

STATEMENT OF ASSESSMENT

Assessment Policies and Practices for the Post Graduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) Current procedures

1 The programme

1.1 Structure of the programme

The Post Graduate Certificate in Academic Practice is a part-time, M Level, 60 credit programme which is undertaken by teaching staff with less than three years full time equivalent experience of teaching in Higher Education. Normal registration is for three years with an option to complete in two. There are two modules in the programme and Module 2 has four pathways from which participants chose one. Staff who are on two year contracts can acquire Module 1 (40 credits) or the full 60 credit certificate as circumstances allow.

1.2 Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning AP(E)L

In certain circumstances AP(E)L may be substitutable for some workshop attendances and/or Module work as appropriate to the objectives of the PGCAP programme and dependant on the level achieved in the prior experience or learning. A formal application must be made on the appropriate form (AP(E)L1 in the PGCAP Handbook) and if necessary documentation on such prior experience or learning will need to be produced by the participant. Applications for AP(E)L will be considered in the first instance by the Chair of the PGCAP BoS in consultation with appropriate supervisors and other colleagues as necessary, and a recommendation put to the BoS for approval.

2 Assessment overview

2.1 Purpose

Assessment is largely summative but unmarked, formative assessment is offered via supervisors should participants wish it. A written summary of meetings held between participants and supervisors is submitted termly.

The summative assessment is based on the written work submitted for Modules 1 and 2.

2.2 Methods

Assessment is awarded on the basis of participants having attained the modular outcomes at the appropriate level. This is achieved by the submission of a portfolio relating to academic practice (Module 1) and a further piece of written work (pedagogical or discipline specific) (Module 2).

There is also a procedural requirement that participants attend 12 workshops and academic induction (including one research-related workshop and a recorded micro-presentation). Eight attendances must be from the core workshops offered. Participants are encouraged to attend the majority of their workshops in Year 1 of the programme. Workshops are not assessed.

Materials for assessment must be submitted in person to the PGCAP Administrator and a receipt will be issued. The submission will be kept in secure and confidential conditions.

Evidence of medical or other mitigating circumstances (for example maternity or sabbatical leave or work abroad) may be used to give extension to submission dates. The candidate should discuss the request for an extension with his/her supervisor and submit a formal request on the appropriate form (EX/01 in the PGCAP Handbook).

2.3 Schedule

It is expected that the Module 1 portfolio work will be submitted by 31st October at the end of the participants' second year. The Module 2 work for Pathways A or C is expected to be submitted no later than 31st October at the end of the third year. The written work for Pathway B is expected to be submitted in two stages six months apart in the third year and no later than 31st October. Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) Pathway D must be completed in two years according to NMC regulations.

2.4 Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners is made up of the supervisors on the PGCAP programme, including the Director, Sue Grace, Sylvia Hogarth, and the External Examiner. The Board of Examiners is responsible for

ensuring that assessment follows the procedures and timetable set out in this document. The External Examiner is chosen by the PGCAP Board of Studies from nominations suggested by its members. The role of the External Examiner is to view a range of submitted written work and comment on the appropriateness of assessment carried out by the internal markers according to the University's normal practice for external examiners. The NMC examiners are NMC accredited.

3 PGCAP Outcomes

3.1 Programme Outcomes

At the end of the programme participants will demonstrate that they have:

- A Effectively participated in a range of common teaching and learning activities (related to outcomes 1 - 5 in Module 1) and attained two additional learning outcomes selected according to their relevance to the participant's working environment (and evidence in the portfolio of academic practice).
- B Evaluated and critiqued relevant literature or other resources as appropriate.
- C Explored more fully a selected aspect of HE provision as appropriate to their academic role (Module2)
- D Demonstrated awareness of the following values and principles, as appropriate:
 - ◆ An understanding of how students learn;
 - ◆ The recognition of different individual learning styles;
 - ◆ A concern for students' development;
 - ◆ A commitment to scholarship;
 - ◆ The recognition of the importance of working as members of a team; the practice of equal opportunities; and
 - ◆ The need for effective and continued reflection on professional practice.

