

NQ
NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS *Review*

SCOTTISH
QUALIFICATIONS
AUTHORITY 

National Qualifications Review Investigation Report

Music
August 2003

Contents

Executive summary	1
1. Terms of reference	3
2. Methodology	5
3. Findings and conclusions	6
4. Recommendations	14
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Agreed actions from the Subject Review Report	15
Appendix 2: Summary of responses to questionnaire	19
Appendix 3: Summary of responses from other key stakeholders	22
Appendix 4: Existing and proposed Course structures	31
Appendix 5: Draft assessment rationale for the emerging Course model	33
Appendix 6: Uptake figures for the past three years	35

Executive summary

This report is the outcome of an investigation into how best to implement the agreed actions which were detailed in the Music Subject Review Report, published in May 2002. The main concerns identified in the Subject Review Report were:

- ◆ The Course structure includes an 80-hour Unit with three discrete Outcomes and assessments.
- ◆ The level of component Units: there are different levels of demand within Courses.
- ◆ The number of optional Units exceeds the maximum of four, and there is a relatively low uptake in some optional Units.
- ◆ The assessment rationale does not clarify the relationship between internal and external assessment.
- ◆ The volume and variety of internal assessments need to be addressed.
- ◆ The external assessment arrangements are too complex and involve a complex variety of assessment instruments and test papers.
- ◆ The use of visiting examination is highly resource-intensive, and alternative models should be investigated.
- ◆ Administration procedures are complex for centres and for SQA.

Consultation with stakeholders took place between January and early April 2003. This included centres (practitioners and co-ordinators), Principal Assessors, the Assessment Panel, local authority groups and advisers, internal SQA stakeholders, further and higher education establishments, HMIE, and a representative Subject Advisory Group.

The consultation took the form of a questionnaire to all presenting centres, as well as seminars, meetings and interviews with stakeholders.

Responses were mixed, and while there was consensus on some aspects of Course structure, there was no clear consensus on the way forward to address the issues raised in the Subject Review Report.

Overall, the feedback indicated support for retaining all three elements of the subject as mandatory: Performing, Listening and Inventing. Initial analysis of the questionnaire responses suggested that a majority accepted models which did not have Inventing as a mandatory element. However, all subsequent discussions in the consultation process indicated that all three elements should be mandatory in some way. In response to this, a number of models which had all three elements as mandatory were given serious consideration during the course of the consultation period, but no consensus was reached in the time available.

A clear view was expressed that more musical literacy content was needed in the Listening element, and there was agreement that the volume of assessment needed to be reduced.

There was much discussion about how to address the issue of the different levels of component Units in each Course, but no clear consensus on how this could best be addressed. Strong views were expressed in favour of retaining visiting examining for the performance element of the Course.

The conclusions drawn were:

- ◆ Performing, Inventing and Listening should be retained as mandatory elements of Music Courses. More time is required to discuss the implications of the model which emerged during consultation before final recommendations on Course structure are made.

- ◆ The component Units should all be at the level of the Course. However, given that there were mixed views how this should be done, and issues were raised which could have an impact on uptake and success rates, more time is needed to investigate this issue further before recommendations are made.
- ◆ The views of the Music profession should be taken into account in the general investigation of the quality assurance of performance-based subjects.

The main recommendations are:

- ◆ Additional time should be given to consult on the emerging Course model.
- ◆ A report with final recommendations should be submitted to relevant groups in SQA and the Scottish Executive, in an agreed timescale, with a view to implementation in session 2005–06. Arrangements should be published as early as possible to allow adequate transition time for all parties.

1 Terms of reference

The Scottish Executive initiated a review of all National Courses in June 2001 with the purpose of considering how best to reduce the complexity, variety and total volume of assessment in each subject. Following the review process, Subject Review Reports were published between February and June 2002. The reports identified a number of actions to be taken forward for each subject. These agreed actions received Ministerial approval.

This report is the result of an investigation into the most effective ways of addressing issues and implementing agreed actions specified in the Music Subject Review Report.

