



Department of Education and Children

Isle of Man
Government

Reiltys Ellan Vannin

Rheynn Ynsee as Paitchyn

Date – Wednesday 27th May 2014

School – Scoill Yn Jubilee

Moderator –

Class teachers -

Evidence of ‘in-house’ moderation activities – Yes. Annual ‘in-house’ moderation.

Moderation Training for Teachers Attended – Yes - Staff Meeting run by

Oral feedback provided during visit? - Yes to Headteacher and Deputy Head

Moderation Focus

To look at evidence collected by the class teacher to assess AT3
Understanding Shape and Measure for pupils working at Level 2A / 3C

Strengths

The work was clearly and accurately labelled and just about every piece was accurately levelled. Maths clearly takes place in a cross curricular way, and there was lots of evidence of maths being used within ICT lessons and literacy lessons. The link to stories e.g Measuring linked to George’s Marvellous Medicine was very effective as a tool for learning. Assessment documentation was very thorough. Children were able to see the next steps in their learning through “I Can Statement” displays.

The children I spoke to were polite and well mannered and a credit to their school. They were all able to answer my questions and were not afraid to have a go when they were not sure.

Thank you for the warm welcome, and the quiet room.

Individual Pupils

Class Teacher Assessment 3c - A range of work for [redacted] was presented (ranging from a 2a to 3b), with the vast majority falling within the 3C Level. The moderator agrees that [redacted] is a secure 3c.

Class Teacher Assessment 2a - A range of work for [redacted] was presented (ranging from a 2a to 3c), with the vast majority falling within the 2a Level. After questioning the moderator felt that [redacted] was a 3c level. The Year 2 staff explained that the end of year level for [redacted] would be a 3c level, and that the 2a level provided represented the level at the time the evidence was collated.

- Class Teacher Assessment 2a - A range of work for [redacted] was presented (ranging from a 2a to 3c), with the vast majority falling within the 2a Level. After questioning the moderator felt that [redacted] was a 3c level. The Year 2 staff explained that the end of year level for [redacted] would be a 3c level, and that the 2a level provided represented the level at the time the evidence was collated.

Areas for Development

Ensure that children are given the opportunities to be stretched and to work at a higher level where appropriate.

To continue with the “no worksheet” approach to innovative maths teaching , perhaps exploring the open ended activities available on NRICH maths and other similar websites.

Signed – Moderators

Signed – HT

Date –

Department of Education and Children

Rheynn Ynsee as Paitchyn

Reading Moderation Visit 2018

School: Scoill yn Jubilee

Key Stage: One and Two

Date: 10th July 2018

Focus of visit:

(Moderators) looked at evidence judged to be 1A, 1C, 3B and 4B.
Judgements were moderated against the Island level descriptors.

1A- Agreed

Clear targets displayed and discussed with students
Excellent use of ICT implemented within the lesson; students were all engaged
All students had an awareness of genre- this was recapped throughout the lesson
Students' comments highlighted awareness of different types of characters
Students could use intonation (one of the lesson objectives) in places
There was clear evidence of thorough tracking for each student
Guided reading records with targets were clear
Evidence of reading challenge in folders
Students were all moving towards a 2C
A wonderful learning environments

- The detailed planning of this teacher was really impressive!

1A- Agreed

Students were engaged from the outset and keen to read.

Challenging words were discussed in detail, which ensured that they were well prepared to read with a degree of independence.

Phonic strategies were implemented to decode when needed.

They were also able to draw on a range of other well established decoding strategies, including 'hop, skip and jump' and 'chunk it like chocolate' when reading longer sentences.

Lively discussions around the illustrations demonstrated that the children could use pictures to confirm and enhance meaning.

They composed questions about the front cover and made predictions about events, which also showed good understanding. It was great to see that the teacher made the most of opportunities to explore and draw upon the children's knowledge of the world; how snow felt and looked like and what they might play in it.

Planning showed that the beginning of the session involved retelling the main events from their previous book.

The teacher knew the class and was able to talk about each child, their attainment and next steps.

A good range of evidence to support her judgements including, whole school AF planning and tracking document (new document with 3 sub-levels), follow up tasks and benchmarks.

1C- Agreed

The children were able to follow the text when the teacher read to the group and when they were reading independently.

There was a clear routine for reading; all students were familiar with this.

