

Social Sciences

13th November 2018, 9.30am-12.30pm, One Awards

Attendance:

8 delegates from 7 providers attended.

Kaur	Bally	Calderdale College
Seal	Julie	Carlisle College
White	Victoria	Carlisle College
Pearson	Jamie	Darlington College
Hughes	Pauline	Derwentside College
Griffiths	Debbie	Newcastle City Learning
Baker	Jade	Stockton Riverside College
Coulson	Nigel	Sunderland College

The event was facilitated by Patricia Oswald and Keran Pincombe, One Awards Lead Moderators.

Apologies:

Sam Prosser – Prior Pursglove and Stockton 6th Form 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: Psychology - Essay

Unit title: Professional Practice - Questions about Case Study

Unit title: Values and Practice in Care and Development – 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: Psychology - essay

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	The student has explained in detail, but not necessarily applied to a given situation. Following discussion, delegates agreed evidence and understanding is shown. Delegates felt that one perspective is covered in detail, the second one less so.	Pass
2.2	The discussion is implicit rather than explicit, although enough awareness is shown to warrant a pass. Overall delegates felt that although there was some critical discussion, it was poor in places.	Pass
4.1	All delegates were in agreement that the assessment allowed for a detailed response for this criteria.	Pass

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1c	Initially not all delegates agreed with awarding a Merit stating that understanding was limited in places, with some points underdeveloped. Following discussion all delegates agreed with the grade of Merit.	Merit
2ab	Submission covers ideas and perspectives with understanding and application shown. Evidence is within the assignment to justify the award of Merit.	Merit

7c	Delegates were divided due to the critical discussion being limited. Some felt that that the ideas and perspectives were not linked which meant the submission lacked substance. The remaining delegates felt that the student has responded to the demands of the assignment and, as such, a Merit should be awarded.	3 Pass/5 Merit
----	--	----------------

Sample 2: Professional Practice - Questions about Case Study

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	Several delegates felt the response was highly descriptive with not enough contrast between civil and criminal accountability. All delegates agreed that the assessment criteria is a considerable amount of work for a student to complete to achieve.	6 Pass/2 Borderline
2.2	The student related the response to the case study extremely well.	Pass
3.1	The student response was put together very well considering the assignment brief (AP3) was a prescriptive list of questions.	Pass

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	Excellent knowledge shown by the student	Distinction
7a	Response is consistently logical and fluent	Distinction

Sample 3: Professional Practice - Questions about Case Study

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	The comparison between now and 50 years ago and with Europe is possibly put in to show some investigation? Essential elements are identified.	Pass on the basis of the tasks
2.2	The questions do not ask the students to analyse.	Ditto
2.3	The command verb evaluate has been added to the assessment task (AP3) when it is not required for the assessment criteria. Pass can be implied. The student had	Ditto

	done as much as possible given the constraints of the assignment brief.	
--	---	--

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2a	Graded against ideas, facts and concepts. It was felt that only ideas and facts had been covered in breadth	Merit
7a and c	Based on response to the brief not the quality of response to the ACs	Distinction

The comments below give reasons for the grading. The assignment brief had problems. It was felt that the students should not be penalised because of poor instructions.

- The tasks do not allow the students to achieve.
- The word count is not sufficient.
- The format of the tasks is not specified.
- ACs are not linked to the assignment tasks.

Outcomes from discussion on Draft Assignments

The facilitators 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 had seen the Drafts policy or knew when it was due to be revised.
- The use of drafts would be the exception.

2. What are the problems with allowing drafts?

- The extra work involved for the assessor
- Could lead to grade polishing
- Should be the exception
- 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

3. What are the problems with not allowing drafts?

- A missed opportunity to give confidence for students returning to study.
- A missed opportunity to provide clarity for progression tutors or learning resource centre staff who do not understand the Access to HE regulations should not be giving extra help.
- General guidance could be given in workshops by Access tutors.
- Drafts could be shown on tracking form which would assist grade profile analysis

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. Delegates to review their drafts policies
2. Ensure that the assignment briefs enable the students to achieve the LOs and ACs
3. Use the correct command verbs in the assignment briefs
4. 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.
5. When uploading the DTR documents next September, try to include a different AP3 from previous years.
6. Explain the assessment strategy in the AP2 and identify if assignments are building on skills and knowledge and why a centre is doing a particular assignment at a given period in the year.
7. Check IMs have the confidence to feedback on the quality of assignment briefs. If there is a disagreement between an assessor and IM, another appropriate member of staff should be consulted. The team should make a judgement which will then be considered by the External Moderation team.

Date report written: 13 November 2018

Name of facilitators: Patricia Oswald, Keran Pincombe