

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

QAA Moderator	Nadine Powrie
Date of moderation	8 October 2019

### 1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQonline
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	7 October 2019

### 2. Moderation Assessment Sample

National Professional Qualification	Number of scripts Moderated	Script identification		
		Given name/ Mononym	Surname/ Family name	TRN
		*List each participant with their name and Teacher Reference Number (TRN) against the NPQ level moderated (add rows as necessary)		
NPQML	1			
NPQSL	1			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>			

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

Outcome	Assessment is secure.	Yes
Percentage of moderated scripts assessed accurately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100%</li> </ul>	

Strengths (Bullet points)	Assessment marking	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment marking sampled at national moderation is completed in line with the requirements of the DfE NPQ Content and Assessment Framework and mark scheme.</li> <li>The notes for each criterion generally reflect an effective evaluation of the quality of the participant's evidence to justify the mark awarded.</li> </ul>	
		QAA moderation comment examples
	NPQ Level: NPQSL [redacted] Criterion: 3.2.1	Assessment notes make good reference to the participant's demonstration of evaluating research, and examples of leadership i.e., <i>'Carries out research into styles of leadership and also into motivational factors (i.e. such as staff seeing the participant as a learner). Adopted approaches to encourage engagement.'</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment notes sampled refer to the evaluation of the sponsor comments and the supporting documents, where applicable, to contribute to the validity of the mark awarded. ([redacted] - criteria 3.2.1/4.2.2)</li> <li>The assessment notes are generally well-balanced to justify the decision that a participant partially demonstrates the criterion requirements. These notes explain where the evidence presented demonstrates aspects of the criterion and also identifies why it is not sufficient to fully demonstrate the required knowledge and skills. The note is most effective when it provides clear and accurate identification of aspects that require improvement to support further leadership development.</li> </ul>	
	QAA moderation comment examples	
NPQ Level: NPQML [redacted] Criterion: 3.1.1	The area for improvement is accurately identified in the assessment note to justify why the assessment criterion has not fully been demonstrated. The note highlights that the participant has not explained the benefits and risks of the approach adopted. <i>'The benefits and risks of each approach are not discussed and so the impact is unknown.'</i>	
NPQ Level: NPQSL [redacted] Criterion: 2.2.3	The area for improvement is clearly and accurately identified paying close attention to the assessment criterion/score descriptor namely reducing variation in pupil progress i.e., <i>'More needed to be made of in-school variation.'</i>	

Minor weakness (Bullet points)	<p><b>Internal Moderation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal moderation is robust. Clear and effective comments provide support and challenge to improve assessment marking practice. Moderation is most effective when the commentary explains to the assessor why the initial score requires modification in accordance with the score descriptor.</li> </ul>			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>QAA moderation comment examples</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>                     NPQ Level: NPQML                       Criterion: 2.1.1                 </td> <td>                     Internal moderation provided the assessor with constructive feedback by highlighting that the submission lacked some evidence but noting that this was demonstrated to some extent within the submission so shifted the 0 mark to a 1 mark i.e. <i>'Does make reference to Maths Mastery and studies undertaken in Finland and Singapore. Makes reference to change in approach mixed-ability seating)-however, there is no evidence of analysing research.'</i> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		QAA moderation comment examples	NPQ Level: NPQML  Criterion: 2.1.1
	QAA moderation comment examples			
NPQ Level: NPQML  Criterion: 2.1.1	Internal moderation provided the assessor with constructive feedback by highlighting that the submission lacked some evidence but noting that this was demonstrated to some extent within the submission so shifted the 0 mark to a 1 mark i.e. <i>'Does make reference to Maths Mastery and studies undertaken in Finland and Singapore. Makes reference to change in approach mixed-ability seating)-however, there is no evidence of analysing research.'</i>			
	<p><b>Assessment marking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In one instance, the assessment notes sampled do not comprehensively justify the mark awarded. This is because they lack a precise evaluation of how the evidence provided demonstrated a key aspect of the criterion score descriptor.</li> </ul>			
	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>                     NPQ Level: NPQSL                       Criterion: 1.2.1                 </td> <td>                     Assessment notes lacks specific reference to evidence of the second element of the score descriptor namely, inclusion of comparative schools. Consequently, the note does not comprehensively justify that the assessment criterion has been fully demonstrated.                 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NPQ Level: NPQSL  Criterion: 1.2.1	Assessment notes lacks specific reference to evidence of the second element of the score descriptor namely, inclusion of comparative schools. Consequently, the note does not comprehensively justify that the assessment criterion has been fully demonstrated.	
NPQ Level: NPQSL  Criterion: 1.2.1	Assessment notes lacks specific reference to evidence of the second element of the score descriptor namely, inclusion of comparative schools. Consequently, the note does not comprehensively justify that the assessment criterion has been fully demonstrated.			

4. Substantiating evidence where moderation finds that assessment is not secure, and judgements do not reflect the national standards. *(Please add additional boxes for each referenced script)*

Script ID	Evidence
N/A	

#### 5. Recommendations for improvement

There are no significant weaknesses to report however the overall good quality of the marking will be further improved by ensuring that every assessment note includes a precise evaluation of all components of each criterion score descriptor.