

# CMALT Assessment Form

This form and the guidance for assessors have been updated. Please read the updated guidance before undertaking the assessment and completing this form. Thank you.

## Assessment summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Candidate name |  |
| Portfolio (link) |  |
| CMALT pathway | CMALT |
| Lead Assessor |  |
| 2nd Assessor |  |
| **Assessment outcome** | |
| Date |  |
| 1st submission  (delete as appropriate) | Pass with Distinction  Pass  Referral - minor revisions required  Referral - major revisions required |
| 2nd submission (delete as appropriate) | Pass  Fail |
| Comments | *Please include comments for the candidate.* |
| **Office use ONLY** | |
| Date |  |
| Checked by |  |

## 

## Assessment form

### Assessment criteria

Assessors review each section of the portfolio to determine whether it is strong, adequate, or whether revisions or additions are required.

* **Strong (S)**: Description, evidence and reflection are notably strong: the section is well-documented and highly convincing;
* **Adequate (A)**: Description, evidence and reflection adequately demonstrate competence: the section is both complete and credible;
* **Revisions required (R)**: At least one of description, evidence and reflection either need improvement or are insufficiently covered/absent.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Portfolio section** | **Lead Assessor** | **2nd Assessor** | **Final decision** |
| **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 |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| **Core area 2: Learning, teaching and assessment** | | | |
| a) An understanding of teaching, learning and/or assessment processes |  |  |  |
| b)An understanding of your target learners |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| **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. | | | |
| Legal |  |  |  |
| Example 2 |  |  |  |
| Example 2 |  |  |  |
| Policy |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| **Core area 4: Communication - Working with others** |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| **Specialist option(s)**  Candidates are required to include at least 1 specialist option**.** | | | |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |
| **Demonstrating 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: | | | |

## Assessment process

Portfolios are peer-assessed by two assessors. One is referred to as the ‘Lead Assessor’: this is a CMALT holder nominated by ALT who has previously assessed at least three portfolios. One is referred to as the ‘Second Assessor’, and may be nominated by the candidate. The candidate is not obliged to nominate an assessor; if no details are provided, or if the nomination is felt to be unsuitable for any reason (such as a conflict of interest, or the nominated person not agreeing to undertake the work), ALT will nominate a CMALT holder to act as Second Assessor.

Assessors will assess the portfolio in line with the rubrics laid out against each section in this document. In each section, assessors will determine whether the description, reflection, and evidence provided are sufficiently robust and convincing to merit the award of CMALT accreditation.

Assessors also assess whether the portfolio as a whole demonstrates the candidate’s commitment to the core CMALT principles and values:

* 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 areas.
* A commitment to communicate and disseminate effective practice.

### Assessment criteria

Assessors review each section of the portfolio to determine whether it is strong, adequate, or whether revisions or additions are required.

* **Strong (S)**: Description, evidence and reflection are notably strong: the section is well-documented and highly convincing;
* **Adequate (A)**: Description, evidence and reflection adequately demonstrate competence: the section is both complete and credible;
* **Revisions required (R)**: At least one of description, evidence and reflection either need improvement or are insufficiently covered/absent.

These descriptions represent an assessment of how well a section is being described, evidenced and reflected upon, rather than a judgement on the relative strength or quality of the example(s) or piece(s) of work being discussed. A 'simple' example may be well described, well evidenced, and insightfully reflected upon, and therefore be judged Strong; and vice versa.

It is assumed that, where candidates have previously been awarded Associate CMALT, the sections which the Associate CMALT portfolio has in common with the CMALT portfolio will already evidence an adequate level of engagement with the core principles and values of the scheme, and an adequate level of understanding and reflection. However, it is expected that the candidate’s context and practice will have evolved, and that a greater breadth and depth of experience, together with a more advanced level of criticality, analysis, and insight will be evident throughout the portfolio. The assessments reached for the CMALT submission may therefore differ from those previously recorded for an Associate CMALT submission.

