



Qualifications and  
Curriculum Authority

---

# **Post-16 citizenship**

*Trialling a staged process to assessment – year 2*

---

August 2005

QCA/05/1722

# Contents

Background	4
Using the process for post-16 citizenship	5
The 2004-5 Project	5
Process and timeline	13
Outcomes	14
Findings	14
Whalley Range Advanced	17
Whalley Range Intermediate	18
B&NES	18
Hybrid:Arts	18
Coulsdon	19
Fareport video	19
Key issues	21
Discussion	23
Conclusion	28
Appendix A1: A process to plan assessment	30
Appendix A2: A process to plan assessment	32
Appendix A3: A five stage process for planning assessment	35
Appendix B: Summary of the 2003-4 Project	37
Appendix C: A framework for citizenship learning	40
Appendix D: Staged process final reporting template	42
Appendix D1: Staged process final reporting template – B&NES	49
Appendix D2: Staged process final reporting template – Coulsdon College	59
Appendix D3: Staged process final reporting template – Fareport 1	67
Appendix D4: Staged process final reporting template – Fareport 2	74
Appendix D5: Staged process final report – Hybrid:Arts	83

Appendix D6: Staged process final reporting template – Merton College	92
Appendix D7: Staged process final reporting template – Richmond-upon-Thames College	100
Appendix D8: Staged process final reporting template – Whalley Range High School	108
Appendix D9: Staged process final reporting template – Whalley Range High School	118

## Background

QCA has recently been developing guidance in respect of post-16 citizenship that is appropriate for all learning settings (published in 2004 as *Play your Part: post-16 citizenship*). One important component of that guidance relates to the assessment, recording and recognition of achievement in citizenship. QCA has continued development work in this area and this project forms part of that development work.

In some cases assessment, recording and recognition of achievement may lead to formal certification. In others, it is anticipated that, in some settings, citizenship learning and development will not be aimed at the attainment of qualifications (and can therefore be described as non-accredited learning). These settings may include enrichment activities provided to full-time learners in sixth forms and in colleges, E2E programmes, community and voluntary sector provision and so on. Whether or not learning is to be accredited, it is important to include guidance to providers on the processes that they need to build into their approach to assessment in order to assure quality and to plan quality improvement.

In parallel with the QCA work, a national LSC/LSDA project has been under way looking at the issues involved in Recognising and Recording Progress and Achievement (RARPA) in non-accredited learning. The model being used in this project involves a staged process with five elements or stages (see appendix A).

The staged process has been designed to:

- focus on and promote the needs and interests of learners
- take account of learners' diverse and sometimes multiple purposes in learning
- allow for negotiation of the content and outcomes of learning programmes
- encourage learners to reflect on and recognise their own progress and achievement, thus increasing their confidence
- promote and support informed learner self-assessment, peer assessment and dialogue about learning and achievement between learners and tutors/trainers
- enable both the achievement of planned learning objectives and learning outcomes not specified at the outset to be recognised and valued
- promote good practice in teaching, learning and assessment
- enhance providers' quality assurance and improvement practices.

The staged process offers considerable congruence with emerging approaches to the assessment of citizenship post-16, including the active learning cycle, progress file, the key skill of improving own learning and one-to-one tutorials.

## Using the process for post-16 citizenship

It was therefore thought worthwhile to draw on the experience of the national project to test out whether the approach, suitably modified, might prove beneficial in post-16 citizenship. In 2003-4, from the existing Round 1 and 2 LSDA post-16 Citizenship Development Projects, five were invited to take part in a project investigating the use of this process in citizenship. The five covered a range of settings:

- Camden Jobtrain
- Merton College
- Sir Bernard Lovell School
- Bath & NE Somerset – Democratic Action for B&NES Youth
- Dorset County Council

The full report on the 2003-4 project, *Post-16 citizenship: trialling a staged process to assessment*, QCA 2004, is available at [www.qca.org.uk/citizenship](http://www.qca.org.uk/citizenship). A very brief summary is included in this document at Appendix B.

## The 2004-5 Project

The findings in the first report were sufficiently encouraging to lead to a decision to extend work in this area into a further year and to include aspects of enquiry for which there had been inadequate time in 2003-4. From the existing LSDA post-16 Citizenship Development Projects (see [www.citizenshippost-16.LSDA.org.uk](http://www.citizenshippost-16.LSDA.org.uk)), seven were identified and invited to participate in the project. Two of these had been involved in the 2003-4 project, but the others were new to the process; they covered a range of settings. Those involved in 2004-5 were:

- Richmond-upon-Thames College (a very large tertiary college)
- Merton College (a further education College)
- Whalley Range High School (sixth-form provision in an 11-18 girls' school)
- Bath & North-East Somerset – Democratic Action for B&NES Youth project (provision by the Youth Service)

- Hybrid:Arts (a training provider working mainly with hard-to-reach young people)
- Coulsdon College (a further education College)
- Fareport Training Organisation Ltd (a training provider, focusing on a group of E2E learners).

Further information about the citizenship programmes for most of these projects are available in the case studies, part of QCA's post-16 citizenship guidance, at [www.qca.org.uk/citizenship/post16](http://www.qca.org.uk/citizenship/post16).

The work took place between November 2004 and May 2005. Each project was asked at the beginning to identify which citizenship learning objectives (taken from the list in the framework for citizenship learning contained in the QCA guidance and attached as Appendix C) they would address. An outline of the programmes and activities planned by each to contribute to this project follows. The 'Summary of Focus' describes the activities that provide the context for the learning directed towards the identified objectives (the latter are numbered according to their order of presentation in the QCA guidance). More detail of the work carried out by each project is provided in Appendix E.

### Richmond-upon-Thames College

<b>Project:</b>	Richmond-upon-Thames College (Zoe Fisher)
<b>Summary of focus:</b>	This project will investigate the perceived ethnic segregation in the use of student social areas around the college. It will investigate the causes of this (including institutional and individual attitudes) and consider whether changes should be made, and if so how. This will include making a video, presenting it and making recommendations to the equal opportunities committee of the college and senior management. The work will be carried out between November 2004 and February 2005.
<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	18 first-year A level students in Zoe's tutor group
<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	Analyse sources of information, identify bias and draw conclusions.  Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity

	<p>and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Represent a point of view on behalf of others.</p> <p>Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities.</p> <p>Exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others.</p>
--	---

### Merton College

<b>Project:</b>	Merton College (Liz Cottrell)
<b>Summary of focus:</b> students who are elected tutor group representatives on the student parliament, among them some who are also members of the executive, will be carrying out those roles in the context of issues of concern to current students. In addition for this project, they will be considering the extent to which they are learning from this process themselves in terms of the selected learning objectives.	
<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	25 elected tutor group representatives, including eight members of the executive. They are a mix of years 12 and 13, mostly at level 3, but one at level 2. The work will be carried out between November 2004 and May 2005.
<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	<p>Represent a point of view on behalf of others.</p> <p>Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities.</p> <p>Exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others.</p>

## Whalley Range High School

<b>Project:</b>	Whalley Range 11-18 High School for Girls – Intermediate (Beverley Keenan and Richard Demby)
<b>Summary of focus:</b> The students will consider two key citizenship issues – democracy and cultural diversity. These will be delivered by tutors using the teaching/learning packs as a key source/stimulus. Each unit is aimed at approximately four weekly 50-minute sessions.	
<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	Level 2 – Intermediate – year 12
<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues (cultural diversity, prejudice, discrimination).</p> <p>Show understanding of key citizenship concepts (democracy; democratic decision-making; elections and electoral systems; public issues (health, education, pensions, etc); representative democracy; cultural diversity; prejudice; discrimination).</p> <p>Consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Discuss and debate citizenship issues.</p>

<b>Project:</b>	Whalley Range 11-18 High School – Advanced (Beverly Keenan and Richard Demby).
<b>Summary of focus:</b>	



<p>A photography project based upon the LSDA pack 'The Real Picture'. Students will be offered a choice of various citizenship themes for their project including: crime and the community, young people and leisure, cultural diversity, health and the environment. The project will culminate in an exhibition, presentations and permanent displays. Delivery will be through five group tutorial sessions of 50 minutes each and a period of three weeks when individuals and small groups conduct their own practical work.</p>	
<p><b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b></p>	<p>120 year 12 advanced level students</p>
<p><b>Selected learning objectives:</b></p>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues: cultural diversity, ownership, power and control, democratic rights and responsibilities, media bias.</p> <p>Show understanding of key citizenship concepts (see above).</p> <p>Consider the social and moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation: inequality, poverty, justice, responsibility.</p> <p>Analyse sources of information, ie media images and project based images, identify bias, stereotypes, representations of power and control and draw conclusions.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others through commentary and discussion.</p>

### **Bath & North-East Somerset – Democratic Action for B&NES Youth**

<p><b>Project:</b></p>	<p>B&amp;NES - DAFBY project (Kate Scully)</p>
<p><b>Summary of focus:</b></p>	

<p>A November to April: considering the appropriate role and terms of reference for an advisory group for the project; presenting on this to the adult members of the group (objectives 1 and 9).</p> <p>B November to March: selecting a topic of interest (eg the situation in Iraq), and planning and delivering an event that considers the moral and ethical issues involved (objective 3 and perhaps 9).</p> <p>C December to March: consideration of the B&amp;NES Local Preventative Strategy; producing a young person's version of this; recommending how young people should be involved in its implementation (objectives 3 and 9).</p>	
<p><b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b></p>	<p>20-30 young people in Peasedown St John and Keynsham will be engaged in one or more of the activities described below on a voluntary basis. A similar number may attend just for the conference/question-time event planned.</p>
<p><b>Selected learning objectives:</b></p>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.</p> <p>Consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation.</p> <p>Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities.</p>

### Hybrid:Arts

<p><b>Project:</b></p>	<p>Hybrid:Arts (Andy Norman)</p>
<p><b>Summary of focus:</b> To encourage citizenship skills and knowledge through writing lyrics and performance; to introduce citizenship concepts to the young people and encourage them to develop their own understanding of (European) citizenship issues as they relate to</p>	

them.	
<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	<p>Two groups of young people, each about ten in number, attend for a half-day per week over an eight-week period.</p> <p>Learners who usually have no significant achievement from school and are introduced via Connexions attend voluntarily.</p> <p>They will be working with a hip-hop poet/DJ to produce and perform their own lyrics/poetry and will perform at the national young people's conference.</p>
<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.</p> <p>Consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation.</p> <p>Analyse sources of information, identify bias and draw conclusions.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Discuss and debate citizenship issues.</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others.</p>

### Coulsdon College

<b>Project:</b>	Coulsdon Comedy (Yolanda Botham)
<b>Summary of focus:</b> Students will create a stand-up comedy routine around the theme of Europe which will be performed at the young people's event in March 2005.	
<b>Learners to be</b>	Approximately nine level 3 learners

<b>involved/programmes:</b>	
<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	<p>This comedy project is considering the following QCA citizenship objectives.</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.</p> <p>Show understanding of key citizenship concepts.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Discuss and debate citizenship issues.</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others.</p>

### Fareport Training Organisation Ltd

<b>Project:</b>	Fareport Training Organisation Ltd – Debate Day (Jackie Oldham)
<b>Summary of focus: Activity 1</b>	
To organise, plan and deliver the debate day that the learners are to host with St Vincent College in February 2005.	
<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	<p>About 50 E2E learners will be involved in the overall event, researching the chosen issues in advance and participating in the debate.</p> <p>Potentially 10 learners will be much more pro-active in the organisation, arrangements etc (including a leading role in the debate itself). These will be involved in additional areas of assessment and evaluation.</p>

<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues  Discuss and debate citizenship issues
--------------------------------------	---

<b>Project:</b>	Fareport Training Organisation – conference performance (Jackie Oldham)
-----------------	---

**Summary of focus: Activity 2**

To put a display together about the national young people's conference on Europe and citizenship. This will link with a proposed visit to Cork as European City of Culture. The learners returning from the conference will put on a mini play of what they learnt at the event for the others.

<b>Learners to be involved/programmes:</b>	60-70 in the wider participation of the activity – investigation of citizenship issues  10-15 will be the core focus due to limited numbers attending the young people's event.
--	---

<b>Selected learning objectives:</b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.  Express and justify a personal opinion to others.  Represent a point of view on behalf of others.
--------------------------------------	--

## Process and timeline

Projects received invitations to participate and responded in autumn 2004. The work involved was designed to operate over the period between November 2004 and May 2005. A briefing meeting was held on 22 October 2004 with an end-of-project meeting on 16 June 2005. During this time, some of the projects were provided with support, advice and assistance from their existing LSDA consultants – Julia Fiehn for Richmond-upon-Thames

and Merton, and Rob Pope for Coulsdon and Fareport – while the overall project consultant, Martin Cross, worked with B&NES, Whalley Range and Hybrid:Arts. Final reports were provided to him by the consultants, based on structured interviews conducted with the seven project leaders using a purpose-designed template (see appendix D). This report by the project consultant draws on all these sources, further discussions, and materials and artefacts generated within the participating projects.

