Access to HE Diploma
Standardisation Report 2019-20

Health (twilight session)

26th November 2019, 4.30am-7pm
One Awards

Attendance:

4 delegates from 3 providers attended:

Christine Evans	Bishop Auckland college
Angela McDermott	Sunderland College
Michelle Kelso	Redcar and Cleveland college
Gillian Morgan	Redcar and Cleveland College

In addition, there were 2 external moderators, Angela Ince and Jan Lynas. The facilitator was Sue scheilling, One Awards Lead Moderator.

Apologies:
None

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. Consider the AVA theme of contingency planning

Samples of student work chosen for the event:

Unit title: Human Biology: Health and Illness – written work

Unit title: Professional skills in Health Care – Case Studies

Access to HE Diploma
Standardisation Report 2019-20

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: Human Biology: Health and Illness - written work

Achievement of learning outcomes and assessment criteria

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	AC required explanation and, generally, delegates considered it was there but lacked some detail and depth	Achieved
2.1	This was considered lacking in detail and some delegates found that much of the information was not relevant to the question. This generated a lot of discussion and a consensus was not achieved.	3 for borderline achieved and 2 considered it not achieved
2.2	This AC was a mirror of 2.1 but for a different disease type. This was considered to be better with more physiological information included.	Consensus Achieved

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators *If 2.1 was deemed 'not achieved', a resubmission would have been completed.*	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
4e	Delegates were conflicted between Pass and Merit and considered it would depend on the quality of the resubmitted work.	Borderline Pass/Merit
7a	Delegates considered the presentation of the work to be logical and to flow. They also appreciated the evidence of a reasonable assignment attempt.	Consensus Merit

Sample 2: Professional skills in Health Care – Case Studies

AC	Comments from delegates and moderators: The work required analysis of interpersonal skills and barriers to communication using 3 case studies.	Consensus decision Pass/ borderline/fail
1.1	Delegates found that there was analysis of verbal and nonverbal interpersonal skills.	Consensus Achieved
2.1	This AC concerned barriers to communication and some delegates were concerned that the information was there for one or other of the case studies but not all to the same depth. Discussion ensued on the nature of achieving an AC within the whole of the assignment. Some found that the analysis of barriers was included in the analysis of communication skills – not necessarily in a section termed barriers. Delegates offered similar situations from their own experiences. After much discussion delegates recalibrated their thinking and a consensus was achieved	Consensus Achieved

Grading judgements using GD components

GD	Comments from delegates and moderators	Consensus decision Pass/Merit/ Distinction/ Borderline
5	Some limitations but a very good performance	Merit
7b	Generally, unambiguous All delegates were comfortable with the merit judgements and did not consider the work distinction level	Merit

Outcomes from discussion Course Contingency Planning

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

Pinch points
- Staff availability and capability (in relation to specialist subjects)
- Reductions in teaching hours or other contractual changes (management changes)
- Rise in numbers of students with associated heavier assessment workload
- Regulations on IT use (permissions/use of certain pieces of equipment altered e.g. memory sticks)
- Turnaround times for large numbers of scripts

Possible preparations

Most of the ideas generated were associated with the scenario of a new tutor, with no knowledge of Access, brought in suddenly. Some of the delegates had been that tutor so the discussions were very interesting and based on real experiences.

- Value of schemes of work, lesson plans and activities available for off the peg use.
- Possibility of someone from the AVA to be called upon for telephone or video link contact.
- Development of a 'crib sheet' or 'package' which would indicate how to navigate computer stored information and would prioritise information needed.
- IT use such as on line submission, back up storage, email, social links and student access to College material on line were all considered in relation to the other scenarios.

Agreed recommendations from the event

1. The importance of avoiding unnecessary resubmissions by being certain about the achievement of ACs.
2. To ensure that the assessor checks all parts of the assignment to check for achievement of the AC, as it only needs to be achieved once.
3. To ensure that GDs are judged individually because they are concerned with different aspects of the quality of the work.
4. That it is worthwhile thinking ahead and preparing resources which would help a new tutor to begin to function.

Date report written: 27th November 2019

Name of facilitator: Sue Scheilling