

## Summary of notes from JTO-JEANZ Workshop December 2, 2009

**Present – providers:** Jim Tully( Canterbury), Jim Tucker(Whitireia), Stu Oldham, Phil McCarthy(SIT), Grant Hannis(Massey), Martin Hirst (AUT), Jack Schoeman, Lani Kereopa ,(Waiariki), Charles Riddle, Jeremy Smith,(Wintec), Peter O’Neill, Janine Burgess, (Aoraki), Robin Martin,(WITT). **CMITO:** Mike Fletcher, Norma Woodhead (all sessions), Joan Grace, Anne Benson, Gerard Denton (for sessions on L5 review and L4 creation. Joan, Anne and Gerard had been delayed because of bad weather).

### Moderation

All JEANZ delegates discussed topic 1. The general findings were:

- AMAP acceptable to polytechnic sector
- Pilot moderation scheme useful
- Pilot becomes new system for all providers
- Documentation for polytechnic and university systems to be amended
- JTO to send moderation request packages to J-schools with clear outlines of requirements
- JTO and JEANZ to foster moderation best practice
- JTO Principles for moderation to be followed

Comments and observations and outcomes are contained in the following table:

Comment	Outcomes
NZQA Principles for best practice moderation outlined	NZQA principles: Flexibility Assessabilty Partnership Quality
JTO Principles handed out and noted that they reflect the NZQA principles	JTO 11principles acknowledged and agreed

Similarity between (Polytechnic) unit standards and (University) learning outcomes observed in pilot moderation	All providers moderated meeting industry requirements Polytechnics meeting Unit standard Assessment requirements
Three examples of students marked work and marking criteria for moderation questioned.	Group agreed three examples sufficient. NZQA require three examples for NZQA moderation
Moderation system, process and plan need to be updated	JTO to advise of final process and the plan for next year, including the material required to be sent in hard copy or electronically, correct addresses, etc
Explain requirements for moderation of each unit (or subject for University sector)	JTO to supply generic explanation of the requirements for moderation relative to each element or group of elements (or subject for university sector) to assist with evidence gathering
Cut down the workload	New moderation system will ensure the workload is reduced and simplified
Advising the providers about unit standards (subjects) for moderation for 2010	Subjects for moderation next year: News writing – US 23111 (or equivalent learning outcome for universities) Ethics –US 23116 (or equivalent learning outcome for universities)
Requirements, moderation documentation for universities	Detail to go to J-schools or appropriate person.
Requirements, moderation documentation for polytechnics	Polytechnics to advise recipients
Best practice	Foster BP among all J-schools
Transparency required with moderation	J-schools to be advised of external moderation panel members and their skill sets
Moderation proposals – plan, system, AMAP	Agreed
Plan of what to be moderated for next 5 years?	Cover all Diploma in 5 year span Cover one large unit and one or two smaller over 5 year period

## **Pre-workshop material**

Before the discussion delegates had considered the following pre-workshop material:

### **Moderation – pilot study**

#### **Background**

The pilot external moderation was agreed at a J-schools workshop held this year. It was felt the pilot would test the reviewed external moderation process outlined in the revised Communications and Media Industry Training Organisation (CMITO) Assessment/Moderation Action Plan (AMAP).

It was agreed unit 23111 (news gathering) would be moderated.

The new process will ensure that the ITO and providers meet NZQA requirements with regard to the quality of assessments within the programmes under the ITO accreditation.

#### **PARTICIPANTS**

Institutions that volunteered for the pilot were:

- AUT
- Massey University
- Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology
- Wairiki Polytechnic
- Aoraki Polytechnic

The moderators for the pilot comprised experts in moderation and unit standard assessment and journalism.

#### **METHOD**

Two sessions were held. The first moderated students' marked work from a university and a polytechnic.

The second moderation involved work from one university and two polytechnics.

Overall, the moderation covered learning outcomes (university sector) and the unit standard (polytechnic). Relative to the News Gathering unit standard.

#### **THE MODERATION PROCESS**

The moderators moderated the assessed work against the marking schedules and judgement statements to ascertain fair valid and consistent assessment, judgements and marking.

#### **OUTCOMES**

The Industry standard /benchmark for news writing as demonstrated in the material provided for moderation has been met by all participating providers.

Although the assessment material and associated marking material varied in the coverage of the unit standard the moderators agreed all five providers were consistent and fair, with the marking completed to the criteria outlined in the assessments. All were at the required level of learning.

It was noted the system used for the moderation process worked well and would require little change for the next round of moderation.

