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##

## **Name of CMALT Candidate: *Example Name***

## **Portfolio URL: URL (if any)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Lead A = Lead Assessor2nd A = other Assessor Final = completed by Lead A | Please complete the relevant column by adding either S, A or I. | *Comments**(particularly if description, evidence and/or reflection are ‘inadequate’)* |
| Section | Lead A |  2nd A | Final  |   |
| **Core area 1: Operational Issues** |
| a) An understanding of the constraints and benefits of different technologies |  |   |   |   |
| b)Technical knowledge and ability in the use of learning technology |   |   |   |   |
| c) Supporting the deployment of learning technologies |   |   |   |   |
| **Core area 2: Learning, teaching and assessment** |
| a) An understanding of teaching, learning and/or assessment processes |   |   |   |   |
| b)An understanding of your target learners |   |   |   |   |
| **Core area 3: The wider context**  | *Candidates should address at least two topics. Either two legal or one legal and one policy or standards as a minimum.* |
| a)Area 1: Area 2: |   |   |   |   |
| b) Policy |   |   |   |    |
| **Core area 4**: Communication - Working with others  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| Specialist option(s)Write the titles below. | *Candidates are required to include at least 1 specialist option.* |
| 1. |   |   |   |   |
| 2. |   |   |   |   |
| 3. |   |   |   |   |
| **The four core principles** | *Applied to the whole portfolio.* |
| A commitment to exploring and understanding the interplay between technology and learning. |   |   |   |   |
| A commitment to keep up to date with new technologies. |   |   |   |   |
| An empathy with and willingness to learn from colleagues from different backgrounds and specialisms. |   |   |   |   |
| A commitment to communicate and disseminate effective practice. |   |   |   |   |

##

Comments:

*If the portfolio is a referral, please provide practical feedback on which sections need to be revised and which components (description, evidence and/or reflection) are not adequate or strong.*

**Assessment outcome:**

Final decision (jointly taken, noted by Lead Assessor in the third column):

1st submission: Pass or Referral (delete as appropriate)

2nd submission (after referral): Pass or Fail (delete as appropriate)

Assessor signed: Dated:

Lead Assessor signed: Dated:

ALT signed: Dated:

## Notes for assessors

Before beginning the assessment process and completing this form, please read the Guidelines for CMALT (<http://goo.gl/KAcM3i> )

The task of the assessors is firstly, independently, to assess the portfolio and complete this form. Once the independent assessments are complete, the assessors exchange results. Next, both assessors jointly agree a decision. To assist them in determining the standard of each section of the portfolio, assessors will take account of the “benchmark” portfolio examples provided.

The Lead Assessor should communicate the outcome of the assessment process or any delays of the assessment to ALT (cmalt@alt.ac.uk) , who will communicate with the candidate. Email exchanges between the assessors should be copied for information to the cmalt@alt.ac.uk , to enable progress to be monitored.

The principles and values that inform the development of the scheme are:

* A commitment to exploring and understanding the interplay between technology and learning.
* A commitment to keep up to date with new technologies.
* An empathy with and willingness to learn from colleagues from different backgrounds and specialist options.
* A commitment to communicate and disseminate effective practice.

These should be kept in mind when assessing the portfolio and examining evidence, both for the core areas and specialist options.

Assessors should judge each section of the portfolio as being of one of the following standards:

1. Strong: There is well documented and highly convincing description of what they have done, evidence that they have done it **and** reflection on it.
2. Adequate: There is complete and credible description of what they have done, evidence that they have done it **and** reflection on it. Note that even if two of description, evidence and reflection are strong the section can only be marked as adequate if any of them is adequate
3. Inadequate: At least one of description, evidence and reflection are inadequate (or non-existent). Where a section is marked as adequate or inadequate comments must be provided which will enable the candidate to bring the section up to the necessary standard.

The contents of the form minus the names of the assessors will be shared with the candidate. If the outcome of the assessment is a Referral or a Fail, the Lead Assessor should summarise the reasons in the comments section indicating, in the case of a referral what improvements are needed in the candidate’s portfolio prior to resubmission by the candidate.

**Assessment outcomes**

If the portfolio is being assessed for the first time, there are two possible outcomes of the assessment:

· Pass:

Both assessors should agree that the portfolio adequately or strongly meets the criteria for all the sections including at least one specialist option (ie all sections have received an adequate or strong from both assessors);

· Referral:

This would arise if at least one assessor judges one or more sections of the portfolio to be inadequate. In this case the assessors will write a feedback statement to be sent to the candidate. This should identify the areas which need revising and outline, in a constructive, supportive manner, what needs to be done for the portfolio to pass.

If the portfolio is being assessed after a referral, there are two possible outcomes of the assessment:

· Pass:

Both assessors should agree that the portfolio now adequately or strongly meets the criteria for all the sections including at least one specialist option;

· Fail:

This would arise if both assessors judge one or more sections of the portfolio to be inadequate. In this case to the lead assessor will write a feedback statement to be sent to the candidate.

Timescale

Assessment should be completed within 6 weeks of the portfolio being received by the assessors. A maximum of 3 months duration can be requested in exceptional circumstances, bearing in mind that candidates must receive their result before the start of the next submission window (see above, p. 10). The submission and assessment cycle is as follows.

Candidates will submit their portfolios:

by 1 February for assessment during March and April and assessment result in May;

by 1 June for assessment during July and August and assessment result in September;

by 1 October for assessment during Oct/Nov/Dec and assessment result in January.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Submit portfolio by**  | **Receive assessment result by** |
| **Assessment window 1**  | 01 February | 31 May |
| **Assessment window 2** | 01 June | 30 September |
| **Assessment window 3** | 01 October | 31 January |