### Assessment outcomes

Once the portfolio has been assessed against the criteria, assessors will decide on one of the following outcomes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Decision** | **Description** |
| **Pass with Distinction** | The portfolio provides notably strong evidence of reflective practice, and of the candidate’s adherence to the CMALT core principles and values, across each of its sections. The candidate is encouraged to share their portfolio via the [CMALT Portfolio Register](https://www.alt.ac.uk/certified-membership/cmalt-sharing-initiative). |
| **Pass** | The portfolio provides convincing evidence of reflective practice, and of the candidate’s adherence to the CMALT core principles and values, across each of its sections. The candidate is encouraged to share their portfolio via the [CMALT Portfolio Register](https://www.alt.ac.uk/certified-membership/cmalt-sharing-initiative). |
| **Referral - minor revisions required** | The portfolio provides convincing evidence of reflective practice, and of the candidate’s adherence to the CMALT core principles and values, across most of its sections. The assessors have recommended minor revisions in some sections before the portfolio is accredited. The candidate should re-submit a revised portfolio for review, highlighting or summarizing where revisions have been made. |
| **Referral - major revisions required** | Some or all sections of the portfolio require significant revision before the portfolio can be accredited. The assessors have detailed where and how the portfolio needs to be revised. The candidate should re-submit a revised portfolio for re-assessment, highlighting or summarizing where revisions have been made. |
| **Fail** | A re-submitted portfolio previously assessed as requiring major revisions cannot be recommended for accreditation. |

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

* **Pass**: The assessors find that the portfolio adequately meets the criteria for all the sections;
* **Referral**: This arises if the assessors assess one or more sections of the portfolio as requiring revisions or additions. 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:** The assessors deem that the portfolio now adequately meets the criteria for all the sections;
* **Fail**: This results if the assessors judge 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.

### How to write feedback

Feedback is anonymous, but please keep in mind when writing your comments that the CMALT portfolio is a highly personal document in which candidates have usually invested significant work.

Be concise, specific, and constructive in your feedback. Where revisions are required the feedback should set out as specifically as possible where and how the portfolio can be improved.

The following pieces of advice from experienced peer Assessors may be helpful in formulating feedback:

* Avoid praising or criticising the candidate: make sure all comments refer to the portfolio. Rather than general comments, consider giving a few specific points of positive feedback, followed by suggestions for change, which (as suggested below) should be focused on what the author could do to improve the proposal.
* Try to write feedback that you’d be happy to receive and that the authors can clearly act on. Be positive in your language and constructive in your suggestions. Rather than simply stating a problem or deficiency in a particular area or aspect of the portfolio, you can suggest changes or additions that would improve it. For example, if you think a section lacks sufficient reflection, you might say: “This section would be improved by deeper reflection; please give some examples of the impact of this [example piece of work] on your users/learners, and reflect on how your practice might change or evolve in the future as a result”.
* Please be respectful and constructive in tone, and be explicit about the nature of the advice you are giving. For example, are you offering suggestions for consideration (“the example/section/portfolio could be enhanced by the inclusion of…”), or insisting on a problem being fixed (“this section is unclear and should be rewritten”)?
* Bear in mind that CMALT candidates come from very diverse contexts and job roles, and from different national contexts across the world. Methods and approaches may differ widely, or appear unfamiliar, but this does not necessarily mean that, relative to the candidate’s context, they are not effective and robust in terms of the CMALT competencies.

### Timescale

Assessments should normally be completed within 6-8 weeks. We undertake to return assessments no later than 3 months after a portfolio is submitted. There are three submission windows a year. Candidates submit portfolios on:

* **31 January:** for assessment during February, March and April and assessment result in May;
* **31 May**: for assessment during June, July and August and assessment result in September;
* **30 September**: for assessment during October, November and December and assessment result in January.

**Document History**

|  |  |  |
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