

2022 KS1 Summary Evaluation*

The management of Oxfordshire statutory moderation was outsourced for the sixth year running to Juniper Education during the 2021-2022 assessment cycle.

Sixty-three schools received a KS1 moderation visit; thirty-two LA schools and thirty-one academies or free schools.

Moderator Recruitment, Training and Preparation

Fourteen KS1 moderators attended two training sessions: the national training delivered on behalf of STA and additional local training. All moderators passed the national KS1 test. All new moderators received a shadow visit prior to moderating independently in schools and additionally, experienced moderators were observed during their visits on a rolling programme, as part of the quality assurance process.

Moderators said that communication was excellent throughout: all the documentation was provided electronically and could be referred to prior to and during visits, the training was excellent, and support notes were a useful tool to refer to at a later date. They appreciated updates throughout the moderation window such as minor adjustments to the timetable to allow schools more time to gather evidence for maths post-Covid if necessary.

Training was thorough, supportive and comprehensive. It clarified details of the moderation process, the statutory requirements and ensured that moderators were fully informed about any recent messages from the STA. Moderators said that they preferred training face to face but appreciated that the online training kept everyone safe. Moderators appreciated planned opportunities during training sessions to discuss with colleagues which ensured consistency. New moderators said that information was shared at the right time so that it was not overwhelming whilst experienced moderators said that there were sufficient reminders for experienced colleagues. For new colleagues, shadow visits were a valuable part of the process which enabled moderators to see how to conduct a moderation visit.

Moderators particularly appreciated the support they received throughout the moderation process from both the moderation manager and from shadow moderators. Particularly, knowing that the moderation manager was at the end of the phone if there were tricky situations was appreciated alongside prompt replies through email, phone or text. Moderators found the moderation manager supportive, professional, pragmatic and kind. They felt they could ask any question and that these would be answered.

New moderators had lots of discussion during their shadow visits and they appreciated the advice, time and support provided by their mentors.

Teachers were keen to discuss additional pupils and moderators were pleased to support teachers where time was permitting. Professional dialogues were central to the moderation process and schools appreciated the opportunity to discuss their pupils and evidence.

Visits

Oxfordshire use a school visit model for moderation. Where schools have two Year 2 classes or less, the visit takes up to half a day, more classes mean that visits could last up to a full day. Generally, visits were conducted by one moderator but seven visits involved two moderators for training or quality assurance purposes.

Visit notes were typed during the visit and were emailed to the school within twenty four hours or, in the case of additional evidence being required, the day after receiving the additional evidence.

Head teachers were given the option to sign a local agreement which meant that moderators could provide pupil lists twenty four hours before the moderation visit. Fifty-five schools opted to sign this local agreement.

Schools were well prepared and teachers knew what to expect because they had received guidance documents, although some teachers were nervous this year having had fewer opportunities to moderate with other schools.

In 2022, most teachers understood what would be considered independent work although in a small number of cases, a more extensive use of workbooks meant that work was over-scaffolded. In many cases, there were gaps in evidence - particularly in maths – which was collected during the moderation visit. More detailed discussions about greater depth in writing were needed than in previous years. Video evidence for reading was a valuable addition to support moderation where available and either hearing a pupil read or watching a video was particularly useful for pupils who were more borderline.

The statutory requirements with regard to pupils with a particular weakness in writing was often understood by teachers, although in a small proportion of schools this had to be explained. Generally, there were more pupils with a particular weakness than in previous years.

In order to support transition and involve the wider school staff, head teachers or delegates were available towards the end of the meeting in order to discuss outcomes and any recommendations or next steps. In many schools, other colleagues were present for part or all of the meeting.

The Visit Notes

All visit notes were completed electronically. This enabled the LA to access the information on the visit note and fulfil its statutory duty to quality assure the data schools submit.

Moderators commented that the moderation visit notes were easy to complete and helped shape discussions with teachers, whilst head teachers said they were clear and accurately reflected the moderation discussions. Head teachers appreciated being able to read the visit notes during the moderation visit. There were a few formatting anomalies which were corrected prior to being received by schools. Moderators said they would appreciate more guidance about how to record where pupils' work will be re-moderated.

With the emphasis on 'secure fit' in the teacher assessment frameworks, moderators no longer record a description of a child's attainment when the judgment for a pupil had been agreed. A commentary is only recorded where a judgment has been changed. This allows more time for moderators to discuss evidence with teachers. Comments are recorded at the end of the visit note in the 'strengths and recommendations' section. Feedback from head teachers suggested that this positively impacted on the moderation process.

