

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

QAA Moderator	Helen Barter
Date of moderation	19 June 2019

### 1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQ Online
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	18 June 2019

### 2. Moderation Assessment Sample *[Insert N/A for qualification levels that are not submitted by provider in this 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	[REDACTED]		
NPQSL	1	[REDACTED]		
Total	2			

### 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)	Internal moderation						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment contractor has robust moderation processes in place to ensure that assessment marking is carried out in line with the DfE NPQ Content and Assessment Framework and mark scheme.</li> <li>Internal moderation provides clear justification and explanation of any changes made to the original assessment score.</li> </ul>						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>QAA moderation comment examples</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 3.1.1</td> <td><i>'Whilst this is not a strong area as the evidence base lacks rigour from research and there is a little on how the participant manages resistance there is some evidence that he has reflected on different styles through his own experience and has modelled different approaches so it is a score of 1.'</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 2.2.2</td> <td><i>'Refers to research carried out e.g. EEF in overview and TWE in shaping project and making changes to delivery of guided reading so awarded 1 mark as evidence of applying research to plans – not enough evaluation of different strategies to be awarded 2 marks.'</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		QAA moderation comment examples	NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 3.1.1	<i>'Whilst this is not a strong area as the evidence base lacks rigour from research and there is a little on how the participant manages resistance there is some evidence that he has reflected on different styles through his own experience and has modelled different approaches so it is a score of 1.'</i>	NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 2.2.2	<i>'Refers to research carried out e.g. EEF in overview and TWE in shaping project and making changes to delivery of guided reading so awarded 1 mark as evidence of applying research to plans – not enough evaluation of different strategies to be awarded 2 marks.'</i>
		QAA moderation comment examples					
	NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 3.1.1	<i>'Whilst this is not a strong area as the evidence base lacks rigour from research and there is a little on how the participant manages resistance there is some evidence that he has reflected on different styles through his own experience and has modelled different approaches so it is a score of 1.'</i>					
	NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 2.2.2	<i>'Refers to research carried out e.g. EEF in overview and TWE in shaping project and making changes to delivery of guided reading so awarded 1 mark as evidence of applying research to plans – not enough evaluation of different strategies to be awarded 2 marks.'</i>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderation comments add detail to the original assessment notes and help participants who do not reach the threshold for a pass mark to improve a future re-submission.</li> </ul>						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>QAA moderation comment examples</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 6.1.3</td> <td><i>'Agree this is a weak area and a score of 0 is justified especially as the project does not enable the participant to demonstrate how he leads, manages a team to assess cost effectiveness of professional development. The participant does not identify any structured professional development he has led to drive the project mainly because it was class based.'</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 1.2.2</td> <td><i>'Agree as only included a quote from 1 example (Harvard) but this is not specifically related to change nor evaluated to be awarded 1 mark. Not enough examples of or research conducted – needs a thorough evaluation e.g. Kotter.'</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		QAA moderation comment examples	NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 6.1.3	<i>'Agree this is a weak area and a score of 0 is justified especially as the project does not enable the participant to demonstrate how he leads, manages a team to assess cost effectiveness of professional development. The participant does not identify any structured professional development he has led to drive the project mainly because it was class based.'</i>	NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 1.2.2	<i>'Agree as only included a quote from 1 example (Harvard) but this is not specifically related to change nor evaluated to be awarded 1 mark. Not enough examples of or research conducted – needs a thorough evaluation e.g. Kotter.'</i>
		QAA moderation comment examples					
	NPQ Level: NPQML [REDACTED] Criterion: 6.1.3	<i>'Agree this is a weak area and a score of 0 is justified especially as the project does not enable the participant to demonstrate how he leads, manages a team to assess cost effectiveness of professional development. The participant does not identify any structured professional development he has led to drive the project mainly because it was class based.'</i>					
NPQ Level: NPQSL [REDACTED] Criterion: 1.2.2	<i>'Agree as only included a quote from 1 example (Harvard) but this is not specifically related to change nor evaluated to be awarded 1 mark. Not enough examples of or research conducted – needs a thorough evaluation e.g. Kotter.'</i>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderation summaries give detailed feedback to the assessor about how to improve future assessment practice, particularly with regard to TRN: 3359702.</li> </ul>							

