

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

QAA Moderator	[REDACTED]
Date of moderation	30 October 2019

1. Provider information

Provider	Forest Learning Alliance
Assessment contractor (if applicable)	NPQonline
Date scripts submitted to QAA for moderation	29 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)		
NPQH	1	[REDACTED]		
Total	1			

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"> 100% 	

<p>Strengths (Bullet points)</p>	<p>Assessment marking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final assessment marking sampled at national moderation is carried out in line with the requirements of the DfE NPQ Content and Assessment Framework and mark scheme. The assessment note and mark awarded, where relevant, take account of the sponsor comments to contribute to the justification for the assessment decision. () – Criterion 3.3.2) The assessment notes are generally well balanced to explain the decision that the participant’s submission has partially demonstrated a criterion. In some instances, they include developmental points to support further leadership development. () – criteria 5.3.3/6.3.1) <p>Internal Moderation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 why the initial score requires modification in accordance with the score descriptor. <table border="1" data-bbox="491 1142 1289 1512"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>QAA moderation comment examples</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NPQ Level: NPQH () Criterion: 6.3.2</td> <td>Internal moderation justified an increase in the initial mark awarded and provided constructive feedback to develop assessment marking practice by noting that the participant had included some relevant evidence. This resulted in the award of 1 mark rather than 0; i.e., ‘Identifies research from Hallinger & Heck – critical factor - quality of leadership & as this was poor, CPD was not addressed until Interim HT arrived & raised profile. Identifies high quality CPD.’</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		QAA moderation comment examples	NPQ Level: NPQH () Criterion: 6.3.2	Internal moderation justified an increase in the initial mark awarded and provided constructive feedback to develop assessment marking practice by noting that the participant had included some relevant evidence. This resulted in the award of 1 mark rather than 0; i.e., ‘Identifies research from Hallinger & Heck – critical factor - quality of leadership & as this was poor, CPD was not addressed until Interim HT arrived & raised profile. Identifies high quality CPD.’
	QAA moderation comment examples				
NPQ Level: NPQH () Criterion: 6.3.2	Internal moderation justified an increase in the initial mark awarded and provided constructive feedback to develop assessment marking practice by noting that the participant had included some relevant evidence. This resulted in the award of 1 mark rather than 0; i.e., ‘Identifies research from Hallinger & Heck – critical factor - quality of leadership & as this was poor, CPD was not addressed until Interim HT arrived & raised profile. Identifies high quality CPD.’				
<p>Weaknesses (Bullet points)</p>	<p>Assessment marking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In one instance, the participant’s evidence was not benchmarked accurately against the criterion score descriptor. Although resolved at internal moderation such errors have the potential to impact on the overall accuracy of marking and assessment outcome when the script is not subject to internal moderation. (Criterion 6.3.2) 				

4. Substantiating evidence where moderation finds that assessment is not secure, and judgements do not reflect the national standards.

Script ID	Evidence
N/A	

5. Recommendations for improvement

Enhance the overall good quality of assessment marking practice by:

- ensuring consistency in the evaluation of the quality of evidence presented against the criterion requirements to standardise marking and award the most appropriate best-fit mark.