



Facilitator script and timings

Table activity 4 - comparing the expected standard to working at greater depth

Each delegate will need a copy of the following materials, which should be distributed at the appropriate point:

- Key stage 1 (KS1) 2018/19 Teacher Assessment Framework (from earlier sessions)
- Training exercise 4: Pupil D – working at the expected standard
- Table activity 4 handout
- Training exercise 4: Pupil D – commentary: working at the expected standard

Facilitator script:

During this final activity we will continue to explore some key statements from the KS1 TA framework for writing. We will compare and contrast the statements for ‘working at the expected standard’ with the statements for ‘working at greater depth’, as well as unpicking some of the statements that we have not looked at so far today.

Distribute training exercise 4: Pupil D.

Here is training exercise 4: Pupil D. This collection has been assessed as meeting all of the statements for ‘working at the expected standard’. While there is some evidence for ‘working at greater depth’, this is insufficient to support the higher judgement and some of the statements are not met.

Please take a few minutes to read these pieces and to familiarise yourself with them. You may also wish to consider how aspects of pupil D’s writing differ from those within the writing of pupil C, which we explored in the previous session.

Allow 5 minutes to read through the collection.

Learning point 1: comparing and contrasting coherence and effectiveness at the ‘expected’ standard and ‘greater depth’ standard

Facilitator script:

In this exercise, I’d like us to consider the differences in effectiveness and coherence between the ‘expected’ and ‘greater depth’ standards. Remember, at ‘working at the expected standard’, pupils are expected to be able to write simple, coherent narratives about personal experiences and those of others. To be assessed at ‘working at greater depth’, pupils need to have written effectively and coherently for different purposes and to have drawn upon their reading to inform the vocabulary and grammar of their writing.

I'd like you to take some time in pairs or small groups to compare and contrast the collections from pupil D (training exercise 4) and pupil C (training exercise 3). To help you record your observations, we have provided a simple table for you to use if you wish (Table activity 4 handout). You may like to consider aspects such as the correct use of tense, sentence structure and grammar, and the use of vocabulary. After the initial discussion, you may find it easier to focus on aspects of pupil D's writing which do not meet the effectiveness and coherence required for 'working at greater depth'.

Distribute the handout for Table activity 4.

Spend about 25 minutes on this activity. After some time spent in small group discussions, widen the discussion to the full group, comparing and contrasting the coherence of the collections from pupil C and pupil D. During this wider discussion, refer to the commentaries for both exercises to help you highlight and draw out appropriate points. You should ensure that, through this discussion, you cover the following points:

- Consider the lack of expansion of ideas within pupil D's manifesto [A], and how this detracts from the overall effectiveness of the piece. Compare this to pupil C's letter [B], where co-ordination enables the writer to expand ideas, aiding the coherence and effectiveness of the piece (e.g. *I scrambled up a quarter of the rock and then my dog began to bark*).
- Look at how pupil D's character profile [B] is suitably organised into sections which help support coherence. Also, draw attention to how the information provided in each section is brief, thereby detracting from its effectiveness. Stress, however, that this does not impact negatively on the statement relating to coherence in simple narratives, as required by the 'pupil can' statement for 'working at the expected standard'.
- Pupil D's narrative [D] coherently follows the structure of the text upon which it is based, and there is some evidence that the writer can draw on their reading to inform the vocabulary and grammar of their writing. However, there is limited expansion and the piece has a somewhat abrupt ending, which limits the opportunity for the pupil to sufficiently demonstrate that they can meet the requirements for 'working at greater depth'. Vocabulary lacks specificity which, if present, would further enhance effectiveness. Compare the vocabulary in this piece with the more precise vocabulary in piece A from pupil C (e.g. *tossed, current, mainland*), and the wide-ranging use of vocabulary from the source stimulus that is present in piece C from Pupil C (e.g. *where the Bong Tree grows, packed honey and money wrapped up in a 5 pound note*).
- The vocabulary in pupil D's letter [E] is relatively simple and, while the writer does use some expanded noun phrases to add detail, this contributes to the lack of effectiveness. Contrast this piece with piece B from pupil C which is also a letter. Consider how expanded noun phrases describe and specify (e.g. *a thick boney green rock, the murky depths*) and how these make this piece of writing effective.

Facilitator script:

As we have discussed, while there are some elements of pupil D's work that evidence the first statement for 'working at greater depth', taken as a whole, there is insufficient evidence to satisfy the requirement that the writing is effective and coherent and that it draws upon the pupil's reading to inform the vocabulary and grammar of their writing. Less adventurous vocabulary, and the lack of detail provided in some pieces, contribute to the fact that the statement is not met.

Of course, there are other aspects of the statements required for 'working at greater depth' that pupil D does not fully meet.