## **Outcomes**

This report should contribute to the:

- consideration of the applicability of the staged process to post-16 citizenship learning in a variety of settings
- LSC's consideration of the more general applicability of the staged process
- further development of the QCA guidance on post-16 citizenship
- QCA's report to the DfES concerning the manageability of post-16 citizenship learning and its assessment
- overall LSDA post-16 citizenship development projects, its findings, and their dissemination.

## **Findings**

A number of issues are considered, following a discussion of the projects' summarised experiences in relation to each of the five stages within the staged process (see appendix A). Where this year's experience supports and reinforces last year's findings, this is reported but not discussed in detail. Attention is paid to new findings, particularly in respect of issues not considered in any detail in the first year.

### **Stage 1 – Aim and purpose**

This year's experience reaffirmed that this is a necessary stage, that it adds values, and that it is important in terms of setting the context for selecting learning objectives.

It had been anticipated that in this second year of the project it might be possible to get a clearer idea of what was planned in terms of aim and purpose for whole programmes

(perhaps covering one or two years) for particular young people. In the event, this did not usually seem to happen. Possible reasons for this are:

- no planning of such overall programmes had been undertaken
- young people were on citizenship programmes of considerably shorter length than that
- the activity/activities selected were in fact the total citizenship programme being made available to the young people concerned.

It should be noted that, if this is a general picture, it has implications, not so much for the staged process, but for what it is reasonable to expect in terms of coverage and outcomes from any post-16 citizenship programme.

The principal exception to this was the DAFBY project at B&NES. Young people were involved in all decisions about their programme, were assisted to gain ownership of the objectives (eg by translating them into language with which they themselves were comfortable), and were then expected and encouraged to be able to relate any part of their DAFBY activity to the relevant objective(s). At Richmond-upon-Thames, citizenship was also part of an overall tutorial programme, which contained non-citizenship related objectives. Similarly the E2E programme at Fareport built citizenship activities into a wider programme where the interaction of the citizenship objectives with key skills was emphasised.

In some projects the aim, purpose, objectives, issues/activities were pre-determined. This was particularly true where, sensibly, organisations were repeating a programme that had proved successful with previous years' young people. In others, the young people were involving in selecting the objectives and/or the issues and activities. In all cases, young people 'worked through' the aims so that they understood and accepted them.

## **Stage 2 – Starting points**

All projects undertook activity to establish learners' starting points. In some cases these were locally designed activities such as self-assessment questionnaires, which also facilitated initial group discussion. In others, either the LSDA baseline activity was used or a process used successfully in the previous year involving positioning against the QCA learning objectives.

In most cases it was not possible to use the information gathered for subsequent individual diagnosis and adjustment of learning programmes (particularly where the designed programme was to be delivered by a team of non-specialists). In some cases, it was

possible to adjust some of the emphases and preliminary activities to take account of learners' starting points. In one case a knowledge quiz confirmed the need to build into the programme an emphasis on knowledge objectives.

Some projects have reused the initial activity during and at the end of the programme. At Whalley Range, students assessed themselves in terms of their knowledge and skills on a ten-point scale against the selected objectives at the start of the programme, the average score being 3. The exercise was repeated at the end of the programme when the average score rose to 6.25. There was some variability across the objectives in terms of progress made. It should be noted that this is a very informal process and that interpretations of what a particular point on the scale means could vary from student to student. However, two key benefits were identified: first, students became absolutely clear about the learning objectives involved in their programme; and, secondly, they were able to identify for themselves what they had learned in respect of those objectives.

### **Stage 3 – Identify learning objectives**

For the reasons mentioned above, in some projects there was an inevitable overlap with stage 1.

In most, but not all, cases the objectives were pre-determined. Opportunities were normally provided for young people to understand and own the selected objective(s), although not necessarily all of them. In some cases joint activity identified the constituent qualities that needed developing, while in other cases the tutor did this. In at least one case, this led to particular young people opting for aspects that suited them (eg writing lyrics rather than performing, and vice versa).

In most cases young people were assisted to 'translate' the selected objectives into language that was appropriate for their own level of learning.

### **Stage 4 – Recognition of learning**

A wide range of methods of review and reflection, of assessment, and of evidence gathering and recording were used. All projects welcomed the emphasis given to this stage. Brief examples are given below of the different approaches used.

#### **Richmond-upon-Thames**



The students were making a video of their documentary and they watched footage as they went along in order to decide what they needed to find out and who they needed to interview. They divided the tasks up between them. This enabled everyone to take part in the documentary making, but there was less opportunity for individuals to build their skills. They discussed their progress among themselves and with the tutor, so through group discussion there was self, peer and staff assessment. Some students kept notes of the discussions as a record and a video was also made of them discussing their progress.

### **Merton**

Staff observed the representatives in the student parliament and in the executive meetings. Tutors observed them when they fed back to the tutor groups and when they canvassed tutor groups for items to be taken to the parliament. Tutors also commented on any follow-up action carried out by students that the parliament had decided needed to be done.

All these observations were recorded on the review sheet.

One-to-one and one-to-two reviews were held with the two key staff, using video clips where appropriate.

### **Whalley Range Advanced**

The self-assessment ten-point scale mentioned above resulted in individual bar graphs. These graphs were discussed both with individuals and groups and also led to oral questioning.

Evidence of learning is essentially the photos taken by the students, together with the accompanying text chosen or written by them. These were displayed in classrooms and a selection was displayed in the sixth form centre.

Learners recorded their progress against the objectives on the bar graphs and some included references to this in their overall progress file.

Some learners gave oral presentations, observed by tutors – but there are no formal records of this.

## **Whalley Range Intermediate**

Self-assessment bar charts were used to help the learners to identify and review their learning. The actual act of self-assessment, with explicit reference being made to the (QCA) citizenship learning objectives, helped the learners significantly in their development of awareness of those learning objectives.

One feature of the cultural diversity pack was a student presentation to the rest of the class. This was both an opportunity for peer assessment as well as peer teaching. There were also many QA sessions and discussion work, either in small groups or as a whole class. Evidence of learning was in the pack itself. There were several opportunities to either write and/or discuss aspects of the pack. At the midpoint of the unit and at the end of the unit, students engaged in self-assessment again using the bar charts. These self-assessments were used as evidence of learning in the students' progress files. Tutors were not expected to keep formal records of student learning.

## **B&NES**

Each session is evaluated collectively under three headings; good points, bad points and learning points. This third column is used to link back to the learning objectives.

Evidence tends to be flipcharts, thank you letters, photos; the project does not have access to video.

All self-assessments are kept in individual portfolios by the learners.

Youth workers are required by the youth service to record every session in terms of 'seven steps of participation'. Any additional recording raises the issues of bureaucracy and time.

## **Hybrid:Arts**

The plan involved:

- continuous and frequent use of video facilitating self-assessment
- peer assessment and trainer/tutor assessment
- using video as vox pop method of getting short answers to questions/issues, and
- evaluation of the lyrics and performances in terms of the objectives.

Every session was videoed. This was used for self-assessment by some, looking at themselves and their performance skills and improving them based on this analysis.

Peer assessment and guidance tended not to be used because of the 'difficult' nature of some of the individuals involved.

The videos were linked in by the group leader to further work. Group discussions were used rather than questioning of individuals in front of others.

Learners wrote on flipcharts, which were retained.

### **Coulsdon**

Student logs were started but not maintained. It was interesting to note that this was because the emphasis on performance and rehearsal narrowed the focus so that there was little motivation for the knowledge sessions and nothing to go in the log. It should be noted, however, that performances become learning activities for their audiences, not just for the participants.

### **Fareport debate**

Written self-assessment was used in respect of key skills. Learner logs and the E2E passport were also used. It was noted that the recording of evidence concerning citizenship varied between different trainers. Tutors observed the discussions in preparatory sessions and on the day itself. The debate was videoed and this was reviewed by learners.

### **Fareport video**

Each week there was an initial group discussion of learning in relation to video making and concerning issues about the Euro and ways to present issues. Video diaries were made by learners. Individual E2E reviews involved self and peer assessment and oral questioning.

## **Stage 5 – Review of overall learning**

All projects considered this stage important and used strategies to establish how well their learners had met the selected learning objectives. Brief comments on some of these strategies and the type of evidence generated follow.

## **Richmond-upon-Thames**

Learners addressed all five selected objectives although there was variable achievement as some had more opportunities than others in relation to particular objectives. Self-reflection forms were used – some learners proved more insightful than others.

## **Merton**

Differential achievement was shown on observation and feedback forms. Reviews were held where students commented on staff observations and listened to peer comments. Each participant received a certificate presented at a special event.

## **Whalley Range Advanced**

Individual and collated group bar charts using the ten-point scale were produced. In a large programme of this sort, and with the lack of time within a tutorial programme, it was not known as to the extent to which all tutors facilitated review and reflection with all individuals.

## **Whalley Range Intermediate**

As for Advanced.

## **B&NES**

Each individual charted their own progress against the objectives. Some young people used this to consider how they could develop themselves further, for instance by becoming a Member of the Youth Parliament. All receive in-house certification.

## **Hybrid:Arts**

The videos of every session were edited down to produce an overall summary video of evidence and achievement. This reports that 100 per cent expressed the view that they had increased their knowledge of citizenship, that 55 per cent were now 'very confident', 36 per cent 'fairly confident' and just 9 per cent 'not very confident' of their understanding of citizenship issues at the end of the programme.

A personal written profile for each learner was produced by the tutor after discussion. Each learner completed an end-of-programme evaluation sheet.

A booklet of lyrics/poetry has been published, and performances took place.

Not much time was provided for reflection and review.

### **Coulsdon**

Achievement by learners was patchy with different degrees of attendance and commitment. Not much knowledge development in fact, as the need to concentrate on the performance dominated. The performance itself is evidence of achievement and certificates were produced for participants.

### **Fairport debate**

The event itself was evidence. Assessors attended and then engaged in one-to-one reviews using learner reflection and own observations.

### **Fareport video**

The video itself was evidence, as was success in the national LSDA competition and the showing of the video at the national conference.

## **Key issues**

A number of key issues were identified during the project. These are listed below. Some, such as the last, were always part of the purpose of undertaking this particular piece of work. Others, such as the first, emerged through discussion and consultation with the wider LSC project. Others were identified collaboratively in an iterative way by the project team and participants as significant for evaluation of the process. These issues were investigated in the first year of the project as well as in this second year.

- *Is the staged process a quality assurance process that could be applied generally to non-accredited programmes, or is it specifically about assessment alone?*
- *Is the staged process a reinforcement of what should be good teaching/learning practice anyway or does it add something additional to that?*
- *Do the various settings impact differentially on the staged process and vice versa and, if so, what are the consequences of these differences?*

- *Are all the various stages to be applied to particular learning activities or only to overall programmes? What are the implications in the context of post-16 citizenship delivery?*
- *Are the QCA guidance learning objectives for post-16 citizenship, as selected by participating projects, appropriate and manageable?*

Discussion on each of these issues follows, as does discussion of the following specific issues arising from the first year's work where further research was thought useful. These issues are therefore specific to the 2004-5 work.

- *How well do the different stages apply to overall programmes and how well to particular learning activities*
- *Does the process facilitate understanding of the relationships between these?*
- *Can the process benefit staff teams as well as individual tutors?*
- *Are there easily deployable systems of initial assessment, and can their outcomes be used for personalised learning?*
- *How manageable are those learning objectives in the QCA guidance that were not involved in the 2003-4 project?*
- *Are levels needed in respect of each of the objectives. If so, what criteria would be appropriate and how might judgements against such criteria be made?*
- *How clear is the distinction between the maintenance of evidence and recording; are both necessary?*
- *What methods of interaction with learners best facilitate reflection and review?*

## Discussion

*Is the staged process a quality assurance process that could be applied generally to non-accredited programmes, or is it specifically about assessment alone?*

The findings in the second year reinforce those described in the first-year report. In particular, participants felt that the staged process links assessment for learning and assessment of learning, and in doing so illustrates the way in which assessment is fundamental to learning. The staged process is therefore not just about 'stand-alone' assessment, an approach that would categorise assessment as summative assessment only, and would not involve all the stages. Projects felt that applying the staged process to their citizenship activities was worthwhile in quality assurance terms.

*Is the staged process a reinforcement of what should be good teaching/learning practice anyway or does it add something additional to that?*

Again, this year's findings reinforce those of the first year. In particular, being clear about the targeted learning objectives and ensuring that there were frequent opportunities for interaction with learners to establish if progress was being made towards those objectives were two aspects of the staged process that brought clear benefits to learners.

The process makes teachers think seriously about, and reflect on their teaching. One commented that it was 'more useful than I had realised at the time'.

*Do the various settings impact differentially on the staged process and vice versa and if so, what are the consequences of these differences?*

Differences between settings impact on many aspects of citizenship and are probably not specifically influential on the staged process.

Key differences that have an effect include: time allocations, particularly when these are not really adequate for the personal interaction needed; whether an individual member of staff only is involved or whether a staff team needs to be managed; whether those involved are citizenship specialists or non-specialists; management commitment and structures and in particular whether any QA processes are in place and enforced.