3.2 Module outcomes

3.2.1 Module 1

At the end of Module 1 participants will demonstrate that they have achieved at least seven of the following outcomes, five of which must normally be outcomes 1 – 5:

1. Designed teaching sessions from a course outline, document or syllabus.
2. Used a wide and appropriate range of teaching and learning methods effectively and efficiently in order to work with large groups, small groups and one-to-one.
3. Acted professionally in a pastoral and academic supervisory role to students in a way which is acceptable to a wide range of students (e.g. international/mature/ undergraduate/postgraduate).
4. Used a wide range of assessment techniques to assess student work and to enable students to monitor their own progress.
5. Used a range of self, peer and student monitoring and evaluation techniques within the existing professional, regulatory framework.
6. Successfully performed the teaching support and administrative tasks involved in teaching as required by their Department.
7. Demonstrated progression in their research career and an awareness of future opportunities in the appropriate field.
8. Demonstrated an awareness of the range of potential sources of funds to support research or other academic activities and/or demonstrated understanding of best practice in research, teaching, administration, or project management.
9. Developed professional strategies for operating as a successful academic practitioner within the constraints and opportunities of the institutional setting and participated in activities with the aim of enhancing professional development.

3.2.2 Module 2

At the end of the module participants will demonstrate that they have;

1. Produced appropriate texts demonstrating proficiency in a key aspect of their academic role.
2. Critically evaluated the chosen topic in relation to the general context of their teaching.

4 Principles of assessment

The learning outcomes outlined ABOVE require that assessment measures three elements of learning:

Knowledge gained;
Understanding of that knowledge;
Skills gained.

Details of aspects covered under these headings are given in the PGCAP Programme Specification.

5 Marking Procedures

Under normal circumstances the portfolio will be submitted **at the end of the October of the second year** of the programme and the submission of the project, essays or research collection will be submitted at the end of the third year. Submission two may be submitted after two years where desired and where appropriate. (NMC Pathway D must be within two years).

Under normal circumstances submitted work will be unseen first and second marked by PGCAP supervisors, but not by the candidate's own supervisor or departmental mentor. Given the nature of the portfolios it is unfeasible for anonymous marking to take place. A representative sample demonstrating the range of work will be sent to the External Examiner in advance of the examiners' meeting but all scripts are made available should s/he wish to see them. NMC scripts are marked by at least one NMC accredited marker and scrutinised by an NMC accredited external examiner. The NMC internal marker **may** also be a supervisor.

The normal timetable is:

- Internal markers' standardising meeting in mid January. Where one marker recommends a pass and the other refer the work is submitted to a third marker. The third marker is one of the Board of Studies, but not necessarily the PGCAP Director. An agreed recommended grade is decided on at the internal markers' standardising meeting and is forwarded to the External Examiner with sample scripts.
- Board of Examiners meeting in February;
- A record of the agreed marks will be taken and kept by the PGCAP Administrator.
- Results will be announced by post to candidates subject to the confirmation of the Senate as soon as is possible after the requisite procedures have been completed.
- Candidates will receive a short summary of comments relating to the portfolio and other submissions.
- Graduates will be awarded their Certificates by the Vice-Chancellor or equivalent guest in May/June.

6 Assessment Criteria

6.1 Module 1 (Portfolio)

Pass

Participants must:

- ◆ claim to achieve the outcome;
- ◆ provide evidence for that claim;
- ◆ reflect upon the evolution of practice relating to the outcome;

for at least 7 out of the 9 programme learning outcomes.

In addition the work will demonstrate the following, as appropriate:

- ◆ scholarly and competent organisation and presentation of the material;
- ◆ understanding of the underpinning theory where educational/pedagogical theory is referred to;
- ◆ critical discrimination and a sense of proportion in evaluating evidence;
- ◆ 'deep' learning in relation to the outcome being claimed;
- ◆ a good awareness of the programme's principles and values.

NB: A 'pass' with minor corrections may occasionally be awarded. This is where a candidate may be recommended to spend a very short period of time (eg no longer than a day) to do corrections and therefore be able to graduate at the same time as other participants from the same entry year.