The moderators acknowledge the work involved by the providers in the gathering of the material for the moderation.

### **MEETING STANDARDS**

It was interesting to note that although the university assessments and marking criteria were based on an achievement based model and the polytechnic on a competency based model, the assessments covered similar outcomes for the students.

Cross-hatching indicated the university learning outcome matched well with the polytechnic unit standard, suggesting the students are meeting the ITO standards required for industry.

### **CHANGES NOTED**

As a result of the pilot, the forms used in the collection of evidence for moderation and the moderation checklists have been altered to accommodate the university and polytechnic sectors.

## Level 5 Review

The polytechnic providers considered the L5 review, facilitated by CMITO CEO Joan Grace.

After lively discussion and workshops the group agreed in broad terms:

- The units require revision to remove prescriptive requirements where logical and practicable
- There is an option to combine the bi-cultural and diversity subjects into one unit
- Shorthand requires review
- A panel will be set up to carry out the review and make recommendations
- The L5 comments/findings outlined in this documents will be part of the input to the review panel
- The JTO will lead the review
- The JTO believes most of the review can be done via email (JTO to outline activity schedule)

### Delegates present for the L5 discussion were:

**Group 1:** Peter O’Neill, Jim Tucker, Lani Kereopa, Robin Martin, Janine Burgess. In attendance: Anne Benson, Norma Woodhead

**Group 2:** Charles Riddle, Jeremy Smith, Jack Schoeman, Stu Oldham, Phil McCarthy. In attendance: Gerard Denton, Mike Fletcher

Comments, observations and findings are contained in the following table:

Comment Group 1	Workshop findings
<p>Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Some units too prescriptive</li> <li>➤ Regional flexibility required</li> <li>➤ Requirements for writing for print, radio, web require unpacking</li> </ul> <p>Analyse daily news coverage</p> <p>News writing</p>	<p>Agreed Agreed Agreed</p> <p>Examine range Broader requirement needed to reflect regional communities as well as major centres</p> <p>Look at range, eg special note 4</p>

<p>News gathering</p>	<p>Portfolio required to demonstrate writing skills range</p> <p>Flexibility on story requirements would allow J-schools to focus on different skills, eg broadcasting</p> <p>Use same story in different environments (print, radio, internet)</p> <p>Element 3 range a concern</p> <p>Teaching links 23111 and 23106</p> <p>Scrap story plan for every story. Useful at beginning but later discussion should suffice. Too much evidence required.</p> <p>Requirements for shorthand too early for teaching element 8</p> <p>Range, types of stories, too prescriptive Rework stories for print radio, internet</p> <p>Shorthand requirements for every story.</p> <p>Generally too prescriptive</p>
<p>Photography</p>	<p>Change requirements to reflect teaching composition, news subjects, how to recognise a story with photos</p> <p>Keep photo processing requirements simple. ie use Windows, not specialist software</p>
<p>Diversity/bi-cultural</p>	<p>Combine. Too prescriptive. Flexibility in regional variations required. Adopt teaching approach rather than prescriptive assessment.</p> <p>Need to recognise that ethnic mix in</p>

Media law	society is changing. Remove element from element 3 ( legal issue in story written) Allow for use of given material . Change to require a test.
Courts	Re-word element 1. Remove “ such as, use may include but limited to...” Allow 3 stories from court (as opposed to naming courts) Change title, omit “explain”
Ethics	Allow a test (consistent with media law requirement) Look at elements 3 and 4 Deal with PR
Stats	Problem with range in E1

Comment Group 2	Workshop findings
Overview: Stick to knitting Range statements require review	Stick to basics Too detailed
Photography	More credits required (convergence) Remove detailed requirements in range statement No. 1 Unit lacks technology focus and depth Include other photography elements, for example: Sound-slides, editing
Bicultural/diversity	Combine these units. More flexibility Assess via stories Remove requirements for specific iwi assessment

Shorthand	Redraft, requires 150 hours Textbook- T-line for journalists Higher speed
Numeracy	Range statements needs adjusting Simplify and make relevant, ie understand that the Government sets Budgets and why but not the detail of the process
Elective unit	New unit to cover video for the web
Daily news – govt and economy	Too many assessments Simplify wording

## Pre-workshop material

Before the discussion delegates had considered the following pre-workshop material:

### Level 5 National Diploma in Journalism (Multi-media)

#### Summary

The major difficulty for the polytechnics is the amount of formal assessment needed to meet the requirements of the units.