*Are all the various stages to be applied to particular learning activities or only to overall programmes? What are the implications in the context of post-16 citizenship delivery? How well do the different stages apply to overall programmes and how well to particular learning activities; does the process facilitate understanding of the relationships between these?*

Participants were clear that stages 1, 2 and 5 were particularly appropriate at the overall programme level, as stages 3 and 4 were to the level of learning activities.

However, in practice, as mentioned earlier, few of the learning activities studied actually formed part of a longer citizenship learning programme. In these circumstances, what tended to happen was an elision of stages 1 and 3, and stage 4 leading relatively seamlessly into stage 5. Stage 2 was also used at the activity level (although participants were clear that in a longer programme it would be best to operate stage 2 at the programme level).

In the main however, clarity about the difference between programmes and activities was thought helpful. The staged process description/chart has been revised accordingly and clearer descriptors of the stages produced (see appendix A1 for the original version and Appendices A2 and A3 for revised versions for future use in appropriate contexts).

The process as a whole was liked by all involved, especially the emphasis on planning via clear learning objectives.

*Are the QCA guidance learning objectives for post-16 citizenship, as selected by participating projects, appropriate and manageable? How manageable are those learning objectives in the QCA guidance that were not involved in the 2003-4 project?*

The findings here are similar to last year. The selected objectives, as interpreted for the groups of learners involved proved appropriate and manageable. This was also true for objectives being used in 2004-5 that had not been used in 2003-4.

Time is the real issue in relation to manageability (in the case studies a maximum of 20 hours was usually used and often even less). This is both a general issue and one specific to certain objectives. Some of the objectives are more demanding than others in time terms, especially where personalised attention at the individual learner level is necessary. In this connection it was suggested that 'demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities' and 'exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others' are difficult to manage in a school context for any sizeable number of learners.



From the case studies it became clear how important it is in any learning activity to focus on a limited number of objectives only, otherwise coverage is very superficial and little worthwhile learning takes place, which might have implications for the development of any qualification unit. Most effective learning took place when no more than two or three objectives were targeted within a learning activity. However, some group projects offered the possibility of different objectives being targeted by different learners within the group, depending on the nature of their contribution to the project.

It is to be noted that where citizenship development forms part of a wider tutorial programme, that programme will have other aims as well. These often impinge or take over from the citizenship objectives, according to managerial or tutor priorities.

In terms of the appropriateness of the language used in the objectives, please see the later discussion concerning levels.

*Can the process benefit staff teams as well as individual tutors?*

Where the process was used by staff teams, it was thought to be of considerable benefit. However, issues did arise. To be effective, there needed to be management commitment and a degree of prescription, plus some mechanism for QA and/or ensuring things are actually delivered as set out in the programme plans. These issues are particularly important where citizenship is being introduced for large cohorts (eg all years 12 and 13). In such situations, it is unlikely that all those involved with the programme will be citizenship 'specialists', and non-specialists may require more pre-prepared materials, support and advice.

*Are there easily deployable systems of initial assessment, and can their outcomes be used for personalised learning?*

Some systems exist and are used to establish starting points. It is worth noting that many staff seem to like the challenge of developing their own, although there are inevitable issues around validity and replicability.

In practice, there appears to be little scope for adjusting programmes in response to what is discovered about starting points, let alone relating to individuals' needs, although at least one case study did so. This appears to be an issue to do with the lack of time in particular. It is also suggested that it is not feasible to adjust programmes (pre-prepared materials) where

staff teams are involved; and that non-specialists are unlikely to be able to adapt activities to meet learners' needs.

*Are levels needed in respect of each of the objectives? If so, what criteria would be appropriate and how might judgements against such criteria be made?*

There was a range of views on this issue, with no consensus. Some participants welcomed the broad nature of the objectives, as this meant staff had flexibility to interpret them in ways appropriate to their own learners. Others felt that this broadness or degree of abstraction made the objectives difficult for some learners and also difficult for some staff to operationalise. It was thought that the provision of some exemplification in different types of setting would be useful. However, it had always been thought that some 'translation' of objectives in order to be learner-friendly for a particular group of learners and to narrow them down for classroom use would be necessary. This could be represented as a consensus position, and would certainly fit with the finding of the project that there are considerable benefits in working through the selected objectives with the learners so that they are familiar with them and own them.

Similarly mixed views were expressed about levels and criteria (which in one sense are just a further perspective on the language issue). Some felt strongly that there was no need for national levels and criteria. It should be left to teachers to adjust the objectives for their own students. Conversely, it was pointed out that there is a need for consistency across staff teams and indeed across learners self-assessing, even if using a simple five- or 10-point scale.

Some thought that levels would assist student choice and would facilitate personalised learning and differentiation, although almost all felt that time constraints when operating with a group of learners would, in practice, prevent this happening.

Those who considered that nationally provided levels would be helpful pointed out that different sorts of criteria would be needed for different learning objectives.

*How clear is the distinction between the maintenance of evidence and recording; are both necessary?*

Participants thought that the maintenance of evidence and recording were more important when national certification, or some other form of external reporting was involved. This did not apply in any of this year's case studies.

Evidence was often ephemeral such as debates, performances and other events. This provided recognition of achievement. In some cases, this evidence could be maintained by video, but this was not always practical or cost-effective. However, teacher/trainer observation of such events could lead to recording of achievement, as could self-assessment by young people. Such self-assessments might however be better described as evidence that the teacher/trainer can use as a basis for discussion about progress towards objectives and to substantiate judgements about achievement.

It was thought student recording on any ongoing basis would need ICT resources that are often not available to them currently in all settings.

Debates and discussions were sometimes videoed, the intention being to provide evidence and also a basis for discussing performance with learners. However, participants found that videos are frequently of poor quality (including sound quality), too long and do not focus on key points if not edited. Staff may well lack skill, and time to edit this sort of material.

*What methods of interaction with learners best facilitate reflection and review?*

All involved were convinced of the benefits for learning of ensuring frequent opportunities for interaction with learners, including interaction at the individual level. Oral questioning was found to be the best method, particularly where individuals were directly addressed. This could occur in group settings, but also in one-to-ones using self-assessment records. Participants commented that finding adequate time for this, especially with large groups and in tutorial settings, was a problem.

For some learners, citizenship was the only part of their programme that involved self-assessment. Some took a little time to adjust to this, but all commented that they found the approach enjoyable and productive. Elsewhere, where democratic involvement is part of the ethos (as at B&NES), learners were used to the approach and benefited from the start of the programme.

Reusing a self-assessment tool (eg the ten-point scale bar graphs at Whalley Range), in conjunction with prompts and questions from the teacher, enabled learners to recognise what they had learned and achieved.

*Other comments*

Other comments made by case-study participants, which are worthy of note follow.

The staged process framework was thought to be a useful way of marrying a student-initiated project with an existing framework, demonstrating the potential flexibility of that framework and ensuring that citizenship learning objectives were addressed by the project.

The process provided a mechanism that could be used to avoid a potential danger: where an artefact or performance or product was involved, it sometimes became more important than the citizenship learning. The pressure to rehearse 'until you get it right' could deter the necessary thinking about the citizenship objectives.

Similarly, being clear about the citizenship learning objectives could ensure that, for any given topic, learning about the specific issue rather than learning how to apply citizenship concepts to issues in general does not become the aim.

The process opened the eyes of some participants to the ways and benefits of assessing informal learning, encouraging the leader to concentrate on what can be gained from an activity. The process also provided a mechanism for briefing outside contributors so that they too could focus on gains.

## **Conclusion**

'A way of life now and I got even more out of it the second time around'. This comment from a member of staff who had been involved in both years of the project summarised the general experience of those using the process. The use of the process, firmly integrating assessment for learning into the teaching and learning strategies being used, produced considerable benefits for learners and enabled all involved to focus on their learning objectives and to identify progress towards those objectives. A number of contingent issues were identified, which should be considered by those charged with developing curriculum guidance, qualifications (if any), advice and support for organisations introducing citizenship post-16.

In summary, the following are perhaps the most important findings in respect of assessment.

- assessment is essential to, and integral to, learning; it must not be thought of as a separate add-on
- the overall programme, and the contribution of the various parts of it, need to be carefully planned in advance
- such planning needs to be done in the knowledge of learners' starting points

- there needs to be great clarity on the selected learning objectives (and therefore what is to be assessed)
- success is unlikely if too many objectives are targeted at the same time; a focus on one or two is much more likely to lead to success
- learners learn better, and can judge their own progress, if they are enabled to understand and 'own' the selected objectives
- learning and assessment for learning are best facilitated through frequent interaction with learners and
- adequate time needs to be planned in for reflection and review.

## Appendix A1: A process to plan assessment

The following represents an abbreviated version of the five steps within the LSC/LSDA staged process, modified for use within post-16 citizenship. This version is included in the QCA guidance for post-16 citizenship.

How each stage is used is flexible - the process should reflect the nature of the citizenship activity or programme, eg whether it is part of a formal citizenship course or an informal learning experience or activity.

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1. Aim and purpose</b>	Establish the aim(s) and purpose of the citizenship activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would we like to achieve?</li> <li>• What are the desired outcomes?</li> <li>• Which aspects will we assess (eg skills, knowledge, understanding)?</li> </ul>
<b>2. Initial assessment</b>	Identify prior citizenship knowledge, understanding and skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do we already know and understand?</li> <li>• What skills do we already have?</li> </ul>
<b>3. Identify learning objectives</b>	<b>Decide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do we want to learn through our activities (skills, knowledge, understanding)?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we review learning to inform future development?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Recognition of learning, recording of progress and achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Decide</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we identify and review learning during the activity?</li> <li>• What form of assessment should we use; one-to-one discussion, self-, peer-, group-activity-presentation)?</li> <li>• Should we keep a record of progress? If so, how?</li> <li>• What evidence can we use?</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Reflection and review of overall progress and achievement</b></p>	<p>Take time to reflect on progress and identify ways to recognise achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall how well did we meet the learning objectives?</li> <li>• Have we evidence to support this?</li> <li>• Did we learn anything in addition to the planned learning objectives?</li> <li>• How might I apply what I have learned in the future?</li> <li>• How will we recognise and/or celebrate our progress and achievements?</li> </ul>

## Appendix A2: A process to plan assessment

The following represents an abbreviated version of the five steps within the LSC/LSDA staged process, modified for use within post-16 citizenship after trialling of the process with five LSDA projects in 2003-4 and seven in 2004-5. It is therefore amended from that included in the QCA guidance for post-16 citizenship.

The five stages can be summarised as:

- 1 Aims and purpose
- 2 Starting points
- 3 Learning objectives
- 4 Recognition of learning
- 5 Review of overall learning

How each stage is used is flexible. The process should reflect the nature of the citizenship activity or programme; for example whether it is part of a formal citizenship course or an informal learning experience or activity. In the questions listed under Action, 'we' means the learners (although tutors/trainers will need to have thought about possible answers beforehand and will need to facilitate discussion of them). Experience so far suggests that learning is most effective where there is joint ownership of the answers to these questions. The items listed under 'Possible Outcomes' are examples of what might ultimately be produced in answer to those questions.

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Questions for action</b>	<b>Possible outcomes</b>
<p><b>1. <u>Aim(s) and purpose</u></b></p> <p>Establish the aim(s) and purpose of the overall citizenship programme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would we like to achieve?</li> <li>• Which of the citizenship learning objectives are to be covered by this programme?</li> <li>• What contexts and activities will provide</li> </ul>	<p>A clear statement of the planned learning programme, with its aims and objectives</p>



	the opportunities for this learning to take place?	
<p><b>2. <u>Starting points</u></b></p> <p>Establish the learners' starting points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What citizenship knowledge and understanding do we already have?</li> <li>• What citizenship skills do we already have?</li> </ul>	A record of outcomes of this process, which could be learners' self-assessment, questionnaire responses, prior certification, etc.
<p><b>3. <u>Learning objectives</u></b></p> <p>Identify <b>learning objectives</b> for the activity/unit/session</p>	<p>What do we want to learn through our activities (skills, knowledge, understanding that underpin the selected learning objectives)?</p> <p>How will we develop those skills, knowledge, and understanding?</p> <p>How will we identify learning during the activity?</p>	'Session plans' relating the objectives and their constituent elements to the activities and contexts to be used.
<p><b>4. <u>Recognition of learning</u></b></p> <p><b>Determine and recognise</b> learning, progress and achievement from the activity/unit/session</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we review and reflect on learning during the activity?</li> <li>• What form of assessment should we use (one-to-one discussion; self-, peer-, group-activity-presentation; presentation)?</li> </ul>	Records of self, peer, group and third party assessment arising from appropriate opportunities for reflection, questioning and feedback, artefacts, videos, CDs, etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should we record (keep track of) progress? If so, how?</li> <li>• What evidence can we use?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. <u>Review of overall learning</u></b></p> <p><b>Review overall learning, progress and achievement in the programme</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, how well did we meet the learning objectives?</li> <li>• Have we evidence to support this?</li> <li>• Did we learn anything in addition to the planned learning objectives?</li> <li>• How might we apply what we have learned in the future?</li> <li>• How will we recognize and/or celebrate our progress and achievements?</li> </ul>	<p>Learner and tutor records and files, certification and presentations</p>

## Appendix A3: A five-stage process for planning assessment

<i>Overall programme</i>	<i>Learning activities</i>	<i>Questions for action</i>
<b>1 Aims and purpose</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would we like to achieve in this programme?</li> <li>• Which citizenship learning objectives are we going to cover?</li> <li>• What are the contexts and activities we are going to use?</li> </ul>
<b>2 Starting points</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What citizenship knowledge, understanding and skills do we already have?</li> </ul>
	<b>3 Learning objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which particular objectives are we aiming at here?</li> <li>• What is the underpinning knowledge, understanding and skills required for each of those?</li> <li>• How are we going to develop that knowledge, understanding and skills?</li> </ul>
	<b>4 Recognition of learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will we identify what we have learnt during the activity?</li> <li>• What form of assessment for learning would be appropriate for this activity?</li> <li>• What sort of evidence of learning might be generated?</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should we record progress, and if so, how?</li> </ul>
<p><b>5 Review overall learning</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How and when will we review and reflect on what we have learnt during the programme?</li> <li>• How well did we meet the learning objectives?</li> <li>• How might we apply and develop what we have learnt in future?</li> <li>• How will we recognise and/or celebrate our progress and achievements?</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Summary of the 2003 Project

**‘Assessment of citizenship helps young people to recognise and value what they have learnt’ *Play your part: post-16 citizenship (QCA, 2004)***

The QCA guidance (page 36) describes a five-stage process for planning assessment for learning. In 2003-4, from the existing Round 1 and 2 LSDA post-16 Citizenship Development Projects, five were invited to take part in a project investigating the use of this process in citizenship. The following five covered a range of settings.