1.1 Issues of concern in Music Courses

The major concerns arising from the Review of Music were:

Course structure

The 80-hour mandatory Unit *Performing, Inventing and Listening* covers three discrete skills, each of which is assessed separately, creating three hurdles for candidates to complete before passing the Unit.

Level of component Units

Course component Units are not all assessed at the level of the Course.

Assessment rationale

The assessment rationale does not make the relationship between internal and external assessment clear.

Number of internal assessments

There are substantially more than two assessments per Unit, and there are different types of assessment within each Unit and, in some cases, Outcomes.

Assessments are conducted Outcome-by-Outcome, and occasionally by each Performance Criterion, and not holistically across Outcomes.

Variety and complexity of external assessments

The complex external assessment arrangements for Music Courses result in several anomalies. For example, the *Performing, Inventing and Listening* Unit forms two thirds of the Course but three quarters of the marks are allocated to it.

Also, different assessment demands are made of candidates depending on their choice of optional Unit. For example, if a candidate chooses *Listening Extension* as an option, they will have two written question papers to complete, one for the Listening core and one for the Extension; whereas if the *Performing Extension* Unit is chosen, only one written question paper has to be completed.

The number of test papers required for Music Courses

The total number of question papers required in Music Courses is 33.

Quality assurance

There are issues with the visiting examination in performing. These are currently being investigated within a wider review of the quality assurance of performance-based subjects.

Administration

Administration procedures are complex and cumbersome.

1.2 Implementing the actions from the Review

The actions to address the issues identified in the Subject Review Report are listed in Appendix 1.

The following issues and agreed actions are the focus of this report:

- ◆ Course structure and the number of optional Units
- ◆ the structure of the 80-hour *Performing, Inventing and Listening* Unit
- ◆ the level of the component Units in each Course

The following issues and actions will be fully addressed once a way forward has been established on Course structure:

- ◆ volume and variety of internal assessments
- ◆ variety and complexity of external assessments
- ◆ the number of test papers required for Music Courses
- ◆ administrative procedures

The issue of quality assurance of assessment of performance will be dealt with as part of the generic project on the quality assurance of performance-based subjects, due to report in autumn 2003.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 A draft consultation questionnaire was drawn up and discussed with Principal Assessors at a meeting in January 2003. Amendments to the questionnaire were made following this meeting.
- 2.2 The consultation questionnaire was posted on the SQA website and sent out to all presenting centres in February 2003 with a return date of 24 March 2003. Returns were received from 172 centres (see Appendix 2).
- 2.3 Meetings were held with the Subject Advisory Group on 3 March, 19 March, and 4 April 2003 (see Appendix 3).
- 2.4 Meetings were held with the Assessment Panel on 5 March and 22 March 2003 (see Appendix 3).
- 2.5 Between 19 February and 26 March 2003, meetings took place with principal teachers, advisers, and other representatives from 10 local authorities (see Appendix 3).
- 2.6 In March and April 2003, meetings took place with representatives of further and higher education establishments (see Appendix 3).
- 2.7 Between February and April 2003, meetings were held with other key stakeholders, including members of SQA's Examination and Moderation teams, and the HMIE for the subject area (see Appendix 3).
- 2.8 A comparison of Course content and structure was made with Music Courses awarded by other awarding bodies in the UK (see Section 3).

3 Findings and conclusions

3.1a Course structure: findings

The current structure of the National Courses in Music includes, at each level, a mandatory 80-hour Unit in *Performing, Inventing and Listening* (the ‘PIL Unit’), which assesses the three skill areas separately, so candidates have three different hurdles to overcome before they can pass the Unit. The remaining 40-hour Unit is chosen from a list of options:

- 5 optional Units at Intermediate 1
- 7 optional Units at Intermediate 2
- 6 optional Units at Higher
- 8 optional Units at Advanced Higher

To ease the administrative burden, SQA created 26 different codes, creating a structure of specialist Courses. This was a temporary measure.

