

National Professional Qualifications QA Agent (QAA) Final Assessment Moderation Report

QAA Moderator	
Date of moderation	4 March 2021

1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQonline
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	24 February 2021

2. Moderation Assessment Sample

National Professional Qualification	Number of scripts Moderated	Script identification		
		Given name/ Mononym	Surname/ Family name	DMS reference number
		*List each participant with their name and DMS Person Reference Number (PRN) against the NPQ level moderated		
NPQSL	1			
Total	1			

3. Overall evaluation of the Provider's assessment of participants (include reference to internal moderation where applicable)

Percentage of moderation sample marked in accordance with the DfE NPQ Content and Assessment Framework and Mark Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% (1/1)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------







Previous moderation report recommendations	<p>22 December 2020</p> <p>Assessment Marking Continue to ensure that each assessment note includes an explicit evaluation of the quality of the evidence submitted against each key element of the assessment criterion/score descriptor to fully justify the mark awarded.</p>
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Summary of effective use of the mark scheme (Bullet points)

Assessment Marking

- Internal moderation confirms that all initial assessment marking is secure with detailed comments.
- Almost all of the assessment notes, for this single submission at national moderation, justify the mark awarded. Where assessment notes are most effective, they provide an evaluation that uses pertinent examples of the participant's evidence to strengthen the assessment decision. In addition, where the lower mark is awarded, they provide clarity on the evidence required to achieve the higher mark.

NPQ level: NPQSL	QAA moderation comment examples
Criterion: 1.2.2	<p>Initial assessment note: <i>'You used a breadth of research into the successful implementation of change and you applied these approaches to your plans. You studied the leadership of change strategies of Fullan, Boyle, Kouzes, Posner and Kotter. You followed the change process as set out by Kotter in the delivery of your plans and used the work of the EEF to ensure that change was sustained.'</i></p> <p>Internal moderation note: <i>'Agree with Judgement. There is clear evidence of analysing research into the leadership of change with appropriate decisions being made about their deployment. There were also good examples of how each strategy was used in the delivery of the plans.'</i></p>
Criterion: 6.2.1	<p>Initial assessment note: <i>'You demonstrated your commitment to high-quality CPD and referenced research into CPD from the TDA. You used different strategies such as coaching, leading by example and reflective conversations to support staff development. To gain an additional mark for this criterion, you needed to broaden your research and explain how you would identify and systematically develop talent.'</i></p> <p>Internal moderation note: <i>'Agree with judgement. There is some evidence of providing professional development arrangements for staff, with more detail in an example for an NQT. Although there was some evidence of research by reference to the TDA and Fielding et al, there was insufficient evidence of analysing either reference.'</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'Key areas for improvement', within the 'Evaluative feedback: summary', are used effectively to identify the weaknesses in the submission and provide appropriate and helpful comment to support the participant's further professional development. <table border="1" data-bbox="400 479 1300 925"> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 479 614 624"> NPQ level: NPQSL  </td> <td data-bbox="614 479 1300 624">QAA moderation comment examples</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 624 614 925">Key areas for improvement</td> <td data-bbox="614 624 1300 925"> <i>'You need to strengthen your research into curriculum development, professional development and the benefits and risks of different styles of communication. In Teaching and Curriculum Excellence, Leading with Impact, Managing Risks and Resources, you needed to be analytical rather than descriptive. It is important to provide evidence against each element of the mark scheme.'</i> </td> </tr> </table>	NPQ level: NPQSL 	QAA moderation comment examples	Key areas for improvement	<i>'You need to strengthen your research into curriculum development, professional development and the benefits and risks of different styles of communication. In Teaching and Curriculum Excellence, Leading with Impact, Managing Risks and Resources, you needed to be analytical rather than descriptive. It is important to provide evidence against each element of the mark scheme.'</i>
NPQ level: NPQSL 	QAA moderation comment examples				
Key areas for improvement	<i>'You need to strengthen your research into curriculum development, professional development and the benefits and risks of different styles of communication. In Teaching and Curriculum Excellence, Leading with Impact, Managing Risks and Resources, you needed to be analytical rather than descriptive. It is important to provide evidence against each element of the mark scheme.'</i>				
<p>Areas for development (Bullet points)</p>	<p>Assessment Marking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On occasion, the assessment notes sampled do not justify the mark awarded. This is because they do not provide a clear and precise evaluation of the participant's evidence presented against all key elements of the relevant score descriptor. As a result, continuing to develop the consistency of high-quality assessment notes, which justify the mark awarded, remains an area for improvement. <table border="1" data-bbox="400 1272 1300 1742"> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1272 614 1417"> NPQ level: NPQSL  </td> <td data-bbox="614 1272 1300 1417">QAA moderation comment examples</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1417 614 1742"> Criterion: 4.2.1 </td> <td data-bbox="614 1417 1300 1742"> There is no reference to '...positive impact on relevant school priorities...' which is a key element of the assessment criterion/score descriptor. <i>'Your sponsor provided positive comments on your ability to establish and sustain partnerships with key stakeholders, such as the Chair of Governors and the SLT. You were proactive in establishing partnerships with the pupils, parents and the wider community.'</i> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Technical Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few minor errors are present in the assessment documentation. For example: 2.2.2 - 'and used their work to on'; and 3.2.2 - use of, 'there is evidence of how the candidate' (instead of participant). 	NPQ level: NPQSL 	QAA moderation comment examples	Criterion: 4.2.1	There is no reference to '...positive impact on relevant school priorities...' which is a key element of the assessment criterion/score descriptor. <i>'Your sponsor provided positive comments on your ability to establish and sustain partnerships with key stakeholders, such as the Chair of Governors and the SLT. You were proactive in establishing partnerships with the pupils, parents and the wider community.'</i>
NPQ level: NPQSL 	QAA moderation comment examples				
Criterion: 4.2.1	There is no reference to '...positive impact on relevant school priorities...' which is a key element of the assessment criterion/score descriptor. <i>'Your sponsor provided positive comments on your ability to establish and sustain partnerships with key stakeholders, such as the Chair of Governors and the SLT. You were proactive in establishing partnerships with the pupils, parents and the wider community.'</i>				

4. Substantiating evidence where national moderation does not verify the accuracy of final assessment marking. *(Please add additional boxes for each referenced script)*

DMS person reference number	Evidence

5. Recommendations for improvement

- As previously recommended, continue to ensure that each assessment note includes an explicit evaluation of the quality of the evidence submitted against each key element of the assessment criterion/score descriptor to fully justify the mark awarded.