- Camden Jobtrain
- Merton College
- Sir Bernard Lovell School
- Bath & NE Somerset – Democratic Action for B&NES Youth
- Dorset County Council

### Findings

The outline findings in respect of each of the stages are described below, followed by some more general findings.

#### Stage 1 – Aim and purpose

All projects involved felt that the ‘forced’ attention or focus on defining aim/purpose/objectives was very beneficial, compared with what often happens in this area: ‘this would be an interesting activity’ or ‘let’s do a session on Fairtrade’. In particular, it helped to ensure that attention was paid to the development of citizenship knowledge, skills, understanding and attributes that could be applied to other issues than the one under immediate consideration. Learners appreciated explicitness about aims and purpose. This appreciation was even more marked where they were involved in negotiating/planning aims/purposes/objectives.

#### Stage 2 – Initial assessment

Experience in the project with this stage turned out to be very interesting, as it was an area to which most practitioners had given little previous thought. Generally, it was thought highly desirable to include this stage. Given the amount of time allocated to citizenship, it was not thought feasible to include initial assessment in respect of each learning activity. However, it

was thought possible to do so at the outset of the overall learning programme. Informal, light-touch and 'fun' initial assessment activities were thought to be the way forward.

### **Stage 3 – Learning objectives**

All projects thought this stage was desirable and operationally useful. This was true whether or not learners were involved in negotiating and selecting the objectives and whether or not they were informed of the selected objectives. General feedback was that the QCA objectives were appropriate, worked well and were sufficiently flexible to apply to each setting. Observation suggests that the objectives need mediating or 'translating' into appropriately accessible language for some learners.

### **Stage 4 – Identification of learning**

All projects involved agreed, that 'discussion with learners at frequent intervals helps them understand their objectives and how they are getting on in relation to them'. Many different techniques were used to identify that learning had taken place and these are described in the individual case studies.

### **Stage 5 – Review and recording**

Some projects successfully reused their initial assessment activity to demonstrate that learning had taken place and that learners had 'moved' as a result of their involvement in the project. Good use was made of reflection sheets, and of the concept of recording on a continuum of confidence or empowerment, whether through self or third party recording. There was not always sufficient understanding of the need to distinguish between evidence and recording, and where the latter might be useful.

#### *Key issues*

A number of other interesting issues were identified during the project.

The five stages should be one part of a more holistic process that would include a focus on teaching and learning through other methods such as observation. The staged process illustrates the way in which assessment is fundamental to learning. The staged process is therefore not just 'about' stand-alone assessment, an approach that would categorise assessment as summative assessment only, and would not involve all the stages.

A number of those involved recognised that good teaching/learning practice should involve the stages set out in the staged process, but that this did not always happen. They felt that it was useful to be reminded of this good practice, and that the simple format of the staged process was an easy and user-friendly mechanism. In particular, being clear about the targeted learning objectives and ensuring that there were frequent opportunities for interaction with learners to establish if progress was being made towards those objectives were two aspects of the staged process that brought clear benefits to learners.

Interestingly, the project may have shown the scope for settings to learn from other settings' experience and for convergence between them. For example, in informal settings such as Youth Services, staff are accustomed to providing time for individual reflection and review, usually involving self and peer assessment. The projects involved found focusing on the identification of citizenship learning objectives led to more planning of ways in which opportunities for the development of those learning objectives, including knowledge and understanding, could be grasped, and how reflection and review could relate to them. Conversely, more formal settings such as colleges began to develop mechanisms – and make time – for reflection and review, involving peer and self assessment, where these had not been a significant feature of provision in the past.

## **Conclusion**

This brief summary of the project outlines some of the initial findings. Further development work is being undertaken with seven institutions in 2004-5.

## Appendix C: A framework for citizenship learning (from the QCA post-16 citizenship guidance)

Post-16 citizenship should provide young people with essential opportunities to work towards broad learning objectives while developing and practising their skills through citizenship actions and activities.

<b><i>Essential opportunities</i></b>	<b><i>Citizenship learning objectives</i></b>	<b><i>Citizenship actions</i></b>	<b><i>Citizenship activities</i></b>
<p><i>Post-16 citizenship should give young people opportunities to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ identify, investigate and think critically about citizenship issues, problems or events of concern to them</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ decide on and take part in follow-up</li> </ul>	<p><i>Citizenship learning increases young people's skills, knowledge and understanding so they are able to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues</li> <li>▪ show understanding of key citizenship concepts; eg rights and responsibilities, government and democracy, identities and communities</li> <li>▪ consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a</li> </ul>	<p><i>Citizenship actions involve young people using skills of enquiry, participation and responsible action to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ discuss and debate citizenship issues</li> <li>▪ make a change</li> <li>▪ challenge an injustice</li> <li>▪ lobby representatives</li> <li>▪ increase representation</li> <li>▪ provide a service or benefit to others</li> <li>▪ empower self or others</li> </ul>	<p><i>Citizenship activities involve young people working with others on issues, for example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ writing and/or presenting a case to others about a concern or issue</li> <li>▪ conducting a consultation, vote or election</li> <li>▪ organising a meeting, conference, forum, debate or vote</li> <li>▪ representing others' views, for example in an organisation, at a meeting or event</li> <li>▪ creating, reviewing and revising</li> </ul>



<p>action where appropriate and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ reflect on, recognise and review their citizenship learning.</li> </ul>	<p>particular situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ analyse sources of information, identify bias and draw conclusions</li> <li>▪ demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination</li> <li>▪ discuss and debate citizenship issues</li> <li>▪ express and justify a personal opinion to others</li> <li>▪ represent a point of view on behalf of others</li> <li>▪ demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities</li> <li>▪ exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ resist unwanted change</li> <li>▪ make informed choices and follow up decisions and/or actions</li> <li>▪ take part in democratic processes to influence decisions.</li> </ul>	<p>an organisational policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ contributing to local/community policy</li> <li>▪ communicating and expressing views publicly via a newsletter, website or other media</li> <li>▪ organising and undertaking an exhibition, campaign or display</li> <li>▪ setting up and developing an action group or network</li> <li>▪ organising a community event, eg drama, celebration, open day</li> <li>▪ training others (eg in citizenship-based activities skills and knowledge, democratic processes.</li> </ul> <p>The case studies on the post-16 citizenship web pages give more examples.</p>
--	---	---	--

## Appendix D: Staged process final reporting template

This document sets out the framework for consultants to report on the experience of each of the projects with which they have been associated and provides a structure which may be useful for the end-of-project discussions between consultants and project leaders. Please expand sections as necessary. Many sections can usefully be supported by the collection and provision of materials generated within the projects. It may be possible to complete some sections by copying across elements of the project's Initial Plan.

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	

<p><b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project, and if so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier</i></b></p>	

<p><i>questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></p>	
<p><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></p>	
<p><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></p>	
<p><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result</i></p>	

<b><i>in higher quality provision?</i></b>	
<b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use, and - if so - what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b>	
<b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b>	
<b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b>	
<b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to</i></b>	

<b><i>citizenship learning)?</i></b>	
<b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b>	
<b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b>	



## Appendix D1: Staged process final reporting template – B&NES

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Martin Cross
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	B&NES (DAFBY project)
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Kate Scully
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	Youth Service
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	<p>DAFBY wishes to include young people in decision-making processes relevant to them and to increase the opportunities for young people to participate in citizenship activities. It wishes to develop means of recognising the citizenship knowledge, skills and understanding developed by young people engaged in real activities of this kind. The original plan involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• considering the appropriate role and terms of reference for an advisory group for the project; presenting on this to the adult members of the group (objectives 1 and 9, from November to April)</li> <li>• selecting a topic of interest (eg the situation in Iraq) and planning and delivering an event that considers the moral and ethical issues involved (objective 3 and perhaps 9, from November to March)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consideration of the B&amp;NES Local Preventative Strategy; producing a young person's version of this; recommending how young people should be involved in its implementation (objectives 3 and 9, from December to March).</li> </ul>
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	20-30 young people in Peasedown St John and Keynsham will be engaged in one or more of the activities described below on a voluntary basis. A similar number may attend just for the conference/question time event planned.
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16+
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	N/A
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.</p> <p>Consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation.</p> <p>Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities.</p>
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Two – a project manager and a part-timer.
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and</i></b>	Activity B did not happen because of the long-term illness of the intended leader, Paddy Nisbet (and therefore the

<p><b><i>explain the reasons</i></b></p>	<p>conference/question time happened. YPs wanted to replace this with consideration of the Bath Spa project, but the council vetoed this in advance of the election (opportunity taken to discuss with YPs why this might be so).</p> <p>Activity C has not yet happened because the Chair of the CYP Partnership has not yet met YPs to talk about their involvement and preparation of a YP version of the strategy (illustrative of the problem of working with Las whose timetables constantly slip).</p>
<p><b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b></p>	<p>All were applied.</p> <p>Stages 1-4 are built into all activity and stage 5 is carried out every six months.</p> <p>Project manager comments that ‘all have to be integrated together to ensure effective learning’.</p>
<p><b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the Staged Process project?</i></b></p>	<p>The participatory ethos here means that YPs are involved in all decisions.</p> <p>Small groups looked at the objectives and then came together to agree ‘translations’ for use generally by YPs (copy provided).</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial</i></b></p>	<p>‘Before’ and ‘after’ positioning done for all</p>

<p><b><i>assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>activities, eg through green and red stickers on wall graph.</p> <p>Overall self-assessment on a five-point scale covering knowledge and skills carried out by individual YPs at beginning of the financial year (copy of form provided). This is recorded on a single chart for all YPs. This is about to be reused and will show change over a twelve-month period.</p> <p>The initial assessments do lead changes in emphasis for particular sessions.</p> <p><i>Overall chart from 01/04/04 and overall chart from repeat of exercise to take place in May 05 to be sent to me.</i></p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning</i></b></p>	<p>See above.</p>

<p><b>activities?</b></p>	
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>Each session is evaluated collectively under three headings: good points, bad points, and learning points. This third column is used to link back to the learning objectives.</p> <p>Evidence tends to be flipcharts, thank-you letters, photos. The project does not have access to video.</p> <p>All self-assessments are kept in individual Portfolios by the YP.</p> <p>YPs, in theory, do not have access to ICT facilities for record keeping.</p> <p>Youth workers are required by the Youth Service to record every session in terms of 'seven steps of participation'. Any additional recording raises the issues of bureaucracy and time.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project. If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do</i></b></p>	<p><i>The overall chart, when completed, may enable answers to be given to some of these questions.</i></p> <p>Initial assessment was used and learners can relate their current position to where they were when they started, in terms of their version of the objectives.</p> <p>Some consider how they can develop further, eg contribute to conferences, seek election as MYP, etc.</p> <p>In-house certification is a normal part of</p>

<p><i>that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></p>	<p>the programme.</p> <p>Some access MV and DofE. A B&amp;NES Award is in development.</p>
<p><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer, or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></p>	<p>YPs enjoy the process and recognise that they are enabled to think about what they are learning for citizenship.</p> <p>In the main, YPs don't recognise anything that they have done pre-16 as citizenship.</p>
<p><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></p>	<p>A favourable response; in particular, Kate commented that it opened her eyes to the ways and benefits, of assessing informal learning. The process is enjoyable and improves learning. It is a better experience for all involved and makes the leader concentrate on what is to be got out of an activity.</p> <p>No issues of practicability or manageability.</p>
<p><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the</i></p>	<p>Some considerable effort needed here, and attention to detail required.</p> <p>Youth workers are not necessarily 'academic', may have spelling and other</p>