Refer

A candidate who is recommended for referral is likely to have produced a portfolio which:

- ◆ does not claim to have achieved; provided evidence of achievement; or failed to reflect upon a required number of programme outcomes;
- ◆ is poorly organised and lacking in a scholarly approach and may be of an unacceptably poor level of presentation/legibility;
- ◆ contains an unnecessary number of errors of fact and shows poor understanding of theory to which the candidate has referred;
- ◆ shows poor discrimination and a lack of sense of proportion in evaluating evidence;
- ◆ demonstrates only 'surface' learning and does not offer a commentary which might be deemed of an acceptable level for a level 4 programme.

Fail

A candidate who is failed may have produced work which:

- ◆ does not address the prescribed number of programme outcomes and where it would appear unlikely ever to be able to do so;
- ◆ is not of a competent or professional standard such as would reasonably be understood in the context of a postgraduate certificate and may be very poorly organised;
- ◆ bears little evidence of the candidate having thought through the issues and reflects only the most superficial learning.

Following normal University practice any candidate recommended for referral of fail **may** be invited to participate in a viva voce examination.

6.2 Module 2

6.2.1 Pathway A (Project)

Candidates are required to submit a project based on some aspect of their academic role.

Pass

Such work will normally demonstrate several of the following qualities:

- ◆ competent and scholarly organisation of material including evidence of aims and objectives and a contextualised and rationalised conclusion;
- ◆ appropriate methodology for the topic;
- ◆ successful data gathering;
- ◆ familiarity with, and understanding of, the subject of the project demonstrated by engagement in the topic, a well-developed argument and an awareness of the limits of the project;
- ◆ a good approach to the handling of primary source material where appropriate;
- ◆ an understanding of the principal sources and authorities (where appropriate to use secondary literature). Where educational/pedagogical theory is referred to the participant must demonstrate an understanding of the underpinning theory. Full citation details must be given but the style of citation may be that used in the candidates own discipline;
- ◆ sufficient knowledge of closely-related primary or secondary information;
- ◆ an element of originality in the specific context of the project application (e.g. within the participant's own department);

- ◆ critical discrimination and sense of proportion in the evaluation of evidence
- ◆ address the module outcomes.

NB: A 'pass' with minor corrections may occasionally be awarded. This is where a candidate may be recommended to spend a very short period of time (eg no longer than a day) to do corrections and therefore be able to graduate at the same time as other participants from the same entry year.

Refer

A candidate who is recommended for referral is likely to have produced a project which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ poor organisation of the material – possibly with confused aims and objectives and lacking a clear conclusion;
- ◆ muddled use of methodology;
- ◆ poor handling of data;
- ◆ restricted understanding of the subject of the project - possibly with a poorly–developed argument and/or a lack of awareness of the project's limitations;
- ◆ an inadequate approach to primary source material used;
- ◆ confused understanding of other sources and authorities referred to – possibly with misunderstanding of educational theory that has been used;
- ◆ little awareness of closely-related information;
- ◆ lacking in any originality;
- ◆ poor critical discrimination and little sense of proportion in evaluation of evidence;
- ◆ Failure to address the module outcomes.

Fail

A candidate who is failed is likely to have produced work which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ incompetent organisation of the material – possibly lacking in aims and objectives and lacking a conclusion;
- ◆ inadequate use of methodology;
- ◆ very poor handling of data;
- ◆ little understanding of the subject of the project - possibly with little evidence of the candidate having thought through the arguments and/or little awareness of the project's limitations;
- ◆ poor approach to primary source material used possibly with errors of fact;
- ◆ confused understanding of other sources and authorities referred to – possibly with misunderstanding of educational theory that has been used;
- ◆ very little awareness of closely-related information;
- ◆ unoriginal;
- ◆ lacking critical discrimination and a sense of proportion in evaluation of evidence;
- ◆ failure to address the module outcomes.

Following normal University practice any candidate recommended for referral of fail **may** be invited to participate in a viva voce examination.

6.2.2 Pathway B (Two written assignments)

Candidates are required to submit two assignments based on either workshop topics or relevant issues concerning teaching and learning in Higher Education or a combination of two or three of the facets of an academics responsibilities (such as the teaching interface with administration or research).

