­­**Moderator Feedback to Centre (F3)**

**Technical Qualifications – synoptic assignment - EXEMPLAR**

**To be completed by the moderator**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Centre name:** | **Centre number:** |
| The College  | 26252204 |
| **Assessment title:** | **Assessment number:** |
| L3 Technical Certificate in Barbering  | 6002-30 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome of moderation** (tick as appropriate) |
| Centre marks accepted  | 🗌 |
| Centre marks adjusted | 🗌 |

| **1. Centre administration** e.g. uploading evidence, communications, meeting target deadlines etc.The examples which follow should be used as a guide to pitch your own feedbackPlease tailor them to your own findings and only place comments where necessary. |
| --- |
| **Uploading evidence to the Portal**: Files were compressed and saved in a logical order, although some (specifically, the photographic images) were not named clearly. **Communication and administration**: There were two candidate signatures missing from Candidate Declaration of Authenticity forms. The centre was contacted and immediately uploaded the completed forms. **Meeting target deadlines**: All documents relating to the synoptic assignment were uploaded by the deadline date of May 17th 2019.  |

| **2. Centre marking** |
| --- |

| **General feedback:*** Were centre marks in tolerance?
* Does quality of candidate evidence align with centre marking?
* Does centre evidence (e.g. PO forms, CRF forms) provide valid and sufficient justification for allocation of marks?
* If applicable, provide feedback on comparative judgements made on the moderation visit

Use the above bullet points and tailor comments to your own findings. Keep it brief and clear. Think of the end user. These are suggestions of areas you may want to feed back on. Please tailor them to ensure they are suitable to your.  |
| --- |
| **Details provided on PO forms**: Tutors gave clear descriptions of candidates’ practical work which helped the moderator distinguish their strengths and weaknesses. However, one observer’s comments were less descriptive. In this instance, the PO form was used to take notes of the sequence of the activity rather than the quality of it. This made it problematic to assign marks for the full set of tasks. Although it is expected that some observer / tutor comments are hand-written, scanning had affected the quality of some documents. **Details provided on CRFs**: It was clear by the comments on the CRF, that markers had considered awarding marks across the full range of AOs in all tasks and used a holistic marking approach when awarding final marks. There were however, some CRFs which made no mention of areas of weakness in certain tasks. This made the moderator question whether these weaknesses had been taken into account when awarding final marks.**Comparative judgments made on the moderation visit**: the lower performing candidates seen on the visit, had comments on their PO forms which did not align with the moderator’s judgment; photographic evidence further corroborated the quality of their practical skills and, as a consequence, the moderator could not agree with centre marking.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Accuracy of centre marking in each Assessment Objective:** These examples are typical reasons why you may have disagreed with centre marking. Please tailor them to your own findings. Boxes stay blank if marking in any AO is aligned.  |
| AO1  | This AO was marked too harshly. Broad and consistent knowledge was shown across the two written tasks. This was supplemented in practical activities by candidates’ ability to choose correct equipment and use it safely. The moderator judged many in the sample to be high Band 3 rather than mid Band 2.  |
| AO2  | This AO was marked too leniently. The moderator judged understanding in some of the higher scoring pieces to be more in line with Band 2 descriptors rather than Band 3. Written explanations were limited and did not fully align with requirements of the tasks. Evaluations lacked depth and connections between client needs and service outcomes were incompletely explored.  |
| AO3  | This AO was marked too leniently. The quality of practical performance seen on the moderation visit conflicted with the final judgments written on PO forms. Centre observers commented upon strengths but omitted weaknesses in candidates’ skills and as such, comparisons between moderator and observer were not aligned. Evidence of dexterity in lower scoring candidates was judged by the moderator as limited and more suitable to Band 1 descriptors rather than the top of Band 2 (as judged by the centre).  |
| AO4  | This AO was marked too harshly. Candidates had clearly drawn from the breadth of their knowledge and skills by solving quite complex problems at times. These were seen in their evaluations and evidenced well on PO forms but no account had been taken during marking. Each candidate in the sample had valid evidence of dealing with new situations well and, as such, should have been given more marks in this AO.  |
| AO5  | This AO was marked too leniently. Attention to detail was not substantiated by the photographic evidence; some of this evidence showing a lack of precision and refinement in the final look. The moderator judged that although written evidence was well presented, practical activities did not show the same level of finesse. |

| **Recommendations for future series (if required)*** Centre administration
* Centre marking

These comments MUST relate to the findings above and not be merely advice to any centre. If the centre marking is aligned and admin is good, there may be very little to say here.  |
| --- |
| The following recommendations will be reviewed at the next submission:* Ensure Candidate Declaration of Authenticity forms are signed across the sample and all forms are present. For clarification on centre documents please refer to the Technicals Marking and Moderation guide: Section A: Administration: 1.3 Centre forms. <https://www.cityandguilds.com/techbac/technical-qualifications/resources-and-support>
* Candidates, tutors and markers should ensure that dates show on all documents.
* Check that hand-writing is legible, particularly when scanned and ensure clarity of photographic images. Clearly annotate each photo to fully support practical performances. Please refer to the Technical Qualifications: Requirements for uploading evidence: page 2. <https://www.cityandguilds.com/techbac/technical-qualifications/resources-and-support>
* Please refer to Centre Guidance on page 14 in the synoptic assignment pack for the rules regarding controls and authentication.
* Standardise assessment practice in the following areas:
* To accurately judge performance, all tutors should be familiar with the Marking Grid. When marking, judgments should encompass the full range of evidence and facilitate candidates in gaining marks in each AO with examples such as verbal questioning to supplement evidence of understanding (AO2); tasks should not be marked separately but show an holistic overview of the full set of tasks. Practice marking materials are available on the City & Guilds website to help standardise these decisions.
* Align observer comments with examples found on the marking grid and check that they form an accurate description of strengths and weaknesses seen in practical performances. Purely documenting the sequence of the activity does not give sufficient detail for accurate marking. In addition, copying the wording used in these examples without explaining what the candidate did to reach this standard is to be avoided.
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Moderator:** | Alison Atkinson  | **Date:**  | 12.6.18 |