<p><b><i>process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>problems and this may cause issues.</p> <p>In this case, this could be resolved because Kate only had one staff member to relate to – but there would be a need for a staff development programme if any significant number of staff were to be involved.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>Informal only.</p> <p>LSDA sessions for project leader.</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this Staged Process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>Beneficial: even when busy, the leader has to think about the objectives of the session (time constraints may sometimes make this very difficult).</p> <p>A useful framework for making outside contributors/speakers focus on objectives, which adds value.</p> <p>The process is essentially democratic. DAFBY has democracy as its focus other settings will need helping to move to this approach.</p> <p>Within the Youth Service, it should be examined as to whether the process can be integrated into the existing QA bureaucracy.</p>

<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>All objectives were thought manageable and accessible.</p> <p>See previous sections for references to rewriting the objectives.</p> <p>While using them, they do need to be considered in relation to individuals' starting points and learning journeys.</p>
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b></p>	<p>Probably, although there are advantages in generating materials locally and working through their relationship to the objectives.</p> <p>Staff development materials would be useful.</p>
<p><b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b></p>	<p>There are costs relating to citizenship delivery, but not specifically for the staged process.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b></p>	<p>Rewrite of objectives.</p> <p>YPs' ideas for ways of assessing informal learning.</p> <p>Individual session self-assessment questionnaires.</p> <p>Overall self-assessment form</p>



	Collated information of five-point scale applied to the objectives 'before' and 'after'.
<b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	Useful to have the support from LSDA/QCA: to have the opportunity to talk things through, which is especially needed in settings outside the education system.  Any national rollout would need a support programme, both for citizenship and for assessment.
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	Although visited by Ofsted, no follow-up letter has apparently been received.
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	'A way of life now', 'we got more out of it this second time round'.
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in</i></b>	

<i>January 2005?</i>	
----------------------	--

## Appendix D2: Staged process final reporting template – Coulsdon College

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Rob Pope
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Coulsdon College
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Yolanda Botham (Vice Principal)  <a href="mailto:yolanda.botham@coulsdon.ac.uk">yolanda.botham@coulsdon.ac.uk</a>  01737551176
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	Further Education College
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	Students created a stand-up comedy routine around the theme of Europe that was performed at the EURU? Young People's Conference on 15 March. To prepare for these students worked with a comedy coach in a series of fortnightly two-hour sessions over a four-month period leading up to the conference. In the alternating weeks the students attended sessions with Yolanda designed to build background knowledge and understanding of the EU and related citizenship issues and concepts, partly to strengthen the development of students' views and ideas within the comedy workshops. It was this work in Yolanda's sessions that formed the basis for this assessment project.
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the</i></b>	Group of 14 at the start and ended with

<b><i>project</i></b>	6, all performers involved in the EURU? Young people's conference.
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16-19
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	All level 3. Mixture of BTEC National performing Arts and AS programmes
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues'.  Show understanding of key citizenship concepts'.
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Two
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b>	
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b>	Yes, all stages considered necessary.
<b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and</i></b>	Activities arose from an LSDA invitation to use comedy as a medium for exploring Europe and citizenship issues and provide a performance for the EURU?

<p><b><i>purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the Staged Process project?</i></b></p>	<p>Conference.</p> <p>Students had considerable opportunity to shape the comedy within this pre-determined framework.</p> <p>Some difficulty in establishing unified aims between the two series of comedy and ‘knowledge’ workshops.</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>Multiple-choice knowledge quiz used at the beginning and again at the end of the project.</p> <p>Further initial exercise where students asked to draw an image representing their view or concept of the EU. These interpreted in group discussion.</p> <p>Also initial discussion in the group to explore students’ views and values in relation to a range of European issues.</p> <p>The different forms of initial assessment very useful in revealing general limited knowledge of European issues.</p> <p>Confirmed need for Yolanda’s background sessions, starting to explore the formation and purpose of the EU from a basic level.</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the ‘menu’ available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved</i></b></p>	<p>The view was taken that the aims of the comedy workshops demanded a good knowledge and understanding base for the students to work with, hence the focus on learning objectives 1 and 2.</p> <p>Yolanda then defined issues and areas</p>

<p><b><i>in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	<p>of knowledge to meet these objectives and designed activities in a sequence of sessions accordingly.</p> <p>Learners were not involved in making choice of objectives, but were made aware of the role of Yolanda's sessions in relation to the comedy exercise.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>Students were asked to keep logs, recording their progress from week to week, making links between their work in the two alternating series of workshops and to include entries about European issues encountered in the news.</p> <p>The logs were started but not maintained. A key feature that emerged in the project was that instead of the knowledge element broadening and increasing the sophistication of the comic possibilities (getting away from crude stereotyping) the main imperative for the comedy coach and performers was to work on a limited amount of material from a fairly early stage in order to have a good performance ready for the 15 March conference. So, in relation to European issues the focus of the students tended to narrow. Their motivation for the 'knowledge' sessions was undermined and they saw little point in keeping the log.</p> <p>Self-assessment, group discussions,</p>

	<p>written and oral questions to individuals all played a part in end of project reviews of what had been learnt.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project. If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>Achievement of objectives considered rather patchy. Differential achievement between individuals reflecting different degrees of engagement and attendance.</p> <p>Various forms of review indicated some gains in general awareness of European issues, including realisation that some issues are more complicated than first thought and the importance of understanding historical context of the EU. Little evidence of detailed knowledge development.</p> <p>Students work on comedy sketches recognised through a public performance and the presentation of certificates marking their achievement at an event within the college.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer, or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier</i></b></p>	<p>Among the core group of 6 considerable enjoyment of the comedy coaching and final performance.</p> <p>In the 'knowledge' sessions mixed</p>

<p><b>questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</b></p>	<p>reactions to the assessment activities.</p>
<p><b>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</b></p>	
<p><b>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</b></p>	<p>Yolanda's sessions and those run by the comedy coach (from outside the college) operated in very separate ways.</p> <p>On another occasion the intention would be to integrate the comedy and knowledge elements in one series of workshops, and thus integrate the assessment process as well. This time there was no explicit attempt to assess citizenship learning within the comedy workshops.</p>
<p><b>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result</b></p>	



<i>in higher quality provision?</i>	
<b><i>What is the overall view on this Staged Process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use, and if so what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b>	Considered to be very useful. The stages, of course, are not new to teachers, but the framework as a whole encourages a more explicit focus on desirable aspects of assessment from the beginning of an activity or course.
<b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b>	The objectives chosen considered suitable for all the learners involved.  Perhaps some re writing. Concern about ensuring enough emphasis on the role of underpinning knowledge about social and political issues throughout all citizenship activities.
<b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b>	No difficulties with suitable resources.
<b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to</i></b>	No.

<b><i>citizenship learning)?</i></b>	
<b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b>	
<b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the staged process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b>	

## Appendix D3: Staged process final reporting template – Fareport 1

<b>Name of consultant</b>	Rob Pope
<b>Name of project</b>	Fareport Training Organisation Ltd
<b>Project leader and contact details</b>	Jackie Oldham: <a href="mailto:jackieo@fareport.co.uk">jackieo@fareport.co.uk</a> 0132 982 5805
<b>Type of institution/organisation</b>	Training organisation
<b>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</b>	<p>A debate day significantly organised by learners themselves and also involving a group of students from St Vincent, a local sixth form college. The themes for debate, chosen some time in advance – in consultation with the St Vincent students – were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the law on cannabis use</li> <li>• restoration of the death penalty</li> <li>• policy change allowing 24-hour drinking.</li> </ul> <p>Learners prepared for the debate day by investigating the chosen issues, preparing their arguments and making arrangements for the organisation of the day itself. Afterwards they spent time reviewing the event and their learning from it.</p>
<b>Number of learners involved in the</b>	Just over 50 Fareport learners involved in preparing for the debate day. Twenty-

<b><i>project</i></b>	eight attended the day itself, together with a similar number from St Vincent. Of the Fareport 50, a smaller group – about 10 – were most actively involved in making the organisational arrangements for the debate day and took leading roles in running the event itself.
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16-18
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	All E2E learners. From entry to level 3. Mainly working in the range E3 to level 1.
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues  Discuss and debate citizenship issues
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Seven throughout plus several more on day of debates.
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b>	Developed according to original plan. Partly because of experience of running similar events in previous years.
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b>	Yes.  All stages viewed as necessary and helpful.  Initial assessment perhaps emphasised a little more because this area is thought to be underdeveloped in the programme as a whole.  All stages are applied to the programme as a whole, with plans to develop initial

	assessment techniques further.
<b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b>	<p>Debate day part of action plan for the year, following successful similar events with St Vincent College in previous years. So, overall aim and purpose not influenced by learners.</p> <p>However, the topics for debate chosen by them and the event itself entirely run by learners.</p>
<b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b>	<p>Learners completed a questionnaire prior to the debate day about their knowledge and understanding and previous experience of the debating process itself. Questionnaire also about prior views about the three chosen subjects.</p> <p>Findings were used to influence some sessions in the preparation period. Different sessions organised for learners with and without experience and understanding of debating process.</p>
<b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives</i></b>	<p>Pre-determined activities analysed to see which objective they could deliver.</p> <p>Learner involvement – see above.</p>

<p><b><i>and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>Written self-assessment in relation to key skills framework – especially ‘working with others’ and ‘improving own learning’.</p> <p>Use of logs by learners and trainers use key skills recording grid document.</p> <p>However, the recording of evidence of genuine citizenship learning variable between trainers and this represents an ongoing staff development issue.</p> <p>The E2E Passport document is also sometimes used by learners to record ‘successes’ and this can include their citizenship work.</p> <p>Observation of discussion in preparation sessions and the debate day itself. Also video evidence of the latter, which learners have reviewed.</p>

<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>A very successful debate day held according to plan and entirely facilitated by learners themselves. Event attended by visiting ALI inspector.</p> <p>Some differential outcomes in quality and frequency of contributions to three areas of debate and in the range of tasks and roles undertaken. Assessors attended the debate day and afterwards engaged in 1:1 reviews with learners – using learner reflections and their own direct observations to record evidence of achievement at different levels for key skills.</p> <p>Yes – see above. Mainly key skills documentation.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer, or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b></p>	<p>No real evidence of this. Written form of initial assessment was the only element mainly new to them within the programme.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>Implementing chosen QCA objectives, identifying constituent elements relating to chosen activities and using these as basis for devising suitable initial assessment techniques. Staff development needs here.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>Nothing specific organised for the project, but elements of implementation addressed in regular team meetings and staff development sessions.</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits?</i></b></p>	<p>Interviewee takes a very positive view of the staged process, most elements of which are not new to the work of staff at Fareport. However working with the model has raised awareness of the need</p>



<p><b><i>Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>to include assessment throughout an activity or programme and in particular has encouraged more thinking about ways to approach initial assessment.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>Objectives considered very difficult to use directly with learners. Language and conceptual difficulty seen as major barriers to understanding.</p> <p>However the objectives are broad and generic, allowing flexibility and choice, which is good.</p> <p>Some re writing considered desirable. One size cannot fit all, so would like incorporation of at least two levels.</p>
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b></p>	<p>Some extra staff time, but not a significant issue.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and</i></b></p>	<p>Attached.</p>

<b><i>learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	See above.
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b>	

## **Appendix D4: Staged process final reporting template – Fareport 2**

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	

<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	Fifteen volunteers from cohort of E2E learners made a video exploring different views about whether Britain should adopt the Euro. The project took up to a day a week (sometimes more, especially towards the end of the project) over a period of four and a half months. The project was in response to an LSDA video competition for the European Year of Citizenship, which challenged learners across the programme to submit proposals for a short video on some aspect of Europe and citizenship. Short listed entries were invited to a one-day seminar with a professional media company, which included support for the detailed development of initial proposals. These final proposals were judged and Fareport emerged as joint winners. The prize was to have support from the video company in the making of their video. This was shown at the EURU? Young people's conference on 15 March.
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues.

