

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

QAA Moderator	Karen Simpson
Date of moderation	22 December 2020

### 1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQonline
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	16 December 2020

### 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		
NPQH	1	[REDACTED]		
Total	1	[REDACTED]		

### 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"> <li>100% (1 out of 1)</li> </ul>
--	---

Previous moderation report recommendations	<p><b>16 September 2020</b> <b>Assessment Marking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further enhance consistency in high-quality assessment marking by ensuring that all assessment notes provide clear evaluation against all key elements of the score descriptor.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>Summary of effective use of the mark scheme (Bullet points)</p>	<p><b>Assessment Marking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vast majority of the assessment notes for this single submission for national moderation reflect the full requirements of the relevant score descriptor, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the participant’s evidence in order to justify the mark awarded. Where the assessment criterion is partially demonstrated, the assessment notes and ‘Key areas for improvement’, within the ‘Evaluative feedback: summary’, are used particularly effectively on occasion to provide constructive guidance. They identify the weaknesses in the evidence presented and enable the participant to consider areas for further professional development.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="448 703 1145 1534"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="448 703 612 759"></th> <th data-bbox="612 703 1145 759">QAA moderation comment examples</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="448 759 612 1534"> <p>NPQ level: NPQH Task 2</p> <p>Criterion: 6.3.1 and ‘Key areas for improvement’</p> </td> <td data-bbox="612 759 1145 1534"> <p>The assessment note identifies the lack of evidence in relation to the extent to which, ‘the systems designed align with relevant/appropriate best practice’, when awarding the lower mark. Further feedback to support leadership development is provided in the feedback summary ‘Key areas for improvement’.</p> <p><i>‘Evidence demonstrates that you have reviewed the school’s current appraisal practice and proposed the design of a new system which uses a wider range of evidence sources to measure staff performance. This system has a stronger focus on evaluating different elements of practice in evaluating the quality of teaching. The system also included further support through coaching and mentoring and timelier target review to implement relevant support where needed. You comment that each year there are some disappointed staff with regard to pay awards but miss an opportunity here to reflect on how their individual contribution could be better evaluated, managed and rewarded.’</i></p> <p><b>‘Key areas for improvement’</b></p> <p><i>‘In further developing your skills, consider how you might reward staff performance in a broader context, particularly where this links to high quality teaching. Consider how a system might recognise the positive impact of high staff performance, providing more immediate and current incentives.’</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		QAA moderation comment examples	<p>NPQ level: NPQH Task 2</p> <p>Criterion: 6.3.1 and ‘Key areas for improvement’</p>	<p>The assessment note identifies the lack of evidence in relation to the extent to which, ‘the systems designed align with relevant/appropriate best practice’, when awarding the lower mark. Further feedback to support leadership development is provided in the feedback summary ‘Key areas for improvement’.</p> <p><i>‘Evidence demonstrates that you have reviewed the school’s current appraisal practice and proposed the design of a new system which uses a wider range of evidence sources to measure staff performance. This system has a stronger focus on evaluating different elements of practice in evaluating the quality of teaching. The system also included further support through coaching and mentoring and timelier target review to implement relevant support where needed. You comment that each year there are some disappointed staff with regard to pay awards but miss an opportunity here to reflect on how their individual contribution could be better evaluated, managed and rewarded.’</i></p> <p><b>‘Key areas for improvement’</b></p> <p><i>‘In further developing your skills, consider how you might reward staff performance in a broader context, particularly where this links to high quality teaching. Consider how a system might recognise the positive impact of high staff performance, providing more immediate and current incentives.’</i></p>
	QAA moderation comment examples				
<p>NPQ level: NPQH Task 2</p> <p>Criterion: 6.3.1 and ‘Key areas for improvement’</p>	<p>The assessment note identifies the lack of evidence in relation to the extent to which, ‘the systems designed align with relevant/appropriate best practice’, when awarding the lower mark. Further feedback to support leadership development is provided in the feedback summary ‘Key areas for improvement’.</p> <p><i>‘Evidence demonstrates that you have reviewed the school’s current appraisal practice and proposed the design of a new system which uses a wider range of evidence sources to measure staff performance. This system has a stronger focus on evaluating different elements of practice in evaluating the quality of teaching. The system also included further support through coaching and mentoring and timelier target review to implement relevant support where needed. You comment that each year there are some disappointed staff with regard to pay awards but miss an opportunity here to reflect on how their individual contribution could be better evaluated, managed and rewarded.’</i></p> <p><b>‘Key areas for improvement’</b></p> <p><i>‘In further developing your skills, consider how you might reward staff performance in a broader context, particularly where this links to high quality teaching. Consider how a system might recognise the positive impact of high staff performance, providing more immediate and current incentives.’</i></p>				
<p>Areas for development (Bullet points)</p>	<p><b>Assessment Marking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all the assessment notes reviewed at national moderation are sufficiently comprehensive to justify the marks 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. The issue of ensuring greater</li> </ul>				

<p>consistency in the quality of assessment notes was identified in the previous two national moderation reports and therefore remains as an area for improvement.</p>	
	<p><b>QAA moderation comment examples</b></p>
<p>NPQ level: NPQH Task 1 [Redacted] Criterion: 1.3.3</p>	<p>Assessment notes do not explicitly reflect the full requirements of the score descriptor for the higher mark in order to validate the judgement made. There is no reference to whether the participant, 'designs and implements plans that are wholly consistent with governing board's vision and/or strategy and fully reflect its feedback'.</p> <p><i>'You have acknowledged the value of the governing body in supporting and challenging you in the work of the school. You have clearly involved the governors in significant collaborative work that the school has undertaken to validate the data and build trust between both school and governing body. (Supporting evidence also in section 3).'</i></p>
<p>NPQ level: NPQH Task 1 [Redacted] Criterion: 2.3.4</p>	<p>Assessment notes do not include a clear evaluation of the extent to which the participant, 'identifies the most 'important/ relevant/ appropriate issues to address', when awarding the full mark. This is particularly important here because there is a comment in regard to how the evidence could have been improved.</p> <p><i>'You have effectively taken account of the impact of teacher workload on the implementation of the plans. You have described the mitigations you have put in place to ensure teacher workload is not negatively impacting on the project outcomes through support, training and linking your projects with an SLT member. An improvement here might have been to use tools such as the DfE workload toolkit to more accurately assess teacher workload.'</i></p>

**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
N/A	

## 5. Recommendations for improvement

### 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.