

Neil Owens

Assistant Registrar, Kingston University
Accreditation Process and Work based
learning

Introduction

- A brief description of the KU portfolio to demonstrate a range of types
- The case study
 - The prior programme
 - The accreditation options
- Progression vs Articulation
- The articulation paperwork
- The QA processes

Articulations at Kingston University

- Overseas
 - 2 + 1 with HEI (3 years of prior programme= 2 years of degree)
 - 2 + 1 with HEI – the top-up delivered at same partner as a franchise arrangement
 - Masters 120 + 60 – through Work based learning framework
- UK
 - Masters 120 + 60 – prior programme professional development related to promotion

The example

- The nature of the training programme
 - Closed course
 - Significant amount of assessment by observation
 - Simulation of work place throughout
 - highly integrated assessment
 - Linked to a range of disciplinary operational standards and requirements
 - Linked to professional progression/specialisation
 - Highly classified area of work
 - High contact time

(The professional requirements will always predominate the academic ones)

Modes of accreditation available

- APCL – not appropriate under KU definitions
 - FHEQ or NQF /QCF. When overseas HEI, NARIC statement
- APEL
- Progression Agreement
- Articulation
- Work based learning framework
- Validation

APEL

- Student “translates” experience to HE learning with tutor guidance
- Alternative assessment against Learning Outcomes, under standard assessment regime
- Identifies how training inputs translate into work place learning

But in this example:

- Students perceive it as an onerous additional requirement
- The prior programme is an intensive programme that meets LOs and credit weighting without the need to consider further work place application
- There is the issue of classified material

Therefore:

APEL would be unviable

Validation

- Re-specification of training into University Curriculum
- Subject to University assessment, monitoring and QA processes

But:

- Classified nature of programme
- Highly integrated nature of assessment does not harmonise with modular approach
- Changes to programme must meet professional needs ahead of academic ones

Work based learning framework

- Flexible curriculum defined in a learning agreement
- Subject to University assessment, monitoring and QA processes

But:

- Classified nature of programme
- Highly integrated nature of assessment does not harmonise with modular approach

Progression agreement

- For entry: UK - widening participation
- Advanced standing: Abroad – facilitate APCL
- The student becomes a responsibility of the University at admission with advanced standing
- Not subject to section 2 of the code of practice
- APCL + mechanisms to ensure continued mapping and optional sampling
- Potentially could incorporate the equivalent analysis done by NARIC

Articulation

- Guarantee of entry
- University therefore has responsibility to students who enter the prior programme
- Prior programme must adequately prepare students for completion of degree at University
- Therefore subject to due diligence, partnership arrangement and section 2 of the code
- More rigorous approval and monitoring process
- Binding agreement

The measures

- Amount of credit
- The academic level
- The mapping of content to outcomes
- Assessment and level of learning – the sample of work

Measuring credit

- Contact time
 - Timetable
 - Activities
- Non contact time
 - interviews with staff
 - Interviews with students
- Checked against level and outcome – exclude low level or none core activities and learning
- Conservative estimates

Comparing level

An analysis of the prior programme, describing how the prior programme is consistently meeting the University level descriptors, and linking into the defined standards and training manuals to demonstrate this.

Mapping

University Learning Outcome	Description of how the experience on the training programme meets the LO	Reference to training manual/curriculum/standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to undertake critical reflection of both their technical and personal performance 	<p>Students are asked to reflect on their own performance at the end of each simulator run as a part of the assessment process. The assessors will be considering their ability to judge their achievement, both operationally and in terms of their personal response to the situation.</p> <p>The student's ability to use self-evaluation to improve performance on future simulator run will also be assessed.</p>	<p>AWC students complete the 'Initial Maritime Warfare Course' (IMWARC) at MWS. The syllabus is found at: http://www.rncom.mod.uk/uploadedFiles/Pages/Training/IDT/Courses/19_07_initial_maritime_warfare.pdf And is drawn from Joint Defence Publications 3 & 5 both available at: 'http://mod.uk/DefenceInternet/MicroSite/DCDC/'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define HRM and the key activity that it encompasses Highlight the business benefits of strategically aligned HRM policies Describe the key elements of the performance management cycle and their role in developing staff performance Identify the main stages of recruitment and selection, including the different methods available for assessing suitable candidates 	<p>Both the leading rates command course and the senior rates command course include an understanding of human resource issues and their relationship with leadership and management roles. This includes selection, motivation, performance management, appraisal and development of staff. The responsibilities of attaining PO rank include achieving an understanding of organisation, management, leadership and command.</p>	<p>Senior Rates Generic Ops Schedule</p> <p>Leading Rates Command Course Syllabus</p> <p>Senior Rates Command Course Syllabus</p>

Student assessment

- KU guidelines: 10% sample of assessments covering all credit at the level preceding the top up portion (e.g for 2+1 UG, all level 5 credit).
- In example: classified nature presented a problem.

KU approval process

- Partner approved to go to Due Diligence
- Due Diligence report to Academic Directorate
- Submission of paperwork to Accreditation and Approvals Board – including a standing external member
- Submission includes a report from an external subject expert
- Conditions and recommendations set
- Agreement and approval 3 months prior to first intake of students onto the University top up

Monitoring

- All changes to curriculum reported within 6 weeks to faculty
- Internal sampling of student assessment on prior programme
- Sampling by External Examiner of prior programme
- Annual report to AAB, including progression and awards data