Pass

Work will normally demonstrate several of the following qualities:

- ◆ address the module learning outcomes
- ◆ competent and scholarly organisation of material and a contextualised and rational conclusion
- ◆ relevance to the candidate's own teaching and development as a teacher
- ◆ a good approach to the handling of primary sources where used;
- ◆ an understanding of the principal sources and authorities and of appropriate underpinning theory;
- ◆ a bibliography and evidence of background reading;
- ◆ a coherent and logical progression of ideas

- ◆ a recognition of tensions inherent in practical situations and in supporting literature, where they exist.

NB: A 'pass' with minor corrections may occasionally be awarded. This is where a candidate may be recommended to spend a very short period of time (eg no longer than a day) to do corrections and therefore be able to graduate at the same time as other participants from the same entry year.

Refer

A candidate who is recommended for referral is likely to have submitted work which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ failure to achieve the appropriate outcome;
- ◆ poor organisation of the material;
- ◆ lacking in relevance to the candidate's teaching
- ◆ restricted understanding of the subject of the submission
- ◆ little secondary reading and cursory critique of the material
- ◆ lack of coherent and logical argument
- ◆ failure to recognise any tensions inherent in the material.

Fail

A candidate who is recommended for referral is likely to have submitted work which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ failure to achieve the appropriate outcome;
- ◆ incompetent organisation of the material;
- ◆ no relevance to the candidate's teaching;
- ◆ little understanding of the subject of the submission
- ◆ substantial errors of fact;
- ◆ very poor range of secondary reading and failure to offer evidence of critical engagement with the material;
- ◆ no acknowledgement of any tensions inherent in the material.

6.2.3 Pathway C (Discipline-specific research paper with associated support material)

Candidates are required to submit:

- a copy of a published research paper in their own discipline area or a copy of the accepted paper together with a copy of the letter of acceptance for publication.
- a 1,000 word summary of the research skills acquired and enhanced during the period of PGCAP registration with some indication of likely future directions for research activity
- a 500 word summary of the ways in which research in the candidates discipline might be drawn upon in the support of teaching and learning.

Pass

- ◆ such work will normally demonstrate several of the following qualities:
- ◆ satisfactory completion of module outcomes
- ◆ competent presentation of the content in requirements ii) and iii);
- ◆ clear evidence of the enhancement of research skills and progression in the research career of the candidate;
- ◆ awareness of future possibilities for research;
- ◆ an awareness of the potential for drawing on research for teaching purposes and an articulation of some of the mechanisms for this
- ◆ a critical and insightful approach to sections ii) and iii).

NB: A 'pass' with minor corrections may occasionally be awarded. This is where a candidate may be recommended to spend a very short period of time (eg no longer than a day) to do corrections and therefore be able to graduate at the same time as other participants from the same entry year.

Refer

A candidate who is recommended for referral is likely to have submitted work which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ failure to satisfactorily complete section i);

- ◆ poor organisation of the material in ii) and iii)
- ◆ insufficient evidence of enhancement of research skills
- ◆ insufficient evidence of progression in the research career of the candidate;
- ◆ insufficient awareness of future possibilities for research;
- ◆ weak articulation of (actual and potential) synergies between research and teaching.

Fail

A candidate who is failed is likely to have submitted work which contains a number of the following flaws:

- ◆ failure to satisfactorily complete section i) such that there appears to be no possibility of this requirement being fulfilled in a reasonable time-scale;
- ◆ incompetent organisation of the material in ii) and iii)
- ◆ lack of evidence of enhancement of research skills
- ◆ lack of evidence of progression in the research career of the candidate;
- ◆ lack of awareness of future possibilities for research;
- ◆ poor articulation of (actual and potential) synergies between research and teaching.

Following normal University practice any candidate recommended for referral of fail **may** be invited to participate in a *viva voce* examination.

7 Academic Misconduct

Participants are made aware of the issues surrounding plagiarism in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate students in one of the core workshops on assessment and in the associated support materials they are given whether they attend that session or not. Suspected academic misconduct by PGCAP participants will be dealt with according to the University's Regulation 5.4

8 Opportunities for re-assessment

Should a candidate's submission be referred he or she will be given the opportunity to re-submit within an agreed period of months. The candidate's supervisor and the PGCAP Director will offer written and oral support in the preparation of work for re-assessment.

9 Appeals procedure

Appeals will be dealt with in accordance with the University's Regulation 2.8 for taught postgraduates.