

Social Work, Social Care & Counselling

4th December 2018, 1.30am-4.30pm, One Awards

Attendance:

5 delegates from 3 providers attended.

Angeline	McSherry	Middlesbrough College
Reece	Farrell	Middlesbrough College
Jade	Baker	Stockton Riverside College
Sam	Stirzaker	Sunderland College
Wendy	Morris	One Awards Diploma Moderator

The event was facilitated by Keran Pincombe, One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies: No Apologies

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: Values, Law & Theory for Social Work - Report

Unit title: Counselling Theory - Essay

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: Values, Law & Theory – Report *

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
4.1	All but one of the delegates felt that the AC had been achieved. Although the submission for the AC was descriptive, the majority of delegates felt that the overarching analysis in the submission justified achievement. Based upon the limitations of the AP3, achievement was agreed by the majority of the delegates.	4 Pass 1 Resubmission
4.2	All delegates agreed that the AC was achieved. Delegates agreed that current research had been used and highlighted knowledge of the subject, they agreed that the application of the knowledge was weaker.	Pass
4.3	All but one of the delegates agreed that the AC had been achieved. Delegates who agreed, justified their response that the comparison was implied rather than being explicit.	4 Pass 1 Resubmission
4.4.	All but one of the delegates agreed that the AC had been achieved. Delegates who agreed stated that the strengths of the methods are present in the submission.	4 Pass 1 Resubmission

*

- Delegates discussed that the assignment brief was complex for the students to decipher
- Delegates agreed that assessors should **always** write case studies for assessments
- Students concentrated on writing case studies, rather than concentrating on achieving the assessment criteria

Grading judgements using GD components

In normal circumstances students are required to produce resubmissions prior to grading taking place. However, for the purposes of the meeting, grading has been discussed for all samples, regardless of the assessment judgement in relation to the achievement of the ACs.

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1a	All but one of the delegates agreed with awarding a Merit. The majority of delegates agreed that, even with the	4 Merit 1 Pass

	limitations of the AP3, there was evidence that the student had a very good grasp of the relevant knowledge base.	
2ac	All delegates agreed with the award of Pass Delegates all agreed that the 'insight' should be removed from the component list.	5 Pass
7a	Following discussion all delegates agreed that the student had produced a very good response to the complex AP3, that required students to produce a case study that was not required for achievement of the assessment criteria.	5 Merit

Sample 2: Counselling Theory – Essay

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
3.1	All delegates agreed that the use of a case study has over-complicated the assignment and that 1000 words was too short to produce three evaluations. One delegate felt that there were inaccuracies within the submission, but following a critical discussion regarding the AP3 agreed achievement. Delegates agreed that whilst the student had evidenced reasonable knowledge, the evaluations were quite weak, and felt that the student has used the word count to discuss the case study which limited the opportunity to produce detailed evaluation.	4 Pass 1 Resubmission

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
1c	All delegates agreed that the student had a very good understanding and had applied that knowledge well	5 Merit
2abc	All delegates agreed that grade component c should be removed, as analysis is not required for the assessment criteria.	5 Pass
7b	A critical discussion took place with the delegates who agreed that components a and c would have been beneficial rather than b.	5 Merit

Sample 3: Values & Practice in Care and Development – Report

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
2.1	Delegates agreed that there were examples to highlight understanding and that the nature of evidence is enough for achievement	5 Pass
2.2	Delegates had a critical discussion for Analysis with 4 delegates agreeing a Re-sub was required with 1 delegate stating borderline	4 Resubmission 1 Borderline
2.3	Delegates had a critical discussion regarding the Codes of Practice. Some of the delegates agreed that there was some explanation but it was not explicit. There was some discussion around the interpretation of the AC, several delegates thought plural Codes of Practice, whilst the remaining delegates thought Codes as a whole.	3 Pass 2 Borderline

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
2ac	The Discrimination section is well written and there is clear evidence that the student has grasped the subject.	2 Pass 3 Merit
7a	Two delegates agreed that the structure is good, although it is not always logical. They agreed some legislation could be linked earlier to the topic. Three delegates felt that the submission was consistently logical and fluent with every section linked together including an introduction and conclusion.	2 Pass 3 Distinction

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
 - 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.

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.
 - Students could seek out learning support and gain additional guidance if those involved do not understand QAA and AVA compliance around assessment.

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. Explain the assessment strategy in the AP2 and identify if assignments are building on skills and knowledge and why a particular assignment is being set at a particular time in the year.
6. 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: 7th December 2018

Name of facilitators: Keran Pincombe