	<p>NPQ Level: NPQML          [REDACTED]          Additional Notes:</p>	<p>QAA moderation comment examples</p> <p><i>'You need to make it very explicit in your opening sentence that the participant has been judged as a fail by you. It is interesting you place the main reason for your judgement because of your score of 0 in 3.1.1 and 6.1.3. but you state that non-engagement of parents in the participant's project evidence is a strong reason for failure. However, you have scored 4.1.1 as a 2 and there is no mention in your notes of non-engagement with parents. However, you do recognise the project does not provide enough scope for the participant to show he leads a team. Your scores of 2s are generous especially as the project itself did not provide the scope for the participant to demonstrate his leadership of a team in respect of improvement which impacts on pupil progress and attainment.'</i></p>				
	<p>NPQ Level: NPQSL          [REDACTED]          Additional Notes:</p>	<p><i>'Compliant with DFE mark scheme. Of the 8 scores moderated 2 were changed from 0 to 1 as the candidate or sponsor had provided some evidence to secure a mark. Notes brief and generally indicate why mark given. However, a clearer indication of why awarding 2 marks is required for example in 4.2.2 states 'some evidence' but notes don't make it clear why 2 marks awarded.'</i></p>				
<p>Weaknesses (Bullet points)</p>	<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A significant number of original assessment judgements required amendment in both internally moderated submissions ([REDACTED] Criterion 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 3.1.1 and [REDACTED] Criterion 2.2.2, 3.2.1).</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="464 1576 1299 1886"> <tr> <td data-bbox="464 1576 724 1648"></td> <td data-bbox="724 1576 1299 1648"> <p>QAA moderation comment examples</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="464 1648 724 1886"> <p>NPQ Level: NPQML          [REDACTED]          Criterion: 1.1.3</p> </td> <td data-bbox="724 1648 1299 1886"> <p>Assessment awards 2 marks but the internal moderation notes, <i>'Whilst the participant references some sources which have extended his thinking about lead change there is little evidence of outlining how he uses a change management tool at different stages of his project so a score of 1 is more appropriate.'</i></p> </td> </tr> </table>			<p>QAA moderation comment examples</p>	<p>NPQ Level: NPQML          [REDACTED]          Criterion: 1.1.3</p>	<p>Assessment awards 2 marks but the internal moderation notes, <i>'Whilst the participant references some sources which have extended his thinking about lead change there is little evidence of outlining how he uses a change management tool at different stages of his project so a score of 1 is more appropriate.'</i></p>
	<p>QAA moderation comment examples</p>					
<p>NPQ Level: NPQML          [REDACTED]          Criterion: 1.1.3</p>	<p>Assessment awards 2 marks but the internal moderation notes, <i>'Whilst the participant references some sources which have extended his thinking about lead change there is little evidence of outlining how he uses a change management tool at different stages of his project so a score of 1 is more appropriate.'</i></p>					

	<p>NPQ Level: NPQSL                  Criterion: 3.2.1</p>	<p>Insufficient account is taken in the assessment notes of some aspects of evidence submitted which would allow a score of 1 to be awarded. The assessment notes state, <i>'There is no evidence of this, from either sponsor statement nor narrative and hence awarded no marks.'</i> This is remedied at moderation which notes, <i>'Clear evidence from sponsor about ability to positively influence staff - comments on 'positive leadership style...teachers took on the change with such enthusiasm and commitment'. Sponsor describes candidate encouraging staff to share planning, making sure information is available to all and her 'positive coaching skills' to support those who needed it. Evidence of research needed to be awarded 2 marks.'</i></p>
	<p><b>Technical</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment and/or moderation notes do not always comment on the lack of clarity in a participant's evidence to help the participant understand the need to improve writing quality at re-submission.</li> </ul>	
	<p>NPQ Level: NPQML                  Additional Notes:</p>	<p>QAA moderation comment examples</p> <p><i>'The resulted in me sharing the SDP and clearly sharing the aim of the project, the impact of this project etc. that, as a result, unintentionally, grabbed the attention and interest of this project.'</i></p>

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

<p>Reduce the need for internal moderation to change the initial marking by ensuring consistent assessment practice which ensures notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are clear and evaluative against the score descriptor;</li> <li>make effective use of the participant's evidence to support the justification for the mark awarded.</li> </ul>
--

**Continuous improvement – Point for consideration:**

- Use the overall feedback to encourage participants to improve the clarity of writing to meet the expectations of quality expected in the submission in preparation for resubmission.