

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

QAA Moderator	Peter Callow
Date of moderation	29 June 2020

1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQonline
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	26 June 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			
Total	1			

2. 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 out of 1)
--	---

Previous moderation report recommendations	<p>May 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no recommendations arising from the previous national moderation of one submission.
--	--

Summary of effective use of the mark scheme (Bullet points)	Assessment Marking	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the assessment notes sampled for the two tasks of this one submission, justify the marks awarded. The notes are closely aligned to the score descriptors and make effective use of the participant's and sponsor's evidence to strengthen the evaluations. On occasion, where the lower mark is awarded, the note provides particularly helpful guidance as to how the higher mark could have been achieved, thereby supporting further leadership development. 	
	NPQ level: NPQH	QAA moderation comment examples
	Task 1 Criterion: 3.3.2	<i>'Your sponsor describes you as adept in adopting your leadership style depending on the situation/person, some more reticent, leading to successful outcomes. The pupil performance data confirms this judgement of impact to support the school's objectives.'</i>
	Task 2 Criterion: 5.3.2	<i>'Within the appendices you have presented a costed action plan for your suggested improvements. You have referred to costs for resources and also extra costs for TLRs and middle leader meeting time. To achieve 2 marks, it was required that you demonstrated an awareness that costings for planning and creating your plan would be significantly different to its implementation over several years. Therefore, your plan would be more credible if it included costings over a three-year period. Incorrectly, you have assumed that staffing costs would be £0 for many of the actions. When setting a whole school budget, all actual staffing costs need to be included. There is not enough information about the impact on teacher workload.'</i>
Task 2 Criterion: 6.3.1	<i>'You have described a systematic approach to improving assessment, marking and feedback. There are sensible suggestions from you of how staff can be rewarded by achieving SMART targets via the school's performance management processes. There is clear evidence that you have used your expertise and experience from your own school to support the placement school's processes for appraisal.'</i>	

Areas for development (Bullet points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'Key areas for improvement' within the 'Evaluative feedback: summaries' for both tasks, provide succinct, constructive comment to help develop leadership competencies. 				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>NPQ level: NPQH</td> <td>QAA moderation comment examples</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	NPQ level: NPQH	QAA moderation comment examples		
	NPQ level: NPQH	QAA moderation comment examples			
Key areas for improvement – Task 1	<i>'An overarching theme was the need to target the language of the assessment criteria more carefully, especially by drawing on research e.g. 3.3.1 which could have mentioned Goleman or many others.'</i>				
Key areas for improvement – Task 2	<i>'Your understanding of school budget setting remains a key development area for you.'</i>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no areas for development arising from the national moderation of this one submission. 				

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

<p>There are no recommendations for improvement following QAA moderation of this single NPQH submission (Task 1 & 2)</p> <p>Point for consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use good quality assessments such as these to help promote and support effective assessment practice more widely.