The external assessment arrangements to support these 26 specialist Courses are also complex, with 33 different question papers required for the examination diet. This is complicated for centres and SQA to administer. It also imposes different Unit and Course assessment demands and standards on candidates, depending on which options they choose. Some of the optional Units have very low uptake, while the option in *Performing Extension* accounts for over 90% of entries at Higher.

The Subject Review Report’s agreed action on this issue is to revise the Course structure, to reduce the number of optional Units, and to take action to address the issues associated with the content and structure of the PIL Unit.

Models presented in the consultation

Two models were put forward for discussion and comment in the consultation paper:

- ◆ The first presented two mandatory 40-hour Units: one in *Performing* (one instrument) and one in *Listening*. The remaining 40-hour Unit was to be selected from a choice of four optional Units in *Inventing*, *Performing Extension* (second instrument), *MIDI Sequencing* and *Sound Engineering Production*.
- ◆ The second model presented two mandatory 40-hour Units: one in *Performing* (with the option of presenting a programme for assessment which could include one or two instruments) and one in *Listening*. The remaining 40-hour Unit in this model was to be selected from a choice of three 40-hour Units in *Inventing*, *MIDI Sequencing* and *Sound Engineering Production*.

These models recognised the focus on performance, the need for underpinning knowledge in *Listening*, and the importance of *Inventing* and technology. Suggestions for other models were also invited.

Response to the consultation questionnaire

200 completed questionnaires were returned. Of these, 185 came from 163 centres (161 schools and 2 colleges — a 41% response rate from centres). 15 responses came from other interested parties. (See Appendix 2)

Of 200 questionnaire returns, 134 opted for Model 1, 39 opted for Model 2, and 27 opted for neither on the grounds that *Inventing* should be compulsory.

These figures have to be qualified by the comments on the returns:

- ◆ 21 of those who opted for Model 1 indicated that they had concerns about *Inventing* being removed from the mandatory section
- ◆ a further 9 responses highlighted concerns that in Model 1, if the *Performing Extension* was chosen, Performing could form two thirds of the Course
- ◆ comments were also made that the *Performing Extension* should be at a higher level than the mandatory Unit

This means that 104 out of 200 opted for Model 1 without adding qualifying comments registering concerns with this model.

One further statistic which can be drawn from the responses is that a total of 152 out of 200 indicated acceptance of models which did not have *Inventing* as one of the mandatory elements. The 152 is made up of 113 who indicated a preference for Model 1 without any negative comment about *Inventing* not being mandatory, and 39 who indicated a preference for Model 2 without any negative comment about *Inventing* not being mandatory. 25 commented that they would specifically like *Inventing* to become optional.

Response of the Subject Advisory Group

The Subject Advisory Group's view was that the three elements of Performing, Inventing and Listening should remain mandatory, as these were essential to the whole musician philosophy and also to establish progression from Standard Grade. There was also a will to retain breadth, choice and the use of music technology.

The removal of the *Listening Extension* Unit, which has low uptake, was agreed as one way of reducing the number of optional Units.

Of the two models presented in the consultation paper, there was concern that in the first model, depending on options chosen, Inventing could be omitted from the Course and Performing could make up two thirds of the Course. At present, Performing can make up half, and this is viewed by some as too weighted in favour of Performing. With the second model, Performing would make up one third of the Course. Inventing, however, could still be omitted. The Advisory Group considered responses from the consultation questionnaire and put forward the view that there were difficulties with the assessment requirements for the current *Inventing* Unit and this could have influenced responses.

They also expressed concern that the questionnaire asked respondents to select a preference between two models, without sufficient emphasis being placed on the option to suggest alternative models. Therefore, further discussions and alternative models were considered:

- ◆ One model involved retaining the PIL Unit and exploring ways to restructure Unit assessments; optional Units could be reduced to four by removing low uptake Units such as *Listening Extension*. The difficulty with this model was in moving towards a holistic internal assessment. No solution was found.
- ◆ The second model discussed comprised two mandatory 40-hour Units: one in *Performing* and one in *Inventing*, each with a Listening Outcome. Optional Units could be reduced to four. This model had the advantages of retaining 80 hours for the three elements, and allowing credit and achievement to be built through two Units as opposed to one 80-hour Unit. Moving to holistic assessment would also be easier, but there would still be a problem with devising an appropriate integrated assessment in each Unit which incorporated Listening. In addition, the split was felt by some to be artificial or contrived.
- ◆ A third model comprised three mandatory 40-hour Units: one in *Performing*, one in *Listening* and the remaining 40-hour Unit in *Composing*, with a choice of presenting a folio in Composition, or Composing with MIDI Sequencing, or Composing with Sound Engineering. In the *Performing* Unit, candidates would be

assessed on a programme of performance involving one or two instruments, or one instrument and Accompanying. At Advanced Higher, candidates would have the further option of being assessed in one instrument and Training and Directing in the *Performing* Unit. This model was viewed by the Subject Advisory Group as worthy of further investigation.

Response of the Assessment Panel

The Assessment Panel view was that the 80-hour PIL Unit should be retained. They took the view that marks for Unit assessments should be aggregated for the three Outcomes in Performing, Inventing and Listening in a way similar to the aggregation of marks for Course assessment. They also preferred that all options should be retained, but should be integrated or merged, eg a new *Creative Technology* Unit would combine MIDI sequencing and sound engineering.

Responses from other groups

- ◆ At meetings with curriculum panels, principal teachers and advisers no consensus on Course structure emerged. Problems were identified with each of the models in the consultation paper.
- ◆ There was a common view that Performing, Inventing and Listening should be mandatory elements of the Course and that options where possible should be retained, although a minority were in favour of Inventing becoming optional on the grounds that for the vast majority of candidates at Higher, the folio for Inventing was too intensive and time – consuming.
- ◆ There were suggestions about integrating the two technology Units and in several instances, a view that Accompanying should be retained. Although uptake was low, it was felt by some that since Accompanying was a relatively new option, it should be given time to become established.
- ◆ One large FE centre which was visited was very much in favour of options being introduced within the *Inventing* Unit to allow candidates to use technology for composition. FE centres would also like optional Units to remain as free-standing Units, to enable them to cater for a wide range of student needs. There was a strong view expressed from this sector that the current Courses are very difficult to administer and streamlining would be welcome.
- ◆ Some also expressed the view that the present Course structure was just settling in and was working well.

Responses from individuals

Views were taken from individuals with a key role in the quality or administration of Music Courses. These included Senior Moderator, Music Technology Co-ordinator, Principal Assessor, HMI, SQA Schools Co-ordinators.

The following comments were made on Course structure:

- ◆ There are too many Courses and codes for Music, which makes it very difficult for centres and for SQA to administer.
- ◆ It would be unwise to integrate MIDI Sequencing and Sound Engineering — some centres are equipped for one but not the other.
- ◆ The Course design is being driven to a certain extent by 5–14. There should be change from the top down.
- ◆ Performing, Inventing and Listening should be mandatory.
- ◆ Integration of optional Units would retain breadth, but the combinations would need to be carefully thought out.
- ◆ Training and directing should be retained, if possible, at Advanced Higher.

- ◆ A model with a *Performing* Unit, and *Listening* Unit, and a choice of three *Inventing* Units (including *Inventing with Midi* and *Inventing with Sound Engineering*) would be viable.

Structure and content of Music Courses from other awarding bodies

Comparisons were made with Music Courses offered at Higher equivalent level by three other awarding bodies: Edexcel, the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) and Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations (OCR). In each of the Courses investigated, there are three Units or modules in the Course structure which are broadly equivalent to *Performing*, *Inventing* and *Listening*. Choice, breadth and flexibility are provided within the three-Unit structures:

EDEXCEL	AQA	OCR
Performing	Performing	Performing
Developing Musical Ideas	Composition	Composition
Listening and Understanding	Understanding Music	Introduction to Historical Study

Edexcel: in the assessment of performance, candidates have the choice of presenting one or more pieces; as part of their coursework in performance, candidates may choose to direct an ensemble or group; choice is also given in Developing Musical Ideas to use music technology as a compositional tool.

AQA: in the assessment of performance, candidates perform on instruments of their choosing, and in one piece they may choose to direct others.