These requirements have the potential to distract from the core skills development needed in the programme. These core skills, writing in particular, require a lot of summative assessment every day. For example, every day students have stories that need editing/review/comment.

The number and complexity of the range statements in the units as well as the many special notes that include numbers of stories and assignments and areas of study generate difficulties for the polytechnics' internal moderation systems.

#### Further action

1. As part of the review, the NZJTO, as the standard setting body, will write to the polytechnics advising that the moderation will focus on the element level, not the performance criteria level. This will allow the internal systems to "relax" a little in terms of what they focus on.

2. The NZJTO will produce an Assessment Guide as part of the revision of the units.

### **Issues and observations**

At the request of the JTO, J-schools have commented on the Level 5 units of the National Diploma in Journalism (Multi-media).

The most common observations are:

- The range statements in many cases are too prescriptive;
- The units require too much formal assessment (In the view of one provider, for example, pc requirements plus internal assessment can generate 136 assessments including re-sits);
- It is difficult if not impossible to properly fulfill all requirements of the range statements at element and performance criteria level.

These observations suggest to the JTO that the current requirements may be impacting on the ability to adequately deliver the basic skills required by industry.

To clarify the JTO's observation and provide further feedback for the review panel we will workshop the two main areas as follows:

**1 Indicate whether at a high level the balance of skills in the National Diploma is acceptable or needs modification:**

- Are changes needed?
- What would you suggest?
- Implications of this suggestion.

**2 Having looked at the comments from your peers and from your own observation:**

- What changes would you suggest for the unit standards?
- What are the implications of the changes?

## Creation of foundation programme at level 4

Polytechnic providers considered this subject.

After discussion and workshops it was agreed:

- A new foundation programme at level 4 is required
- The qualification will be a provider, not an industry, qualification
- The qualification is not intended as a lower-level entry to a newsroom
- The group that reviews the level 5 units will create the draft contents of the level 4 qualification

At the beginning of the L4 discussion Joan Grace posed the following:

### **Question - who:**

- School-leavers
- Return to workforce
- Career change

### **At the end of the foundation course:**

- What can students do
- What do they know
- How long typically wld the course be

Asked whether it was intended that the new course would offer an entry-level path, Joan Grace said the ITO would not be able to prevent the industry hiring certificate graduates.

Daly Post editor Scott Inglis said industry wanted to employ properly qualified people.

The recognised entry level qualification was the national diploma, he said.

The JTO executive director, Mike Fletcher, said the JTO would continue to emphasise that the national diploma was the entry-level qualification to a newsroom.

The delegates again divided into two groups to discuss possible content of the L4 qualification.

They commented as follows:

## Group 1

Comment	Findings
The make-up of the new qualification should include: Tertiary study skills (computing, research)	Opportunity to select good students
General communications paper	Literacy skills
Interpersonal life skills	Grooming, etc
Journalism skills	General knowledge, industry knowledge
Shorthand theory	Begins process.
Numeracy	Numbers
Produce basic publication	Promotes industry knowledge and teamwork
Duration	One semester

## Group 2

The make-up should include:	Grammar, style, sentence construction, spelling, punctuation, news story structure, keyboarding (20 wpm), basic interviewing and writing
Focus for students	All the above
T-line	Theory
Fundamental skills	Radio, rapport, time management, current events web, photography
Flexibility with course (65 credits- 50 core, 15 elective)	Subjects should be journalism-specific including media law, ethics
Strengthens selection procedure	Good for J-school
Foundation may lead to final learning in different areas ( students have option not to commit to journalism at higher level)	Good for J-school

## **Pre-workshop material**

Before the discussion delegates had considered the following pre-workshop material:

### **Level 4 foundation qualification Summary**

The industry has indicated it wants the JTO to create a pathway of journalism learning from secondary school to the workplace.

As part of the business plan for 2010, the JTO has agreed that a new Level 4 national foundation journalism qualification be created.

The qualification will replace the level 3 National Certificate in Journalism.

At the industry/provider workshop convened by the JTO in June there was a feeling a new foundation qualification may provide further opportunities for students, provided the course is designed as the stepping stone to level 5 National Diploma study.

Providers say prospective journalists should have the following key skills:

- An ability to write
- An inquiring mind
- An understanding of grammar
- An understanding of numeracy

It is proposed the new qualification focus on these skills and that the transition of study from level 4 to level 5 be seamless via properly-stepped learning.

It is suggested, for example, that some students may begin at level 4 and take three semesters (one semester at Level 4 and two semesters at Level 5) to graduate with the National Diploma.