**Verifier report: Cluster moderation meeting (2016-17)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster** |  | **LA** |  |
| **Subject** |  | **Date** |  |
| **Present at meeting** | **School** | **Role within school** | |
|  |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Commentary on the moderation process:** |
| **Summary information:**   * Was every primary / secondary school in the cluster represented for the duration of the meeting?*If not, what were reasons for this?* * Were there any Headteachers or members of the SLT present? (Brief overview) * Was someone from the LA / consortium present? What was their role? * Was there a clear understanding of purpose/expectations? (*prior, during and at the end of the meeting)* * Did every school present learner profiles (‘collection of work’) for moderation? (L4 and L5 primary, and L5 and L6 from the secondary school) * Were all the profiles moderated during the meeting? If not, why was this and what actions were agreed (if any)? * Was each profile reviewed by representatives from at least three schools or cross-moderated by more than one group? |
| **Moderation of work:**  Were ‘best-fit’ principles applied appropriately in all cases?  Were the national curriculum level descriptions and exemplification materials used appropriately?  Was sufficient time given to moderate each attainment target and cover the full range of evidence?  How did the group moderate oracy? Was first or second hand evidence used? Was this the same for all schools?  Was there a detailed discussion, which included clear reference to the level descriptions when reviewing the ‘profiles’?  Did all participants engage in discussion and contribute clear justifications for the levels awarded?  Was written feedback provided for each school in relation to each of pupils profiles? |
| **By the end of the meeting:**  By the end of the meeting, were any disagreements between the level awarded by the school and the group, and/or between different moderators, resolved effectively? *Please describe the process.*  If the cluster was unable to agree with the judgement awarded by for particular profiles, what was the reason for this? *e.g. Not enough pupil work, important gaps in coverage as well as insufficient range (literary and non-literary reading and writing), insufficient detail in the commentary, individual pieces of work levelled and no overall best-fit judgement given, work not at the appropriate level)*  Was the representative from each school clear about the judgement agreed for their pupils’ profiles? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall evaluation on the quality and rigour of the moderation process** |
|  |
| **Comments by the Chair** |
|  |
| **Recommendations** |
|  |
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