Students felt comfortable to reading the text themselves, most with lovely enthusiasm.

Some children in the group required support to apply this learning and used phonic strategies to decode, but it was lovely to see that they used the flash card cues which they already knew, as aids to their understanding.

All the children in the group showed familiarity with exclamation marks and applied their understanding when reading the title of the book; 'Shoo Mouse, Shoo!'

The children demonstrated that they knew that print carries meaning and read from left to right and from top to bottom.

The teacher knew the children very well and was able to talk about each individual child and their attainment. had a range of evidence to support judgements including; follow up tasks, Benchmarks and the whole school AF planning and tracking document (one level only).

3B - Agreed

The children read short sections of the story independently.

They were all able to decode at this level, some with slightly more fluency and intonation than others.

They demonstrated the ability to use a range of strategies when encountering tricky or unknown vocabulary, including self-correction, rereading and seeking clarification from their teacher.

Discussions about the text showed secure comprehension of events and character's emotions. Individual reading showed that some children had knowledge of how to use punctuation when reading aloud, but did not always use it to enhance phrasing or intonation.

The session began with a review of events so far and the group was able to give detailed explanations about what had happened.

When reading independently the children were asked to gather examples of words which showed how a character might be feeling.

Planning showed that the teacher intended to discuss these words in detail to consider the impact on the reader.

The teacher had prepared the lesson carefully and provided detailed planning notes including key probing questions (what, why, how), clear links to AF's and a relevant and appropriate follow on task.

The reading file contained a good breadth of evidence to support the teacher's judgements about the children's attainment.

A range of interesting, varied and engaging follow up tasks linked to the guided reading session were included in the reading file, in addition to the school planning/tracking documents (1 sublevel document).

3B- Agreed (only folder evidence)

All students were working within a 3B

Worksheets and pieces displayed a good variety of learning

Evidence of some tracking

Comments were taken from Island descriptors and adapted to make more student friendly

4B- Agreed

Fluent reading from all students

Developed responses that highlighted some 5c

Questioning from teacher allowed for inference from students.

There was a clear consideration of prior knowledge; and opportunities to build on this

All students were aware of sentence structure

Contextually aware – thorough questioning throughout meant that students were constantly being challenged (they felt supported)

Key words were explored

Written evidence displayed clear tracking for each student

Comments written were linked to assessment and targets were thoughtful

All written tasks had clear objectives

4B- Agreed

The children were clearly enjoying reading this interesting text and were keen to share their ideas and opinions about the underlying themes of the book.

The boys in particular were very engaged, which was good to see.

The children were all able to make reference to the text when explaining their ideas.

There was a great deal of conversation around this focus area during the session.

The teacher challenged the group to extend their understanding and explore sophisticated ideas around how the language changed at different points in the story.

The teacher provided planning notes which included key questions (what, how), with clear links to AF's and an extension task for the more confident children in the group.

The reading file showed evidence of the children's attainment in the form of a tracking grid of the IOM Reading AF's, which had been annotated by dates achieved for each child. No further evidence was available in the file at the time of this moderation.

General Comments

- √ *All levels were accurate.*
- √ *School carries out regular internal moderation.*
- √ *School has a great attitude towards improving reading and this is evident with the various reading challenges that students take part in*
- √ *Reading evidence came from a range of genres with cross-curricular links.*
- √ *In most cases there was evidence of detailed planning and monitoring of targets*
- √ *Most teachers planned their lessons with appropriate aims for the students*
- √ *Evidence that the children have relevant targets related to the assessment*

Recommendations

*There was lack of consistence in terms of approach to guided reading
Some teachers could be more mindful of how they can link guided reading to assessment
Some folders demonstrated a lack of planning – there was a mixture of handwriting
amongst the 3B.*

Thank you for your support in arranging this visit. We found your school to be highly positive and welcoming. We hope you found it useful.

Moderator:

Writing Moderation Visit

School: Scoill yn Jubilee

Key Stage: Foundation Stage, Key Stage One and Key Stage Two.

Date: 18th March 2014

Focus of visit:

looked at a sample of recent scripts from each class/set (top, middle and lower ability). Moderated these against the Island level descriptors and discussed the scripts and judgements with the Head Teacher.

Reception 4 boys and 2 girls

RDW:

Script 1: Girl

The teacher had assessed this script at Scale Point 1.
Moderator agreed this script at Scale Point 1.

