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- Marks and Grades
- Preparing Students for ePortfolio – Physical and Health Education and Language Acquisition perspective
- How to best use the topic lists?
- ePortfolios and Personal Project Feedback
- eAssessment professional development workshops
Marks and Grades
What is the difference between marks and grades?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different for every exam</td>
<td>Mean the same for every year (and subject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed by mark scheme</td>
<td>Described by grade descriptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed at the start of the marking period</td>
<td>Agreed at the end of marking period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Marking

• Award marks in relation to candidates’ successful completion of assessment task.

• Differentiates students based on achievement on task/component

• Students who best meet the objectives at the top of the rank order
Distribution of Marks
Awarding marks

- Uses a range of marking tools
  - Point marking
  - Criteria
  - Mark bands

Tool chosen
- To reward answers fairly
- That can be successfully applied by examiners
- That leads to highest inter-rater reliability
Awarding grades

Evidence that supports the selection of grade boundaries
Distribution of Marks
Grades Awarded
Why have student results

Better than the alternative!

- Think of bias etc in selection interviews
- People do not stop comparing students just because you make it difficult – they just make less meaningful decisions

- If we “own” this assessment we can do our best to make sure it is as fair and meaningful as possible
Summary

• Marks and grades are two different things
• Grades should mean the same every year – irrespective of whether the assessment is easy or hard

• We balance script evidence (judgemental) and outcome date to maintain standards

• If a candidate is on the boundary, probably both grades are fair... and will always someone who just misses the boundary
Preparing students for ePortfolios

From a Physical and Health Education perspective
How Best to Prepare Students for ePortfolios

• Complete a simplified version of one of the PCUP’s in Year 4 of the program, so that students have an understanding of what the expectations are in Year 5.
• Use the MYP Subject Report in reflecting on current teaching practices in PHE, and make changes going forward so that students are better prepared over all.
• Teachers should ensure that students understand the requirements and give students the background information needed for students to complete the tasks.
Task A:
• Although knowledge and understanding is included to be evidenced in Task A, there needs to be this knowledge also evidenced throughout the entire portfolio.
• Procedural knowledge shows an understanding of the physical skills as well as of the human body.
• Conceptual knowledge ties to the bigger picture.
• Health is not only Fitness, though is usually the connection students make.
• Familiar vs. Unfamiliar
Task B:
• Development and understanding of goal setting is needed.
• Use a chart template to help with the layout of what is needed to be included in the development plan.

Task C:
• Ensure video evidence is well prepared to highlight the best of the client.
• Choice with guidance.
• Add text and voice over on video.
• Edit, edit, edit!
Task D:
• Evaluation of performance should be done through the analysis of the final performance video.

Reminder that we are setting up students for lifelong healthy living, making wise choices that affect their physical and mental health. By tying in our current situation, goal setting, program development, reflection, adaptation, and an understanding of how the human body functions....we are giving students the opportunity to exit the MYP program ready for their future. This ePortfolio can tie what they have learned throughout the MYP program in PHE and give them those final pieces in a way that has a real life impact.
Assessment:
• Use the new Task Specific Clarification for the PHE ePortfolio assessment.
• When teachers assess students in the ePortfolio, be sure to give levels for each of the strands within a criterion, as well as a comment that supports the assessment level given.
• If teachers assess in this same way throughout the program, by the time the ePortfolios are done, both students and teachers will be better prepared and ultimately a chance to be more successful.
Preparing students for ePortfolios
From a Language Acquisition Perspective
How to best prepare students for ePortfolios?

• The requirements of a language acquisition ePortfolio,

• What schools should consider to give students the best opportunity to succeed

• What happens next – the purpose of the standardization meeting to ensure consistent standards across all languages and levels, joint analysis of student work, valid outcomes etc.

• Key documents and resources
Requirements

- Task types divided by level: Emergent, Capable and Proficient
- Criteria to use (Phase 2, Phase 4 and Phase 5)
- Documents to upload (for each task, for each level)
Our Learners’ success

- **Criteria**: The role of the *level descriptors* in each level to assure we give our learners the *opportunity* to achieve the *highest levels*
What happens once school send their portfolio?

Key role of examiners ensuring consistent standards across all languages and levels
Essential Documents and resources

• Language Acquisition Guide
• Partially Completed Unit Planners
• eAssessment guide 2017
• Language AcquisitionTeacher Support Material
• Handbook of procedures for the MYP: Assessment 2017 (files to upload)
How to best use the topic list?
Curriculum framework

• MYP provides a conceptual curriculum framework. MYP helps teachers and students to develop inquiries that includes facts, topics and concepts.

• Schools are to determine relevant and significant content according to local requirements.