	<p>Express and justify a personal opinions to others</p> <p>Represent a point of view on behalf of others</p>
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Mainly one, sometimes two.
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b>	The original plan was to develop a broader project with the whole E2E cohort on issues of concern to learners about the EU and UK membership. This to involve a residential visit to a European capital city. For organisational reasons this visit had to be delayed until July. Consequently the more focused video exercise – one part of the overall European theme – had a more convenient time frame for the assessment project.
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b>	Yes – all stages deemed to be necessary.
<b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities</i></b>	See above – impetus initially from the externally set competition and

<p><b><i>determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	<p>designation of 2005 as European Year of Citizenship. However, learners made the decision to formulate an entry, chose the Euro subject matter and, with support and guidance, made the key decisions about the construction of the video.</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>Initial group discussion session with trainer to assess what learners knew about the EU and it's history. On basis of this and the learner interests and attitudes emerging, areas for investigation planned with individuals and small groups.</p> <p>Further discussion at the end of project to review knowledge gained and other learning points (See assessment section of additional sequences in <i>Make it Happen ...</i> (DVD, 2005) for evidence of this review and the range of learning identified by members of the group).</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>At the beginning of each weekly session group discussion to review how the project was progressing – what learners had learnt in relation to technical processes of video making and knowledge/understanding of issues concerning the Euro and ways to present knowledge and arguments for others to understand and to persuade.</p> <p>Learners made video diaries with short entries after each weekly session on the project.</p> <p>Also individual review of learning as part of overall 1:1 review with E2E learners every two weeks.</p> <p>These processes involved self-assessment, peer assessment and oral questioning of individuals.</p> <p>Recording using key skills framework and E2E passport as for activity one.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there</i></b></p>	<p>Original objectives effectively met.</p> <p>Learners showed considerable determination to fulfil aims of the project.</p> <p>Award of Fareport certificate of achievement.</p>

<p><b><i>for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>Success in the LSDA competition.</p> <p>Showing of video at national conference.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer, or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b></p>	<p>Generally very positive about the group and individual review sessions and making of video diaries. This sense of being positive increased as the project went on – as learners got more involved and felt a sense of ownership of the video making reviewing their work seemed more meaningful than sometimes is the case for learners in the E2E programme.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	



<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods</i></b></p>	

<p><b><i>used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b></p>	

## Appendix D5: Staged process final report – Hybrid:Arts

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Martin Cross
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Hybrid:Arts
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Andy Norman; 01926-886188; <a href="mailto:andynorman@hybridarts.co.uk">andynorman@hybridarts.co.uk</a>
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	Private Training Provider, but working with public funding to cater for hard-to-reach young people (therefore, some similarities to some Youth Service provision)
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	<p>To encourage citizenship skills and knowledge through writing lyrics and performance. To introduce citizenship concepts to the young people and encourage them to develop their own understanding of (European) citizenship issues as they relate to them.</p> <p>Learners worked with a hip-hop poet/DJ to produce and perform their own lyrics/poetry. Some performed at the national YP Conference.</p> <p>One half-day per week over an eight-week period.</p>
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	Two groups of young people, each about ten in number. Learners, who usually have no significant achievement from

	<p>school and are introduced via Connexions etc, attend voluntarily. Thirteen completed the eight weeks.</p>
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16-19
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	N/A
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	<p>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues</p> <p>Consider the social, moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation</p> <p>Analyse sources of information, identify bias and draw conclusions</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity, and challenge prejudice and discrimination</p> <p>Discuss and debate citizenship issues</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others</p>
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Three: Andy Norman, Katie Howell and Max Golden (poet/DJ/main deliverer)
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b>	Essentially the project proceeded as planned.
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view</i></b>	As this project covered a short period of time, the overall programme and the learning activity were effectively identical.

<p><b><i>that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b></p>	<p>This meant that some of the stages elided or merged (eg stages 1 and 3, and 4 and 5 as originally described).</p>
<p><b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	<p>See the section on learning objectives below.</p> <p>Learners were introduced to the focus of the project, but not involved in determining it.</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>Introductory day with poet/DJ: exploration of individuals' backgrounds and areas of citizenship relevant to their interests.</p> <p>Max used a dictionary that did not include the word 'citizenship' but did include 'citizen' explored understandings based on this divergence.</p> <p>An individualised or personalised learning approach is needed with these learners, but this activity started to help them operate as a group.</p> <p>There were no surprises in terms of individuals' starting points, so no changes were made to the intended</p>

	<p>programme.</p> <p>The same process was reused later in the programme and some changes were visible.</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the ‘menu’ available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	<p>The relationship between the activity and the objectives had been determined in advance. Individual discussions had been held with all individuals before they were referred or selected onto this programme, so only those who had made a positive choice to participate in fact joined the programme.</p> <p>Some translation/discussion of the objectives was necessary to make them understandable by all learners.</p> <p>Given the performance nature of the programme, the necessary micro-skills were analysed and discussed (some learners then opted to produce written poetry/lyrics rather than to perform).</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer</i></b></p>	<p>The plan involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuous and frequent use of video facilitating self-assessment</li> <li>• peer assessment and trainer/tutor assessment</li> <li>• using video as vox pop method of getting short answers to questions/issues</li> <li>• evaluation of the lyrics/performances in terms of the objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Every session was videoed. This was</p>

<p><b><i>record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>used for self-assessment by some, looking at themselves and their performance skills and improving them based on this analysis.</p> <p>Peer assessment and guidance tended not to be used because of the 'difficult' nature of some of the individuals involved.</p> <p>The videos were linked in by the group leader to further work. Group discussions were used rather than questioning of individuals in front of others.</p> <p>Learners wrote on flipcharts, which were retained.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so, what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners'</i></b></p>	<p>The videos of every session were edited down to produce an overall summary video of evidence and achievement.</p> <p>A personal written profile for each learner was produced by the tutor after discussion.</p> <p>Each learner completed an end of programme evaluation sheet (see sample).</p> <p>A booklet of lyrics/poetry has been published.</p> <p>A song was performed by learners at the LSDA EURU conference. This was a specially written second song after LSDA vetoed the original. The latter has since been performed at a Youthcomm event</p>

<p><b><i>overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>at Worcester Cathedral, and a Connexions/HA event on 18 March.</p> <p>Not much time provided for reflection and review.</p> <p>Video reports that 100 per cent expressed the view that they had increased their knowledge of citizenship; and that 55 per cent were now 'very confident', 36 per cent 'fairly confident' and just 9 per cent 'not very confident' of their understanding of citizenship issues at the end of the programme.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer, or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b></p>	<p>Some learners were also on other programmes; their attendance at this was voluntary (they would not have lost money if they withdrew), but they stuck with it because they enjoyed the approach and outcomes.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	<p>Andy Norman was the interviewee. He could see some similarities with the evidence-gathering process for key skills in their Pupil Referral Unit work.</p> <p>He could see no problems of practicability and manageability, although he commented that he felt some of the processes/paperwork he had seen from other participating centres would have been too onerous for Hybrid:Arts' circumstances.</p>



<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>There was only a very small team so no management problems.</p> <p>However, conversely, there could be an issue because of individual members of staff being taken away from other responsibilities to deal with this project.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>The staff involved are self-employed contractors, so the project did not see staff development as its responsibility.</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>The project was considered to have added value because it actively engaged a difficult group of learners. Originally it was feared that they would not grasp the concepts, but they did. The process helped the group to cohere.</p> <p>It was also felt that the organisation learnt from the process, as it showed it a new and different way of delivering 'difficult' curriculum areas.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning</i></b></p>	<p>The project felt that it was necessary to translate the objectives for particular</p>

<p><b><i>objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>learners or groups, partly at least as an issue of 'level'.</p> <p>The discussion of social, moral and ethical issues sometimes revealed personal situations that needed adult intervention and action. This was a staff development issue.</p>
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b></p>	<p>No.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b></p>	<p>Personal profiles of learners attached.</p> <p>Sample end-of-programme form for completion by learners attached.</p> <p>Video (on DVD) attached.</p> <p>Tutor's evaluation attached.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be</i></b></p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>'My day in London' attached also.</p>

<p><b><i>useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b></p>	<p>The project found this approach new and interesting, but had no previous experience in this area with which to compare directly.</p>
<p><b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b></p>	<p>The use of the learning objectives has helped to throw a new slant on learner performance, and to show how performance can relate to citizenship issues.</p>
<p><b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b></p>	<p>Considered valuable, but some concern as to whether it is too prescriptive in terms of methods/media. At first sight some of this seemed to imply 'written' rather than other forms.</p>
<p><b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b></p>	

## Appendix D6: Staged process final reporting template – Merton College

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Julia Fiehn
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Merton College
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Liz Cottrell: <a href="mailto:lcottrell@merton.ac.uk">lcottrell@merton.ac.uk</a> 020 8408 8671
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	College
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	Members of the student parliament and executive used self, peer and tutor assessment, looking at the extent of their success in achieving the objectives of the parliament. The project took place between October and March and took about 20 hours.
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	Eleven representatives on the parliament. Most were also members of the executive.
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16-19
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	All level 3.
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Represent a point of view on behalf of others  Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities  Exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others
<b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b>	Two staff centrally and six tutors who took part in the observation of feedback to tutor

	groups.
<b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons.</i></b>	<p>It was not possible for students to watch video of the parliament, as had been intended. The reasons were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the video was poor quality and too long</li> <li>• students were reluctant to be on the video</li> <li>• students were reluctant to watch the video</li> <li>• it was too difficult to get them together as a group.</li> </ul> <p>Instead, the two staff held one-to-one reviews with students, sometimes in pairs, and where possible, showed them the short clips of themselves in the parliament.</p>
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b>	All stages applied to the whole project, although the aims and purpose had been set in advance of the project, and the students were not involved.
<b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from</i></b>	The young people were not involved, but this caused no difficulties. It is what happens in the tutorial programme where the senior tutor decides on the programme.

<p><b><i>what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>The initial assessment employed part C of the LSDA baseline activity. It was also used at the end of the project to debrief the students. The graphs were completed to show the students where they had changed in their levels of confidence. An additional form was devised by the lead tutor, which was also used in the final debrief (see below).</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning</i></b></p>	<p>The learning objectives were agreed by the tutor and the researcher at the beginning of the project. They were selected to fit with an activity that had been pre-determined and learners were not involved in the choice. The students knew they were involved in a pilot research programme on assessment and understood that the main objective was about representing the views of others.</p> <p>The main objective was broken down as a result partly of a student brainstorm on the qualities needed to represent others and partly by the lead tutor deciding on the qualities to be observed. These were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarity of comment</li> </ul>

<p><b>activities?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• confidence of presentation</li> <li>• positive body language</li> <li>• ability to present an argument</li> <li>• sensitivity to others.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc?</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>Staff observed the representatives in the parliament and in the executive meetings. Tutors observed them when they fed back to the tutor groups and when they canvassed tutor groups for items to be taken to the parliament. Tutors also commented on any follow-up action carried out by students that the parliament had decided needed to be done.</p> <p>All these observations were recorded on the review sheet.</p> <p>The parliament was videoed at the start, and attempts were made to view it, but for reasons given above, this did not work.</p> <p>One-to-one and one-to-two reviews were held with the two key staff, using video clips where appropriate.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project/? If so, what changes did</i></b></p>	<p>There was differential achievement on the learning objectives, as shown on the observation and feedback forms. The form refers largely to the first learning objective. The feedback forms were used by the two key staff in the one-to-one and one-to-two reviews, where students commented on the observations by staff and tutors and they also listened to peer comments in the pairs that came for review. Their own comments on improvements to skills were added to the</p>

<p><b><i>this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>sheets during the review process (see attached).</p> <p>Each student who has been a representative on the parliament will receive a certificate at the Prom/Record of Achievement evening at the end of May.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised?</i></b></p>	<p>At the start there was a feeling that the students 'couldn't be bothered' with the assessment (eg when being encouraged to watch the video) but they did say that they enjoyed the reviews and found them useful.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	<p>The tutor realised, through the process, how important preparation for the parliament is. The reviews highlighted what the students had learned and they did improve learning. However, the one-to-one/two reviews were very time-consuming.</p> <p>Video-editing skills are needed if video is to be used as evidence and stimulus for review.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it</i></b></p>	<p>The process itself did not add to the burden and tutors were fine about the forms to be completed. But the proposed use of video was very difficult because of the need for specific equipment and the lack of videoing</p>



<p><b><i>make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>skill.</p> <p>Learners being aware of their achievement will make a difference to the operation of the parliament in the future, since some will stay on as reps next year and have the chance to build their skills.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>The reviews added value and will be used with executive members before they go on to the group next year.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria</i></b></p>	<p>The learning objectives selected were fine since they are flexible and staff can adapt what they do. The tutor was not keen on key skills-type levels.</p> <p>The main focus was on representing the views of others, and this skill was broken down as shown above.</p>

<b><i>would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b>	
<b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b>	No.
<b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b>	No.
<b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b>	See attached.
<b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. In particular please collect any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	See attached.
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	No.
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	Video does not work with students as an assessment tool, but they do value the chance to reflect and self-assess.
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of</i></b>	The tutor thought the wording in the revised version was confusing and addition of

***the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?***

evidence made it more complicated.