Understanding of Year 2 Teachers

Almost all schools used the TA Frameworks to make their end of Key Stage 1 judgments, although a minority of schools used formative data from internal tracking systems and converted to statutory outcomes. This was problematic because most tracking systems are 'best fit' and so pupils were able to meet a standard in internal tracking systems without necessarily demonstrating all of the statutory pupil can statements. Teachers were generally confident in their judgments however, a number of schools had not checked their evidence against each of the pupil can statements.

The areas which were less secure:

- Greater depth
- Writing, particularly the expectations of coherence between the WTS and EXS
- In maths, many schools had followed a catch up curriculum which meant that not all of the aspects of the curriculum required for EXS and GDS could be demonstrated. However, moderators noted that in most instances, when asked, pupils could demonstrate the required pupil can statements

Feedback from Stakeholders

Initial contact was prompt and schools felt well supported in preparing for the moderation visit. Arrangements were clearly outlined in the introductory email with attached moderation guidance. This comprehensive guidance provided detailed information about the moderation process. Head teachers appreciated receiving this in advance and shared with teachers. This was then followed by a phone conversation with the allocated moderator. Head teachers appreciated that moderators arranged dates for visits which suited school schedules.

Head teachers said that moderation visits were a positive experience and although challenging, moderators were supportive and professional. They noted that visits were invaluable professional development for teachers and leaders were impressed by the professionalism of moderators who 'ensured it was a positive experience for all'. Teachers were 'fully involved in the process'. One head teacher who had previously experienced moderation in a different local authority said how impressed she was with the systems in Oxfordshire and the professional, yet supportive manner in which the moderation took place.

Teachers appreciated the opportunity to share their understanding of the standards; discuss their pupils' attainment and appreciated the willingness of moderators to look at work from additional pupils. Teachers felt that they were listened to and the process was very fair.

Head Teachers noted the clear visit reports reflected the discussion and decisions of the day accurately. These arrived very quickly after the moderation visit.

Head teachers thanked their moderators and teachers. All feedback from teachers or senior leaders was positive in 2022.

Moderators very much enjoyed being involved in moderation this year and all moderators who have remained in the same role, said they would like to be considered for KS1 moderation next year.

Consistency of Judgements

Many schools had managed to engage in moderation activities within school, across partnership schools or within MATs in 2022 although there has been less moderation and standardisation than pre-pandemic years.

Where schools had more than one class in year 2, judgments were consistent between the classes in most schools. Judgments in the majority of schools were consistent with national standards but there were more schools this year where this was not the case.

Approximately two hundred and thirty six pupils were moderated in reading, in writing and in maths. Fifty one judgements were changed as a result of moderation, which represented approximately seven percent. However, this proportion was significantly lower in reading and maths and higher in writing.

In reading, there were five judgments changes (2%); four judgments were moved up and one moved down. Additional evidence was sort for a further four pupils in reading following which, the school judgment was agreed.

| Reading | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------|-----------|
| Judgments moved up | WTS - EXS | EXS - GDS | Judgments moved down | EXS_WTS | WTS - PKS |
| | 4 | 0 | | 1 | 0 |

In writing, thirty seven judgments were changed (16%); seven were moved up and thirty moved down. Additional evidence was sort for a further thirteen pupils in writing following which, the school judgment was agreed.

| Writing | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Judgments moved up | PKS-WTS | WTS - EXS | EXS - GDS | Judgments moved down | GDS - EXS | EXS - WTS | WTS - PKS |
| | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 13 | 11 | 6 |

In Maths, nine judgments were changed (4%); six were moved up and three moved down. Additional evidence was sort for a further twenty one pupils in maths, following which, the school judgment was agreed.

| Maths | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Judgments moved up | WTS - EXS | EXS - GDS | Judgments moved down | GDS - EXS | EXS - WTS | WTS - PKS |
| | 2 | 4 | | 0 | 2 | 1 |

The proportion of judgments changed during the moderation process rose by 2% from 2019. None of the changes were disputed following discussion with the moderator and there were no formal appeals in 2022.

The moderation manager would like to thank all moderators, teachers and senior leaders for their hard work and support again in 2022.

**Feedback taken from moderator evaluation forms, head teacher evaluation forms and comments recorded on the moderation visit note by the head teacher or delegate.*