Script 2: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script as Scale Point 6.
Moderator agreed this script as Scale Point 6.

Script 3: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script as Scale Point 8.
Moderator agreed this script as Scale Point 8.

RSM:

Script 1: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script as Scale Point 2.
Moderator assessed this script as Scale Point 1.
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Scale Point 5.
Moderator agreed this script at Scale Point 5.
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Scale Point 7.
The moderator assessed this script at Scale Point 7.
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Year 1: 3 boys, 3 girls

1HJ

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at a Level 1B.

Moderator assessed this script at a Level 1A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at a Level 1A.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2C.

Most targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at a Level 2C

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2C.

The script contains many elements of 2B.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Ensure that targets are the next steps and not too challenging.

1CC

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 1C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 1C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 1A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 1A.

More aspects of 2C could have been identified.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2C.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2B.

Enough aspects were identified to award this level.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Year 2 – 4 boys, 2 girls

2SQ

Script 1: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 1A/2C.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2C/2B.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2B.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A/3C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2A.

There are many elements of a Level 3C that could be identified.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

No assessment sheets were presented with this class and all scripts were presented as dual level. Targets were accurate but there were too many and some were too complicated.

2HN

Script 1: Boy

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2B/2A.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2A.

Many aspects of a Level 3C can be identified.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

No assessment sheets were presented with this class. Targets were accurate but there were too many and some were too complicated.

Year 3 4 boys, 2 girls

3MB

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2C.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2B

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2A.

This script has many aspects of a Level 3C that can be identified.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3B.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 3A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

3O

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2B.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 2A

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 3C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4C.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 4B.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Teachers in this year group often looked and highlighted the next level up but didn't award it.

Year 4 3 boys, 3 girls

4S

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 2A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3B.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 3B.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4B.
Moderator agreed this script at Level 4B.
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

4M

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A.
Moderator agreed this script at Level 2A.
There are aspects of 3C.
No Targets provided with this script.

Script 2: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3B.
Moderator assessed this script at Level 3B.
No Targets provided with this script.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4C.
Moderator agreed this script at Level 4C.
Many aspect of 4B can be identified.
No Targets provided with this script.

Both peer and self-assessment was evident in this year group. Cross year moderation of scripts was also evident.

Year 5 4 boys, 2 girls

5K

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 2A.
Moderator assessed this script at a Level 3C.
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3A/4C.
This was unclear in paperwork accompanying the script.
Moderator assessed this script at Level 3B.
The moderator agreed that the target set was relevant.

Script 3: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4B.
Moderator agreed this script at Level 4B
Targets set agreed by the moderator.

5M

Script 1: Boy

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 3C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Boy-

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 3A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4B.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 4C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Year 6 3 boys, 3 girls

6H

Script 1: Girl –

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3A.

Moderator agreed this script at a Level 3A.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 4C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 5C.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 5C.

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Only one target per script was set in this class.

6W

Script 1: Boy -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 3A.

Moderator agreed this script at Level 3A

Targets set agreed by the moderator.

Script 2: Girl -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 4A.

Moderator agreed this script at a Level 4A.

Targets identified agreed by the moderator.

Script 3: Girls -

The teacher had assessed this script at Level 5C.

Moderator assessed this script at Level 4A.

Targets identified agreed by the moderator.

There was some evidence of peer and self-assessment in this class.

General Commentary

- √ Most levels were accurate.
- √ Based on the scripts seen, the children appear to be achieving at or above an appropriate level for their NC year.
- √ Targets are set for pupils and in general they reflect the assessment guidelines.
- √ Cross-curricular links were evident in a number of pieces.
- √ Most children have targets for improvement that relate to the 'Level Descriptions for Writing'
- √ Foundation stage level using a wide range of evidence and work is well annotated.

NB - these observations are made using the presented scripts for moderation and may not represent the typical performance of the individual year cohorts.

Recommendations:

- √ To develop a whole school approach to all aspects – assessment documentation, target setting and peer/ self assessment.
- √ To continue to moderate internally in a variety of settings e.g. same year group, cross year groups, transition year groups.
- √ To develop links for moderation purposes with other schools.

Thank you for your support in arranging this visit. I hope you found it useful.

Moderators:

- Literacy Moderators