# PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

## ENTRY PATHWAYS
## PERSONAL PROGRESS

## SUMMER 2022

**General Comments**

Overall, the majority of centres submitted good quality, in some instances outstanding, moderation samples that met the Personal Progress Award specification either fully or with very few minor errors.

There were some centres that submitted samples that were on the incorrect format and the Principal Moderator agreed the centre outcomes based on evidence submitted where this evidence was clearly annotated, relevant, and referenced to specific unit assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

Where evidence was poorly presented and not clearly referenced or annotated it was, in some cases, impossible to agree the centre outcomes.

Centres should note moderation samples need to be uploaded and submitted using the correct format otherwise centres will be required to resubmit moderation samples. This may delay the issue of awards to candidates significantly.

A very small number of centres submitted an entire moderation sample that did not meet the award specification and the pass marks could not be agreed.

To ensure full compliance and consistency in meeting the award specification, **all** centres are required to read their individual centre reports in tandem with this report and implement any action points before submitting future external moderation samples.

**Comments on individual units**

Moderation samples covered a very wide range of units with the language/literacy and mathematics-based units seeing the most entries, closely followed by those focusing on the development of personal and social skills.

However, it was most encouraging to see that the majority of centres were entering candidates for units that would best meet the needs of the individual and facilitate their progress and development. This is very much in the spirit of the Personal Progress Award.

Where the quality was good or outstanding, transcripts and evidence (either inserted into the transcript or submitted separately well presented, collated, clearly referenced, annotated, and relevant), were individual to each candidate and provided clear, succinct, and lively descriptions of the candidate's achievements and progress against the unit assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

More importantly those centres that submitted such samples were delivering the units in a way that enabled and supported candidates to make progress and face the challenges they encounter in their lives.

There were some instances on identical transcripts being submitted for some candidates. This is poor practice and should be remedied.

**Summary of key points**

**All centres must in future:**

1. **Ensure a good level of staff competency**. That all staff involved in delivering the Personal Progress Award are familiar with the award specification and its requirements. The format for the Personal Progress Award differs from all other Entry Pathways awards as it encompasses and accredits a very broad range of subjects and personal development areas.

2. Ensure every candidate has **ONE correctly completed Candidate Authentication Form** that lists **all** units for which the candidate had been entered. Upload this with the candidate's first unit sample.

3. **Ensure good quality of transcripts**. These are mandatory as they are the major record of assessment and achievement. They should be individual to each candidate (not identical 'one-size-fits-all') and give a succinct but explicit description of:

   - the candidate's engagement and participation in learning and assessment activities
   - how learning outcomes were achieved and assessment criteria met
   - progress made
   - the type and level of support given to the candidate.

   Each learning Outcome (LO) and Assessment Criterion (AC) paragraph should conclude with an Achievement Continuum Stage being awarded at a level appropriate to the candidate's achievements and progress. Achievement Continuum can be found in the award specification.

   Centres that don't do this already should consider incorporating photographic evidence of candidates participating in learning and assessment activities and scans of work samples directly into the unit transcript within the appropriate AC/LO paragraph (max 3 photographs/work scans per unit). This would make compiling a supporting evidence folder unnecessary. It would also obviate the need for an Assessment Record.

4. **Ensure good presentation of separate evidence if submitted**. Separate evidence, if submitted, should be relevant, clearly referenced, and annotated with commentary on context and levels of support given. A few good quality pieces per unit.

5. **Ensure and submit evidence of a robust Internal Verification/Moderation.**

   **This is a mandatory requirement of the award specification.**

   Centres **must** implement a robust internal verification/moderation process prior to uploading the external moderation sample.

   Assign the role of internal verifier/moderator to a staff member who is familiar with the delivery and administration of the award – a teacher (Assessor) cannot IV their own candidates' work, but a team IV process is equally valid.

Devise a simple check list that indicates that in a sample verification across the entire candidate cohort:

1. All transcripts and separate supporting evidence in the external moderation sample have been uploaded into the correct unit and the correct way up.
2. All transcripts are individual in content to the candidate (no identical transcripts).
3. All transcripts for all candidates have been signed and dated by the teacher and countersigned by the internal moderator/verifier where applicable.
4. The transcripts and comments match the assessment criteria (AC) paragraph headings.
5. Each AC paragraph in every transcript concludes with Achievement Continuum Stage.
6. Any separate evidence submitted is clearly annotated, referenced to the Unit Assessment criterion it supports, and is not excessive.
7. Every candidate has **ONE** correctly completed Candidate Authentication Sheet which lists **all** units (60xx numbers) for which the candidate has been entered, attached to the first unit for each candidate in the moderation sample when uploaded.

The check-sheet should then be signed and dated by the internal verifier/moderator and uploaded along with the first sample candidate's first unit. It is also very good practice for any IV notes and comments on transcripts to remain and be submitted.

It is recommended that the centre IV samples three transcripts from every unit across the candidate ability range and teaching group(s) – if only one candidate is entered then this should also be part of the centre's IV process.