• MYP identifies a range of subject-specific topics (lower level of specification) that authors use when creating onscreen examinations.

• Schools are not limited to these topics.

• This list of topics promote equality and rigor across examination processes and represents a level of curriculum development.
Design of eAssessment tasks

• Authors from different contexts give ideas about topics that are typically taught at MYP schools.

• Knowledge and understanding assessed against criterion A (25%) using topics or general content (not so specific) through familiar situations in different contexts

• Topics are used to create lower and higher level questions considering a specific context in order to measure or make judgments about the level of student's conceptual understanding.

• Students need to transfer what they know using communication skills.
Recommendations

• Topics or content should be revised and reinforced during MYP 4 and MYP 5.

• Teachers must develop a variety of approaches in order to familiarize students with the list of topics.

• Provide contexts to topics or contents taught to create a conceptual understanding. This will allow students to transfer information and communicate well in different situations (use of correct terminology).

• Teachers need to design a variety of assessment tools such as performance-based assessment tasks, open-ended tasks, journals, others.

• Connect all assessment tasks with assessment criteria.
ePortfolio and Personal Project Feedback
Moderation

• For assessment to be fair, all candidates must be marked to the same standard.
• In examinations we check the quality of examiners before they start marking and during the marking process.
  • If they are not marking correctly we stop them and remark.

• For ePortfolio we need to take equal care as the marks are equally important.
  • If teachers are marking to a different standard we cannot stop them and remark – there is no one else who saw the quality of the student work.
  • Instead we calculate a moderation factor to bring their standard in line with everyone else.
Scenario: consistent application of standard, within tolerance

The teacher’s totals stand, no adjustment is made through moderation. (In reality only 3 pieces of work would have been moderated by the examiner; because all 3 were within tolerance the remaining 2 pieces of work would not have been sent to the examiner).
**Scenario: consistent application of standard, out of tolerance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher total</th>
<th>Examiner total</th>
<th>Final total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marking has been found to be out of tolerance. A moderation factor is applied to bring the teacher totals into line with the examiner. The teacher’s top total of 32 (which wasn’t sampled) would be moderated to 32.
Scenario: inconsistent application of standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher total</th>
<th>Examiner total</th>
<th>Final total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of standardisation between teachers has led to large changes for students. The teacher’s top total of 32 (which wasn’t sampled) would be moderated to 29.
Moderation Feedback

• Moderation is adjusting teachers marks so they are in line with the global standard.

• The best outcome is that you were marking correctly – therefore we do not change the teacher’s marks.

• If we do make an adjustment we should explain to you how your standard differed from the global standard.
Feedback should

- Explain the main reasons for differences of judgements between examiner and teacher

- Be entirely focussed on criteria (there should be no other reason for disagreement)

- Focus on teachers marking and not on student work

- Be efficient/concise

- Be consistently clear and high quality
Feedback is not

• Teaching and learning PD for teachers –

• Having looked at the way you marked a few pieces of student work we do not believe we can tell you how to be a better teacher!

• We can only tell you where the teacher’s marking was different to the global standard

• BUT when you have designed an assessment task we can provide feedback on that specific assessment task – in the context of the students responses we have seen
MYP moderation report

School: [Redacted]
Subject: PERSONAL PROJECT - ENGLISH  Level: MY  Component: INTERNAL ASSESSMENT

Suitability of the work submitted

Did the marking comments support the levels awarded?
No

Was all work submitted clear and legible (for example audio files audible, visual files correctly cropped)?
No

If any answer above was no, please explain in one sentence:
Some process journal entries were not legible.
Some comments were not specific to individual criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criterion A - Investigating</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion A - assessment accuracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally the examiner awarded a lower achievement level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examiner comments on Criterion A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more students did not provide justification for the challenge of their goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examiner comments on Criterion A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all strands of this criterion were addressed by one or more students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examiner comments on Criterion A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence of strand iii for one or more students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further comments (optional)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are reminded that the information from the research is not included in the report, rather how this research assisted in the completion of the goal. It may be used as evidence in an appendix to the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion A - Investigating

Criterion A - assessment accuracy
The examiner found the marking accuracy to be inconsistent

Examiner comments on Criterion A:
Not all strands of this criterion were addressed by one or more students

Examiner comments on Criterion A:
One or more students did not provide justification for the challenge of their goal

Examiner comments on Criterion A:
There is little or no evidence of strand iii for one or more students
Professional Development Support
Power and Impact of Digital Assessment

- Develop inquiries into the rationale, integration, and design of digital assessment.
- Investigate strategies for implementation of tools used for digital assessment.
- Explore the ways in which digital assessment is present in IB schools.
- Consider ways to integrate digital assessment into the teaching and learning across subjects, areas and themes in IB programmes.