Learning point 2: comparing and contrasting the use of suffixes at the 'expected' standard and at the 'greater depth' standard

Facilitator script:

One of the 'greater depth' statements requires pupils to use suffixes to spell words correctly within their writing. Take a few moments to consider the range of suffixes used within the writing of pupil D and pupil C. You may wish to use the next row on the table we have provided on the handout, to support your comparison.

Allow 5 minutes to discuss, in pairs, the use of suffixes in the writing of pupil D and pupil C.

Facilitator script:

The correct use of suffixes is a requirement for 'working at greater depth': the framework states that there should be evidence that the pupil can add suffixes to spell most words correctly in their writing. The framework provides some example suffixes in brackets, but these are only examples and pupils are likely to draw on a wider range of suffixes from the KS1 programme of study. There should be sufficient evidence that suffixes are spelt correctly, with only occasional errors, in order to meet the requirement of the qualifier, 'most'.

It is also worth noting that pupils should not be expected to use suffixes correctly which are beyond the KS1 programme of study as detailed in Appendix 1 and 2 of the national curriculum.

Pupil D's work provides only limited evidence of the use of suffixes. Compare this to pupil C's work where suffixes are used throughout all five pieces and where the range of suffixes is correctly and confidently deployed, according to the intended purpose.

At this stage, it is also worth noting that pupil D's work does not show evidence of the pupil making simple additions and revisions to their writing, which is required for the award of the 'greater depth' standard.

Learning point 3: comparing and contrasting spelling at the 'expected' standard and 'greater depth' standard

Facilitator script:

Another key difference between the requirement for 'working at the expected standard' and 'working at greater depth' is the requirement relating to spelling. Can anyone recall the differences in the spelling statements between the 2 standards?

Through brief discussion, draw out the following points:

- For 'working at the expected standard' pupils should be able to spell **many** common exception words correctly.
- For 'working at greater depth' pupils should be able to spell **most** common exception words correctly.

- For 'working at the expected standard' the pupil should be able to segment spoken words into phonemes, selecting the correct graphemes to spell many words correctly. Where the pupil spells words incorrectly, there should be evidence that attempts are phonically plausible. Correct spelling of words which adhere to the rules and guidance taught at KS1 should be frequent, but it may not necessarily be consistent and, where correct spelling is not present, we should expect to see phonically-plausible attempts.

Facilitator script:

Remember that, when the statements refer to common exception words, it is expected that pupils are taught the common exception words stated in the national curriculum Appendix 1.

When making a judgment about spelling within a piece of writing, it is essential to remember that, where correct spellings are not used, the expectation is that the pupil makes phonically-plausible attempts. In Pupil D's work, for example:

- *In Piece A, 'candidate' is attempted as 'candanate' and 'wealthy' is attempted as 'wealthy'.*
- *In Piece B, 'wrinkly' is attempted as 'wringely', 'scare' as 'scair' and 'embalmers' as 'enmbarmers'.*

Now spend 5 minutes, in pairs, looking at pupil D's pieces C, D and E and considering the spelling in these pieces. In particular, you should identify whether phonically-plausible attempts have been made where words are misspelt.

Allow 5 minutes to complete this activity in pairs. Then widen out the discussion to include the whole table. Ensure delegates appreciate that:

- Most year 2 common exception words are spelt correctly, except 'could' which is spelt 'coud' in Piece D. This, therefore, means that pupil D does meet the requirement for the statement.
- Many words are spelt correctly but, where words are misspelt, phonically-plausible attempts have been made.

Ask participants for some examples of phonically-plausible spellings from pupil D's pieces C, D and E. To aid you in this discussion, examples from each piece are listed below:

- In Piece C, 'stitched' is attempted as 'stiched' and 'finally' as 'finnally'.
- In Piece D, 'enormous' is attempted as 'enourmas' and 'field' as 'field' and 'feild'.
- In Piece E, 'spaghetti' is attempted as 'speghetti', author as 'atuhour' or 'auther', and 'scared' as 'scaird'.

Facilitator script:

Remember that spelling tests can also provide additional evidence that the common exception words are spelt correctly; however, a spelling test is not required to be used as evidence. Teachers may also choose to use the KS1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test as part of their evidence for the spelling statements, but again, this is not a requirement.

Of course, we have not explored all of the reasons why pupil D meets the requirements for 'working at the expected standard'. I'd therefore like to give you a short period to read and discuss together the full commentary.

Distribute the commentary for pupil D.

Ensure there is an opportunity for participants to read the commentary and discuss any points where they may require further clarification. To ensure consistency, it is essential that, when responding to questions, you refer to the commentary to support participants' understanding of the standard.