## Appendix D7: Staged process final reporting template – Richmond-upon-Thames College

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Julia Fiehn
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Richmond-upon-Thames College
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Zoe Fisher: <a href="mailto:zfisher@rutc.ac.uk">zfisher@rutc.ac.uk</a> 020 8607 8252
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	College
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	This project investigated the issue of assessment in relation to a change in those attitudes (institutional and individual) that led to the perceived ethnic segregation in use of social areas around the college. This was planned to include: making a video, presenting it and making recommendations to the equal opportunities committee of the college and senior management. The work was carried out between October 2004 and February 2005 and took 20 hours.
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	17
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16-17
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	All from a first-year level 3 tutor group
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge

	<p>prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Represent a point of view on behalf of others.</p> <p>Demonstrate skills of negotiation and participation in community-based activities.</p> <p>Exercise responsible actions towards and on behalf of others.</p> <p>Analyse sources of information, identify bias and draw conclusions.</p>
<p><b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b></p>	<p>One tutor.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons.</i></b></p>	<p>In the original plan, students were to carry out an experiment in which they would film students in areas not normally frequented by their ethnic group. This did not happen because of shortage of time. The feedback to the EO committee did not occur, but instead two students addressed the Breaking Down Barriers workshop attended by 25 key staff. The workshop was set up to address the very issues being investigated by students. The outcomes of this workshop were very positive, largely because of the input of the students.</p>
<p><b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more</i></b></p>	<p>The project applied to all five stages and none was felt to be unnecessary. The project took about 20 hours and the main focus was on the making of the documentary. All the activities were</p>

<p><b><i>fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b></p>	<p>geared towards this end. Students did reflect, during the project, on some of the skills they learned from different activities, eg interviewing skills and discussion skills, while viewing the video.</p>
<p><b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	<p>The whole project came about as a result of the young people. They identified the issue and decided on the making of the documentary. It was part of the tutorial programme, under the broad theme of 'community' suggested by the tutor. The aim had to be revisited when the students edited the documentary because they wanted the video to answer the original questions.</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>A baseline activity, a multiple-choice quiz entitled, 'Are you one in a million?' was devised by the tutor. This is attached. It attempted to raise awareness and determine attitudes and was used by the tutor to stimulate discussion about the issues. It was not used at the end because the tutor decided it would not be appropriate to do the whole thing again. A different form was designed, to enable students to reflect on the whole process. This is also attached, with a summary of student responses.</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or</i></b></p>	<p>The students decided on the activity and the learning objectives were selected afterwards. The main objective, to 'demonstrate understanding of and</p>

<p><b><i>were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	<p>respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination' was discussed at length with students, but they were not aware of the other learning objectives. The objectives were not broken down, although the tutor selected activities that would allow the learning objectives to be met.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</i></b></p>	<p>The students were making a video of their documentary and they watched footage as they went along in order to decide what they needed to find out and who they needed to interview. They divided the tasks up between them. This enabled everyone to take part in the documentary making, but there was less opportunity for individuals to build their skills. They discussed their progress amongst themselves and with the tutor, so through group discussion there was self, peer and staff assessment. Some students kept notes of the discussions as a record and a video was also made of them discussing their progress.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one</i></b></p>	<p>The learners did meet all five of the learning objectives, although some had more opportunity to represent a point of</p>

<p><b>learning activity):</b></p> <p><b><i>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>view on behalf of others, since they fed back to the staff workshop, and some did more of the information-collection. The evidence for the judgements was provided by the student self-reflection forms, which gave information on students' assessment of skills and knowledge that they believed they had gained. Some showed more insight on these forms than others.</p> <p>The recognition of achievement has consisted of the feedback to the staff workshop, the existence and showing of the video and also involvement of the students on a forthcoming 14-19 day in July, when the students will talk about their project to visitors from local schools.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b></p>	<p>They were aware of the process, but the tutor was not sure what they thought of it. They enjoyed the project however.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their</i></b></p>	<p>The tutor really liked the process and found it useful to plan the project, especially to have clear learning objectives. She thinks it would be easier the more times it is used and would</p>



<p><b><i>usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	<p>certainly use it again. Although this particular group are already reflective, she thinks the process made them more so. There were problems of manageability, only in the sense that other issues had to be covered in the tutorial programme and this meant that the process was constantly interrupted.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits?</i></b></p>	<p>There were no disadvantages to the process and the tutor would like to use it again on a similar project. It would be difficult to use the process with everything in college because not all</p>

<p><b><i>Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>work lends itself so easily.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>The tutor felt that some students would not be able to meet all of the learning objectives: some did not want to represent a point of view on behalf of others because they were not confident enough. She felt there would inevitably be differentiation between students. She felt that levels would have been helpful, but the criteria would be different for different learning objectives.</p> <p>The wording of the learning objectives needs looking at, since it is not student-friendly and some of the objectives are very broad.</p>
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b></p>	<p>Resources would not have helped in this project. They might be useful in some circumstances, but it would depend on the nature of the project and they would probably have to be very specific.</p>
<p><b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b></p>	<p>No.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b></p>	<p>Attached.</p>
<p><b><i>Please collect any examples of</i></b></p>	<p>Attached.</p>

<p><b>learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. In particular please collect any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</b></p>	
<p><b>Any other comments from the project?</b></p>	<p>It was thought to be supportive to have a researcher working with the college.</p>
<p><b>Any other comments from the consultant?</b></p>	<p>This was a particularly interesting project to try the process out on.</p>
<p><b>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</b></p>	<p>'It was a way of marrying a student-initiated project with an existing framework demonstrating the potential flexibility of the framework.'</p>
<p><b>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</b></p>	<p>No comments on the revised version, but the tutor said of the version she used that she 'found the staged process useful as a framework for an open-ended themed project, and would welcome the chance to use it again to consolidate the requirements of each stage of the process and perhaps make the framework a bit more transparent to the students in order to allow them to participate more fully in the design of the project itself'.</p>

## Appendix D8: Staged process final reporting template – Whalley Range High School – Intermediate

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Martin Cross
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Whalley Range High School - Intermediate
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	B Keenan/R Demby
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	11-18 Girls' School
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	Discrete citizenship units – created in-house and delivered by form tutors – were delivered in one session of 50 minutes per week. Module one, 'Democracy' and module two, 'Cultural Diversity' each focussed on some key political literacy concepts and attempted to get the students to apply these to their own local context.
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	80 year 12 intermediate students
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16- to18-year olds
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	Intermediate (level 2) vocational
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from QCA guidance</i></b>	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding about citizenship issues: democracy, cultural diversity, elections, representation, democratic rights and responsibilities.  Show understanding of key citizenship

	<p>concepts (see above).</p> <p>Consider the social and moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation: political rights, prejudice, discrimination and stereotyping.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others through commentary and discussion.</p> <p>Debate controversial issues.</p>
<p><b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b></p>	<p>Project managers and four staff.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons.</i></b></p>	<p>Tutors were provided with tutor booklets to guide them on both content and delivery. Students were issued with parallel student booklets. As such there was no significant divergence.</p>
<p><b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear</i></b></p>	<p>Yes. All stages were necessary in order to see the learning process holistically, that is to be explicit about learning objectives and to review learning at various stages of the module's delivery. As we embarked on the QCA assessment pilot at a later stage, the five stages were applied specifically to the particular unit. As such it is not possible to make practical links between stages applied to</p>

<p><b><i>relationship between these?</i></b></p>	<p>the whole programme.</p>
<p><b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b></p>	<p>This was the second amended version of the two units. The units were developed in-house. After their first 'exposure', there was a staff development day. Some of this day was dedicated to staff feedback on the delivery of the two units, which were amended in the light of comments made. Students were also invited to feedback after the first version was delivered. There was useful feedback, from both students and staff, which was incorporated into the latest version. The fundamental themes of each unit were not altered and remained chosen by project managers.</p>
<p><b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>There was an initial citizenship audit on political literacy. This was produced as a 'partnership' project.</p> <p>For the second of these units, we began the staged process. Initial assessment followed the technique used for the advanced group. A 10-point scale was used, which could be easily translated into bar charts. The students self-assessed 'where they were' at the outset in terms of five key categories; identifying citizenship issues, interpreting sources of data, debating controversial issues, consideration of social, moral and ethical aspects of a situation and expressing and justifying a personal opinion to others. This initial assessment was to be used as a baseline for later comparisons as to</p>

	<p>progress made. The process was revisited midway through the unit and at the end (see example Excel files).</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	<p>Some basic political literacy was the initial goal. The units were devised making explicit reference to the QCA guidelines and learning objectives.</p> <p>The activities were first devised and then analysed/amended in order to determine the most appropriate learning objectives for this particular unit.</p> <p>Learning objectives were made explicit to the learners. However, this will have been of variable quality and frequency depending on individual tutors. There was staff development that aimed to reinforce the importance of such explicit reference to the learning objectives.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral</i></b></p>	<p>Self-assessment bar charts were used to help the learners to identify and review their learning. The actual act of self-assessment, with explicit reference being made to the (QCA) citizenship learning objectives, helped the learners significantly in their development of their awareness of those learning objectives.</p> <p>One feature of the Cultural Diversity pack was a student presentation to the rest of the class. This was both an opportunity for peer assessment as well as peer teaching. There were also Q and A sessions and discussion work, either in</p>

<p><b>evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</b></p>	<p>small groups or as a whole class. Evidence of learning was in the pack itself. There were several opportunities to either write and or discuss aspects of the pack. At the midpoint of the unit and at the end of the unit, students will have engaged in self-assessment again, using the bar charts. These self-assessments will be able to be used as evidence of learning in the students' progress files. Tutors were not expected to keep formal records of student learning.</p>
<p><b>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</b></p> <p><b>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements</b></p>	<p>In some cases, there is incontrovertible evidence that the students did meet the original learning objectives. However, it is more difficult to ascertain the degree to which there is consistency across all the tutor groups. Inevitably, when being delivered by non-specialists and some who can be described as less committed, there is a lack of overall consistency in modes of delivery. The self-assessment process was designed in such a way as to enable the learners to know what they now know and to know what they can now do in comparison to the start of the unit. This was made explicit to them. However, again, a discernable lack of consistency will have meant that this is not true for all year 12 level 2 learners.</p> <p>We are in the process of designing appropriate local certification. Criteria for awards are in discussion.</p>



<i>planned?</i>	
<b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, clearer or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b>	A wide variety of attitudes has been demonstrated. Some have clearly thrived on the explicit nature of the learning and assessment process. Others have only seen the citizenship provision as an 'extra' and an unnecessary one as that. Those who were interested found the process informative and fun. As with the advanced students, the intermediate students, on the whole, liked the fact that assessment was different – not by teachers but by honest self-reflection. This was clearly different to most of their normal learning experiences.
<b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b>	N/A
<b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there</i></b>	The process helps teachers to reflect more, something they rarely have time for! The self-assessment process makes teachers as well as learners think more explicitly about the knowledge and skills that were the learning objectives. Stage 5 was clearly a crucial element of the staged process in that it 'sets the

<p><b><i>issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>reflection agenda', incorporating it as a fundamental necessity in the learning process.</p> <p>Similar to the level 3 students, the level 2 students also made great leaps in their realisation of exactly what knowledge and skills they had been developing (stage 4). However, this was again impeded by the inconsistency of tutor commitment.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result in higher quality provision?</i></b></p>	<p>Half-day inset (see file - sixth form tutors training programme.doc) had three purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to introduce the pack to staff new to post-16 citizenship and or</li> <li>• to consult those who had been involved in earlier delivery to amend where necessary/when possible</li> <li>• to broaden the tutors repertoire of active learning techniques, appropriate to the specific learning/levels.</li> </ul> <p>The staff development was generally seen as successful and crucial, especially given the non-specialist nature of the tutor team.</p>
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to</i></b></p>	<p>The process is considered to add value, particularly in terms of the emphasis on planning and on reflection. There was a greater emphasis on establishing what students had learnt as a result of participating in the project.</p>

<p><b><i>make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>How it is marketed to senior management is crucial. It needs integrating into the overall citizenship package and/or a quality assurance process that emphasises assessment for learning.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>As long as the learning objectives were made 'language accessible' to the learners, all were seen as appropriate. The categories for self-assessment must be understood if the students are to successfully self-assess. In fact, some of these categories needed to be explained more explicitly to staff. Consideration of social, moral and ethical aspects of a situation has proved the most difficult to help the students understand, perhaps as it is more difficult to approach a situation from a more philosophical and less tangible angle.</p> <p>It may be beneficial to focus on fewer objectives for it to be manageable. As the process is learner directed, the number of objectives must be congruent with the level of the learners.</p> <p>The self-assessment process allowed the students to assess themselves at an appropriate level. It does, of course rely on honest self-assessment and this in turn relies upon a clear understanding of the categories and crucially the interpretation of the ten-point scale. This was a particularly difficult task especially as it relied upon different tutors. Despite staff development, the delivery lacked</p>

	consistency. As such the self-assessment process is subject to a lack of a standardised interpretation of the ten-point scale.
<b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the process?</i></b>	Learning materials were available. There was a separate input in terms of the self-assessment process, with instructions on its practical use. There was also a meeting for staff involved, which was a staff development exercise on the use of the process. The key aim was to enable staff involved to use the process and to be able to effect a standardised approach (within the constraint of varying levels of student comprehension). It was here that the mechanics of the process were focused on as well as the meanings behind the categories and measures.
<b><i>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</i></b>	Minimal.
<b><i>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</i></b>	See associated Excel files.
<b><i>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. Please collect in particular any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to</i></b>	See relevant files in folder.

