

National moderation panel – 7 October 2015

The National moderation panel is a key element of the moderation process that has been designed to embed national consistency in the ASYE (adults). For the panel to make an effective contribution to this process, it is crucial that employers engage with us, by supplying assessment and internal moderation evidence from their organisations.

We are very grateful for the evidence that has been presented for the first National moderation panel. We are providing individual feedback to organisations whose evidence we have considered, and we have also compiled some general feedback which is outlined in the key messages below.

Key messages

1. The panel reviewed a mixture of evidence from the “original” and the “new” ASYE framework. In general we are optimistic that process issues we identified with the original documentation are being addressed in the new documentation (critical reflection log and record of support and progressive assessment). We would however reiterate the importance of:
 - completing all sections of these documents as they all have relevance in addressing the minimum requirements of the KSS (adults)
 - ensuring that the documents are signed and dated in appropriate places and that the roles of signatories are clearly identified.
2. We identified a clear correlation between employer support of the NQSW and the quality of the documentation and accompanying evidence. Where there was evidence of “good” quality support (in line with employer standards), the evidence supplied was generally of a higher standard than where this evidence was lacking. CQC and Ofsted do take an interest in how well NQSWs are being supported and it is deemed a mark of care if they are supported well.
3. We identified variations in the quality of the assessor’s reports, particularly with regard to evidence of progressive assessment. Assessors should record where they draw their evidence from, and also be selective about what they include. Too much detail can be as ineffective as too little detail. The additional guidance in the new documentation should help.
4. We felt that, in the main, there was not enough reference to service user feedback. We would like to see a clearer relationship between feedback received and how the NQSW applies this to their practice and learning.

5. Effective referencing of the PCF and the KSS is important, particularly within the professional development plan. We identified a number of instances where there were no references or they were too general.
6. There seems to be inconsistency in the interpretation of what constitutes an ASYE year.
7. Going forward, we will review paperwork at the three month, six month and 12 month stage. If we are reviewing at 12 months we will give the organisation the opportunity to moderate.
8. Employers and their partners may wish to use the feedback from the national panel, in conjunction with the evidence reports they submitted, as learning resources to support the ongoing development of assessors.