



## Facilitator script and timings

### Table activity 3 - distinguishing between 'working at the expected standard' and 'working at greater depth'

Each delegate will need a copy of the following materials:

- Key stage 2 (KS2) writing framework (from session 1)
- KS2 training exercise 3: working at the expected standard collection
- KS2 training exercise 3: working at the expected standard commentary

The commentary should not be distributed until the end of the session.

Distribute the 'KS2 training exercise 3: working at the expected standard' collection (one per delegate).

Facilitator script:

*This collection meets all of the requirements for 'working at the expected standard' however, despite its many strengths, it does not meet the requirements for 'working at greater depth' (GDS).*

*It consists of 5 pieces of writing - a myth, an informative article, a formal letter, a balanced argument and a short horror story.*

*Take 10 minutes to read the collection.*

*Feedback from the 2018 moderation cycle indicated that moderators sometimes found it difficult to distinguish between writing that met the 'expected standard' and writing that met 'working at greater depth'. Some teachers and moderators may have been making comparative judgements rather than applying the criteria, for example, awarding 'working at greater depth' to pupils simply because they were significantly stronger than other pupils in the cohort.*

### Learning point 1: drawing independently on reading to write effectively for a range of audiences and purposes

Facilitator script:

*Let's consider the 2 'working at greater depth' statements that were not a focus for the previous session. We'll take them one at a time. We'll start with the statement 'the pupil can write effectively for a range of purposes and audiences, selecting the appropriate form and drawing independently on what they have read as models for their own writing' (for example, literary language, characterisation, structure).*

*By drawing independently on what they have read as models for their own writing, pupils may, for example, choose to adopt the style of a particular author following the study of a class novel, as well as drawing on their wider reading of fiction and non-fiction to make judicious choices with regard to structure and organisation, grammatical structures and vocabulary.*

*A pupil's experience of reading and exploring a range of different texts should enable them to select the appropriate form in their own writing according to the audience and purpose. This includes making well-informed choices about the typical features of their chosen form (for example, when writing a formal argument, a promotional leaflet or a newspaper report). The extent to which they can do this independently should, of course, be clarified during the professional discussion with the teacher.*

*Now look at the first piece in the collection, the Mayan myth, in which a young boy sets out on a quest to save his village. Take 5 minutes to discuss in pairs whether there is any evidence for this 'pupil can' statement and to what extent it might be met.*

Take brief feedback from 2 or 3 delegates, acknowledging some of the strengths of the piece in relation to the statement.

Facilitator script:

*The pupil clearly draws on some of the features of a myth and is beginning to experiment with literary language however, use is not yet assured (Having completed the river of glass a river of water ahead of him – no, a river of acid).*

*Control over more ambitious grammatical constructions is not yet secure, resulting, at times, in some weakening of the intended effect (He had a sigh of relief that he completed the houses...). Similarly, although the pupil draws on a broad range of vocabulary, some choices are not precise or are repetitive, also weakening the intended effect (As he leaned forwards he accelerated forwards).*

## **Learning point 2: using punctuation precisely to enhance meaning and avoid ambiguity**

Facilitator script:

*Now let's consider the statement 'the pupil can use the range of punctuation taught at key stage 2 correctly (for example, semi-colons, dashes, colons, hyphens) and, when necessary, use such punctuation precisely to enhance meaning and avoid ambiguity'.*

*There is no longer a requirement to use specific forms of punctuation, such as colons or semi-colons at GDS, although pupils working at this standard may well choose to do so. The examples in brackets are just that – examples. A requirement is, that when necessary, pupils use such punctuation precisely to enhance meaning and avoid ambiguity. The assured use of commas, for example, may well be a significant factor in ensuring clarity of meaning in writing.*

*Take 5 minutes to look through the collection to find examples of writing where the meaning is unclear or ambiguous, or invites a miscue on the part of the reader on account of missing or incorrect punctuation. Take a further 5 minutes to discuss your examples in pairs.*

Invite 2 or 3 different delegates to share an example and explain how punctuation, used precisely, might have enhanced the meaning and avoided any ambiguity.

Facilitator script:

*We are not suggesting that use of punctuation is the only reason why this collection does not meet the 'greater depth' standard. As before, we'll give you a detailed commentary to take away, explaining the evidence for each 'pupil can' statement across the collection.*

*Since there are no qualifiers applied to the 'greater depth' statements, some moderators were uncertain as to whether any 'lapses' were allowed or whether the statements should be consistently demonstrated throughout a pupil's writing for the standard to be met. In order to meet 'greater depth' standards, a pupil's work must show that they can consistently demonstrate attainment in line with the wording of the 'pupil can' statements. However, occasional slippage across a collection of writing would not necessarily negate the award of the standard.*

### **Learning point 3: managing the professional discussion**

Facilitator script:

*Let's imagine that this collection is presented to you as 'working at greater depth' during moderation. I'd like you to consider the discussion you might have with the teacher to ensure that the school understands why the collection does not meet this standard in relation to the 'greater depth' 'pupil can' statements.*

*Work in pairs to rehearse the professional discussion between the teacher and the moderator. You may wish to alternate roles so that both of you have the opportunity to adopt each role.*

Take feedback from each pair, focusing on whether any particular 'pupil can' statements were particularly difficult to manage in the discussion.

Then distribute the complete commentary (one per delegate) and ask them to read the final section which explains why the collection is not awarded 'greater depth'. (*Why is the collection not awarded the higher standard?*). For ease of reference, this section is replicated below.

The collection cannot be awarded 'working at greater depth within the expected standard' because the pupil does not exercise an assured and conscious control over levels of formality through manipulating grammar and vocabulary.

Writing is often lively and engaging and the pupil is clearly beginning to emerge as a writer, experimenting with literary technique; however, they have yet to secure control over more ambitious grammatical constructions, especially when writing for more formal contexts. This results, at times, in some weakening of the intended effect (*He had a sigh of relief...some people can argue the opposite side...I was horrified to be replied to with...if only he didn't take Rellic Alley*). Similarly, although the pupil draws on a broad range of vocabulary, word choice is at times imprecise or repetitive, weakening the intended meaning and level of formality (*As he leaned forwards he accelerated forwards...protective gear...gets decapitated...This raging discussion...*).

The balanced argument and the letter of complaint demonstrate some grasp of the appropriate register; however, neither piece manages to sustain the required level of formality, either through choices of vocabulary or the manipulation of grammatical structures (*these are a few examples of why they believe this...so neither me or my brother knew the plot*).

Furthermore, the range of punctuation taught at KS2 is not used precisely to enhance meaning when necessary. Although writing evidences a range of punctuation, errors and omissions often result in ambiguity of meaning (*Quick thinking Votan grabbed the bone...Sources suggest that the losing team were sacrificed to the gods and possibly the successful captain as it was said...Having debated the issue; the world remains divided*).

Ask whether delegates have any questions about the reasons or the examples given and clarify where necessary. Then give them 15 minutes to read the rest of the commentary. If time permits, delegates may wish to read the commentaries from the previous 2 sessions.