the handbook were useful.
- Use of a specific form generated by One Awards was discussed and the proper use of AP4s was discussed and practice shared.

The 'disaster' issue (snow, traffic, flood etc)

- Student preparation at the beginning of the programme to assist individuals to use the time constructively.
- Communications via email
- Having lesson plans on line/distance learning
- Preparation of a document clearly indicating what had been missed so that students could 'catch up' independently.

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. To judge ACs very carefully so that unnecessary resubmissions are not requested
2. To provide specific feedback to students on the evidence provided for ACs to help them understand why they may or may not be awarded the higher grades.
3. To really consider GDs and components individually so that you can reward different aspects of the students' work.
4. To remember that feedback to students will help to provide evidence for your judgement if it is specific and detailed.
5. Useful to consider contingency planning at an early stage in case modifications or resources are required.

Date report written: 21st November 2019

Name of facilitator: Sue Scheilling