<b><i>facilitate reflection and review.</i></b>	
<b><i>Any other comments from the project?</i></b>	The original plan to cover five of the citizenship learning objectives in such a short project was a mistake. While they might all have been touched on, real learning and progress would have been better facilitated if one or two of them had been selected as the focus.
<b><i>Any other comments from the consultant?</i></b>	
<b><i>A summary view on the value of the staged process?</i></b>	The process and the support provided nationally, has been very helpful.
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b>	The original did not make clear enough the distinction between the stages applying to the overall programme and those applying to constituent learning activities.

## Appendix D9: Staged process final reporting template – Whalley Range High School - Advanced

<b><i>Name of consultant</i></b>	Martin Cross
<b><i>Name of project</i></b>	Whalley Range High School – Advanced
<b><i>Project leader and contact details</i></b>	Beverley Keenan and Richard Demby
<b><i>Type of institution/organisation</i></b>	11-18 Girls' School
<b><i>Summary of focus of project (this should include an estimate of the amount of time provided and over what period)</i></b>	<p>A photography project based upon the LSDA pack 'The Real Picture'. Students were offered a choice of various citizenship themes for their project including: crime and the community, young people and leisure, cultural diversity, health and the environment. The project was intended to culminate in an exhibition, presentations and permanent displays.</p> <p>Delivery was through five group tutorial sessions of 50 minutes each and a period of three weeks when individuals and small groups conducted their own practical work.</p>
<b><i>Number of learners involved in the project</i></b>	120 year 12 advanced level students
<b><i>Age range involved</i></b>	16- to 17-year olds
<b><i>Qualification aims/level of learners' main programme (where appropriate)</i></b>	AS/A levels
<b><i>Selected learning objectives from</i></b>	Demonstrate knowledge and

<p><b>QCA guidance</b></p>	<p>understanding about citizenship issues: cultural diversity, ownership, power and control, democratic rights and responsibilities and media bias.</p> <p>Show understanding of key citizenship concepts (see above).</p> <p>Consider the social and moral and ethical issues applying to a particular situation: inequality, poverty, justice and responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of, and respect for diversity and challenge prejudice and discrimination.</p> <p>Express and justify a personal opinion to others through commentary and discussion</p> <p>Analyse sources of information ie media images and project based images, identify bias, stereotypes, representations of power and control and draw conclusions.</p>
<p><b><i>Number of adults/staff involved with the delivery of the project</i></b></p>	<p>Project manager and eight tutors.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the project in practice diverged from the description in the Initial Plan, please describe the differences and explain the reasons</i></b></p>	<p>The students selected the issues (first learning objective) so these were not necessarily the issues listed in the original plan.</p> <p>It is not clear that all groups produced an</p>

	exhibition and permanent display.
<b><i>Did the project apply all five stages of the staged process? If not, which did it omit and why? Was there a view that any of the stages were unnecessary, or that some were more fundamental than others? Which stages were applied to the overall programme and which to particular learning activities? Was there a clear relationship between these?</i></b>	<p>All stages were used.</p> <p>It was felt fundamentally important in stages 1 to 3 that learners were clear about their learning objectives.</p> <p>Stage 1 was considered ideal for the overall programme, as was stage 2. However, because this latter (initial assessment) had not been done at that point, it was done within this project, that is at the 'learning activity' level.</p>
<b><i>How was the aim and purpose of the selected citizenship activity/activities determined? Were YPs involved in this determination? Were there any problems in identifying aims and purposes? Was this any different from what is done in relation to citizenship activity not part of the staged process project?</i></b>	<p>The aims and purpose were selected by the project manager, but the issues through which these were explored and developed were selected by the YPs through tutor-facilitated discussion.</p> <p>This is the same process as used by Whalley Range for all their post-16 citizenship.</p>
<b><i>What process was used for initial assessment, to establish what learners already knew, understood, and could do in a citizenship context? Was this a knowledge assessment, a skills assessment, or both? If not both, why not? What immediate use, if any, was made of the findings from initial assessment? Did it lead to a change in the intended programme either for groups as a whole or for individual learners? Has the same</i></b>	<p>Initial assessment was effectively related to this activity not the overall programme.</p> <p>A 10-point scale was used in which YPs self-assess their confidence in terms of knowledge and skills. Tutors provided explanations and talked through the process in relation to previous citizenship activity.</p> <p>Initial assessment was seen as a baseline for comparing with later achievement, not as a diagnostic tool or</p>



<p><b><i>process/instrument been reused at the end of the project? If so, please summarise any findings.</i></b></p>	<p>a basis for adjusting the planned programme. It was felt that this would not be feasible with a team of non-specialist tutors.</p> <p>The same process is used at the mid-point and end. The findings are not yet available.</p>
<p><b><i>How were the chosen learning objectives selected from the 'menu' available? Were activities then planned to deliver these objectives, or were pre-determined activities analysed to see which objectives they could deliver? Were learners involved in making the choice? How were learners made aware of the objectives and given ownership of them? Were the objectives analysed in order to see what constituent knowledge, understanding and skills needed to be developed in order for them to be successfully achieved? Did this process affect the design of learning activities?</i></b></p>	<p>Both the objectives and the activity were chosen by the project team. However, the chosen activity, the LSDA photography project facilitates learner involvement.</p> <p>Staff development for the tutors was undertaken so that they were aware of techniques for ensuring learners understood and had ownership of the objectives, eg by analysing existing photos to see how they could relate to citizenship issues.</p> <p>The project manager provided some written materials/guidance to tutors to help in this.</p>
<p><b><i>In relation to a particular activity (whether consisting of one or more sessions):</i></b></p> <p><b><i>How was learning in respect of the objectives or their constituent elements identified and reviewed in an ongoing way? Was self-assessment used, peer assessment, oral questioning of individuals, group</i></b></p>	<p>The self-assessment log mentioned in the project plan is the 10-point scale bar graph mentioned above. These graphs were discussed both with individuals and groups and also led to oral questioning.</p> <p>Once photos were peer-assessed, in practice little further development or learning was possible because of the</p>

<p><b>discussions, etc? Was this learning recorded? If so, how (teacher/trainer record, learner log, Progress File, etc)? What types of evidence were used (particularly if ephemeral evidence)? Were both the maintenance of evidence and recording undertaken? If only one or the other, which and why?</b></p>	<p>lack of any more available time.</p> <p>Evidence of learning is essentially the photos taken by the students, together with the accompanying text chosen or written by them. These are displayed in classrooms and a selection in the Sixth Form Centre, but the overall product was not felt good enough to justify an exhibition.</p> <p>Learners will record their progress against the objectives on the bar graphs and may include references to this in their overall progress file.</p> <p>Some learners gave oral presentations, observed by tutors – but there are no records of this.</p>
<p><b>In relation to the overall project (ie where it consisted of more than one learning activity):</b></p> <p><b>How well did learners meet the original objectives? Was there differential achievement as between individuals? What evidence was there for coming to these judgements? Was an initial assessment process reused at the end of the project? If so what changes did this show in relation to individuals and/or groups? Do learners know what they can now do that they could not when starting on the programme? Were learners given the opportunity to think about how</b></p>	<p>Collated information and findings to come, which will help answer some of these questions.</p> <p>Learners will only be clear what they can do that they could not do at the start if this reflection has been facilitated by all tutors (and it is not known whether this happened). Similarly any discussion about planning for the future and linking back to learning from the activity, is likely to have been variable and different from one individual learner to another. Lack of time within the overall tutorial programme is considered to be a significant problem.</p> <p>Local certification is being planned, but it</p>

<p><b><i>they might apply what they have learned in the future? Has learners' overall achievement in respect of the objectives been recorded? If so, how? If not, why not? Is any recognition of learners' achievements planned?</i></b></p>	<p>is not yet determined on what basis.</p>
<p><b><i>What is known about learners' attitudes to this process? Did they find it appealing, enjoyable, and clearer or not? Did they notice any difference from the way the rest of their learning is organised? (Some of the earlier questions could also be looked at from a learner perspective.)</i></b></p>	<p>Learners appeared to find the process 'fun, interesting and different', especially because of the lack of pressure (self-assessment without others making judgements about them).</p> <p>Learners noticed the difference as there is nowhere else in their programmes (apart from progress review tutorials) where they are asked to get involved in self-assessment.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had direct responsibility for interaction with learners, what did they think of the process? Was it better, worse, or no different to their usual approach? Were there any staff development issues identified by individuals for themselves? Did they think it improved learning? Were there any issues of practicability and manageability?</i></b></p>	<p>The view is that using this process makes teachers think seriously about, and reflect on, their teaching and learning. Indeed, the end-of-project meeting between the consultant and the two project managers (stage 5, 'reflection and review', for them?) led one to say that the process 'was more useful than I had realised at the time'.</p> <p>For the learners, completing stages 4 via their bar graphs was obviously very useful, a tutor described this as being able to see the 'light-bulbs' going on in their heads as they realised what they had learned and achieved.</p>

	<p>Stages 2, 3 and 4 (particularly 4) were thought especially useful in this project.</p>
<p><b><i>Where the interviewee is a staff member who had responsibility for managing the contribution of other staff in contact with learners, what did they think of the applicability of the process? Did it make matters more manageable, or did it add to a management burden? Were there issues relating to staff capability and staff development within the team that became clear as a result of using this process? Did it impact on the overall quality of the learning process across all the members of staff and learners involved? If not, why not?</i></b></p>	<p>There are issues about managing the contribution of non-specialist staff and 'power relationships' which apply generally and not necessarily just to this project.</p> <p>It was felt that the use of the process, alongside a quality activity (the LSDA photography pack), had a beneficial impact on the learning process, and successfully integrated assessment into it.</p> <p>The use of the bar graph was a good tool for use by the tutor team, although some were resistant even to that. The graph will be modified for future use as a result of the experience.</p> <p>Linking stages 4 and 5 to stages 1 and 3 were seen as crucial. There was some variation between tutors as to the extent to which they did this.</p> <p>For Whalley Range, the activity and process needs building in formally into the overall tutorial and progress review process.</p>
<p><b><i>If particular staff development activities were used within the project, please describe these. Why were they used? What were their objectives? Were they successful? Did they result</i></b></p>	<p>An introductory session was provided, which took the tutor team through the pack and the process. It was regarded as very important and positive.</p>

<i>in higher quality provision?</i>	
<p><b><i>What is the overall view on this staged process to assessment? Is it considered to have added value or not? Are there any particular disadvantages and disbenefits? Would it be suitable for wider use and if so, what might need to be done to make its wider introduction successful?</i></b></p>	<p>The process is considered to add value, particularly in terms of the emphasis on planning and on reflection. There was a greater emphasis on establishing what students had learnt as a result of participating in the project.</p> <p>How it is marketed to senior management is crucial and it needs to be integrated into the overall citizenship package and/or a quality assurance process that emphasises assessment for learning.</p>
<p><b><i>Did interviewees form any view as to whether any particular learning objectives that they had targeted were unsuitable for any particular types or levels of learners? Would any of these learning objectives benefit from rewriting? If so, how? Were the selected objectives manageable? Did interviewees feel that objectives used might have needed identified levels for different learners? If so, what criteria would have been appropriate and how would judgements against such criteria have been made?</i></b></p>	<p>None were regarded as unsuitable.</p> <p>The language was regarded as suitable for teachers but that rewording would probably be needed for some learners.</p> <p>The last two objectives are felt to be quite difficult in a school context. Issues of manageability, opportunities and time in relation to large numbers make for problems in delivery.</p> <p>The view was expressed that teachers would pitch the objectives at the appropriate level for their learners, but that criteria would not be needed unless there was to be certification.</p>
<p><b><i>Would the availability of learning materials and resources referenced and related to the learning objectives have facilitated the introduction of the</i></b></p>	<p>Yes, but the LSDA pack used was of this kind.</p>

<b>process?</b>	
<b>Were there any particular costs associated with using this process (ie specific to the process, not specific to citizenship learning)?</b>	No, but access to ICT facilities for students to facilitate self-assessment record-keeping is an issue.
<b>Please collect any descriptions and samples of methods of recording used.</b>	Sample self-assessment bar graph provided.  <i>Collated information to come along with information provided to tutor team.</i>
<b>Please collect any examples of learning materials and learning/assessment exercises used. Where practicable, examples of learners' responses would also be useful. In particular please collect any useful information about methods used to interact with learners to facilitate reflection and review.</b>	N/A (LSDA pack)
<b>Any other comments from the project?</b>	An interesting and strongly held view came through as a result of using the process. This was that the original plan to cover as many as six of the citizenship learning objectives in such a short project was a mistake. While they might all have been touched on, real learning and progress would have been better facilitated if one or two of them had been selected as the focus.
<b>Any other comments from the consultant?</b>	
<b>A summary view on the value of the</b>	The process and the support provided

<b><i>staged process?</i></b>	nationally has been very helpful.
<b><i>Any views from the project and the consultant on the respective merits of the Staged Process description contained in the current QCA guidance and issued at the beginning of the project, and the draft revised version provided to consultants in January 2005?</i></b>	The original did not make clear enough the distinction between the stages applying to the overall programme and those applying to constituent learning activities.