

**External moderation reviewer
template non-refresh programme**

**Reviewer and portfolio information**

**Reviewer name:**  Insert text here

Role/organisation: Insert text here

Portfolio reference: Insert text here

Date: Insert text here

**Review of support arrangements**

**Please tick which of the following support arrangements have been delivered:**

[ ]  Evidence/confirmation that supervision has taken place at the specified frequency?

[ ]  Evidence/confirmation that the NQSW’s workload was reduced?

[ ]  Evidence/confirmation that the NQSW has attended additional workshops and/or has record of
 how 10% protected time was used?

**Any comments on the support arrangements delivered:** Insert text here

**Transparency of sampling**

Please tick which sections of the NQSW portfolio you have sampled for review:

[ ]  Support and assessment agreement (SAAM)

[ ]  Professional development plans for 0-3, 3-6, 6-9, 6-12 and end of ASYE

[ ]  Support information for the three month foundational review

[ ]  Interim reviews at 3, 6 and 9 months

[ ]  Final assessment report

[ ]  Direct observations at 3, 6 and 12 months

[ ]  Critical reflection pieces at 6 and 12 months

[ ]  Evidence of feedback from people who draw on care and support

[ ]  Evidence of feedback from other professionals

[ ]  Evidence of the verification of professional documentation at 3, 6 and 12 months

[ ]  Additional documentation/evidence of progression e.g. confirmation that the PQS (KSS)
 self-assessment tool has been undertaken

**Any comments:** Insert text here

**Moderation of the employer’s decision**

The reader would be expected to scrutinise the documents presented for moderation and comment on the recommendation of pass or fail.

1. **Does the assessor/employer provide clear evidence of why they have made their recommendation? Is it:**

[ ]  Accurate - consistent with the assessment criteria (i.e. the PQS and PCF)

[ ]  Valid - based on evidence that reflects the breadth of the NQSWs work throughout the year and t
 their progression

[ ]  Robust - based on evidence that is checked and consistent and leads to a defensible judgement

[ ]  Sufficient - based on a sufficiently broad and varied range of different types of evidence

Any comments:

Insert text here

1. **Do you consider that the internal moderation panel process demonstrates the expected level of quality (i.e. accurate links between panel comments made and evidence contained in the portfolio, valid comments regarding the quality of the evidence contained in the portfolio)?**Please provide details:

 Insert text here

1. **Feedback to the organisation, internal moderation panel and/or assessor (e.g. themes identified, strengths, areas for development, learning needs, compliments and concerns).**

Organisation:

Insert text here

Internal moderation panel:

Insert text here

Assessor:

Insert text here

**Note to ASYE co-ordinator:** Please add the comments that are in section 3 to the evidence you’re gathering to produce your annual action plan for continuous development.