

Castle Hill Moderation 2020-21

Moderation Focus	Term 1	Term 2	Term 3
Castle Hill Pathways	<p>Date: 16.11.20 - Maths moderation Working Party (8x teachers, 1x ETA, 2x ITT students)</p> <p>Intent: To focus on SSM Pathway and writing of associated PIPs</p> <p>Implementation: Each person selected a pupil in class and gave evidence from SSM Pathway to justify why pupil had been levelled at a certain Step. PIP targets to show progress in SSM were considered, including language of Engagement Model.</p> <p>Impact: There was discussion around how much of each Step needs to be achieved to be awarded 'c', 'b', or 'a' sub-level. It was recognised that for some pupils with additional needs, such as visual impairment or physical limitations, it may be that some statements need to be amended appropriately, or disregarded. There were one or two statements that appear to be incorrectly placed in Steps, but this will be addressed when the Pathway is reviewed in the future.</p>	<p>Date: 13.01.21</p> <p>Intent: To moderate judgements of levels in Speaking and Listening Pathways</p> <p>Implementation: Learning Journal evidence ('My Communication' Autumn 2020) was used for moderation. Two pupils were discussed at length and assessed against the Speaking or Listening Pathways, as appropriate.</p> <p>Impact: There was general agreement regarding CHLs. We will continue moderating further pieces of evidence.</p>	<p>Date: 28.04.21</p> <p>Intent: To moderate judgements of levels in Speaking and Listening Pathways cont.</p> <p>Implementation: Three pupils were discussed at length and assessed against the Speaking or Listening Pathways, as appropriate.</p> <p>Impact: Following discussions, the importance of using the Pathways in planning to support horizontal progress was stressed.</p> <p>Next Steps: JA to make amendments to Literacy Pathways to support clarity of focus at each Step, eg 'Increasingly intentional and consistent responses. Initiation in limited contexts' (previous Step 2.2)</p>
MAPP/PIP	<p>Date: 21.10.21</p> <p>Intent: To moderate the effective use of language when writing PIP targets</p> <p>Implementation: There was a focus on the inclusion of the Engagement Model language within PIP targets. Small groups discussed and amended individual targets as necessary.</p>	<p>Date: 24.02.21</p> <p>Intent: To moderate the effective use of language when writing PIP targets</p> <p>Implementation: Teachers worked in pairs to consider the 'conciseness' of targets, as well as inclusion of the Language of Engagement within the PIP targets.</p>	<p>Date: 09.06.21</p> <p>Intent: To consider whether key information has been highlighted in PIPs</p> <p>Implementation: Teachers and class leads worked in pairs to consider whether key information in PIP targets was highlighted in grey appropriately, as well as checking</p>

	<p>Impact: There was a discussion regarding the 'SMARTness' vs 'conciseness' of each target. Although it is important to highlight context of each target, eg to assist ETAs in being clear in how to apply target when working with pupil, it was also agreed that key part of target only needs to be stressed for clarity. We also discussed how to highlight small indicators of progress from PIP to PIP, eg 3/5 occasions to 4/5 occasions, or continuous to intermittent prompts.</p>	<p>Impact: Teachers discussed which was the key part of each target, and what was 'extra' information. We agreed to highlight key information in grey on the PIP trackers moving forward. We will revisit this at the next moderation session.</p>	<p>that the Language of Engagement was included in the targets.</p> <p>Impact: Key information is being increasingly presented through highlighting in grey, with supporting information left unhighlighted. This is enabling staff to pick out the key part of each target. The Language of Engagement is becoming embedded in targets.</p>
Tracking EHCP – MAPP – PIPs	<p>Date: 30.09.20</p> <p>Intent: To track progress for individual pupils from EHCP to MAPP to PIPs</p> <p>Implementation: A case study example was introduced. Teachers worked in pairs to track progress from EHCP (Communication target) to MAPP to PIP tracker and discussed evidence to support, eg orange books, observation sheets.</p> <p>Impact: There was evidence of 'plan-do-review' process. Some teachers considered progress through MAPP targets over last two or three years. There was discussion regarding breaking EHCP short term targets down further to produce 'smarter' MAPP targets.</p>	<p>Date: 27.01.21</p> <p>Intent: To track the Language of Engagement incorporated into EHCP, MAPP and PIP documents</p> <p>Implementation: Teachers worked in pairs to track the Language of Engagement from EHCP to MAPP to PIP to orange observation books, as well as in medium-term planning.</p> <p>Impact: The Language of Engagement is becoming more embedded now throughout these key documents. There was a discussion regarding use of 'persistence'/'consistence' – teachers to ensure these words are used correctly.</p>	
Early Years		<p>Date: 22.02.21</p> <p>Intent: The Pennine Teaching School Alliance has been leading the Early Years Foundation Stage discussion groups for several years. The group has met on an ongoing basis to discuss the use of 'Development Matters' and to support colleagues in discussing personalised, small step assessment systems.</p>	

		<p>Implementation: As well as moderating five pieces of evidence in this session, there was also a discussion between EYs teachers at Castle Hill, Southgate, and Fairfield regarding the proposed changes to the EYFS Framework and 'Development Matters'.</p> <p>Impact: There will be continued discussions in the future, addressing changes to the Framework and implementing these changes effectively.</p>	
--	--	---	--