OCR: in the external assessment for performance, candidates perform a solo piece, but in the internal assessment of performance, candidates may choose to perform on a second instrument, to perform in a duet or ensemble, or as an accompanist, or they may perform their own composition.

3.1b Course structure: conclusions

- ◆ The consultation did not produce a consensus on a model for Course structure. While a majority chose the first model presented in the questionnaire, comments expressing serious reservations about this model, taken together with numbers of respondents choosing the second model or choosing neither, produced almost an even division.
- ◆ Face to face consultation with a variety of groups and individuals produced a broad consensus that *Performing*, *Inventing* and *Listening* should continue to form the basis of the Course. This would maintain the continuum from 5–14 and Standard Grade through to further and higher education. There was also a view that breadth should be retained through choices; integration of Units was suggested by many as a method of achieving this.
- ◆ The current Course structure is complex for centres and for SQA to administer. There is not a common pattern of internal and external assessment across the many optional Units. This makes it difficult to ensure parity of standards and parity in assessment demands at any particular level.
- ◆ It should be possible to separate the three skills in the PIL Unit into three separate Units while still maintaining a holistic, integrated approach to teaching and learning. Models based on this structure are offered by other awarding bodies. However, many stakeholders, including the Assessment Panel, wished to see the PIL Unit retained. No satisfactory solution to the problems associated with the internal assessment of the PIL Unit was presented.
- ◆ Three models were viewed by the Subject Advisory Group as possible ways to meet the design criteria. The one which was viewed as worth further investigation

(and was based on stakeholder feedback) was the three-Unit structure: *Performing*, *Listening* and *Composing*, with breadth and choice included within the Units. This model emerged at a late stage in the consultation period. (More information on this model is given in Appendix 4.) This model would have the following advantages:

Content:

- It addresses stakeholder concerns that the Course should continue to ensure breadth of musicianship by retaining the three key elements of *Performing*, *Listening* and *Composing* (Inventing).
- Flexibility to meet candidate needs would be maintained by incorporating choices within Units.
- Use of music technology would be incorporated as a choice in the *Composing* Unit.

Assessment:

- The number of internal assessments currently required is viewed as excessive. The proposed model would substantially reduce the amount and complexity of internal assessment.
- A coherent pattern of holistic Unit and Course assessment could be developed. The proposed Course model would remove duplicate assessments, reduce the variety and volume of assessment and ensure parity of standards in the external assessment, irrespective of candidate choice.

Administration:

- One Course code could be used, simplifying administrative procedures for centres and SQA, and reducing the possibility of administrative errors.
- The current total number of question papers is 33. This would be reduced to four (one *Listening* paper at each level).

- ◆ Given the diversity of opinion in the profession, it is unlikely that consensus will be achieved in the short term. More time is required to investigate this model before making final recommendations on Course structure. Taking time to communicate with the profession to give feedback on how their views have been taken into account in seeking solutions would also be beneficial in the long run.

3.2a Level of component Units: findings

Models presented in the consultation paper

Two models on levels were presented in the consultation paper:

- ◆ Model 1: set Intermediate 1 at Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (AB) Grade 2, Intermediate 2 at AB Grade 3, Higher at AB Grade 4 and Advanced Higher at AB Grade 5. This model reflects the current minimum standard of performance at each level.
- ◆ Model 2: set Intermediate 1 at AB Grade 3, Intermediate 2 at AB Grade 4, Higher at AB Grade 5 and Advanced Higher at AB Grade 6. This model takes minimum standards of performance up one grade at each level.

Response to the consultation questionnaire

- ◆ 78 respondents indicated a preference for Model 1.
- ◆ 82 indicated a preference for Model 2.

- ◆ There were comments from 32 respondents who had chosen either Model 1 or Model 2, that an endorsement would need to be added on the candidate certificate showing achievement of Units at levels above the level of the Course.
- ◆ 8 chose neither Model, but presented models which were not in a straight hierarchy.

Views, therefore, were mixed and no clear consensus was established.

Other responses

The Subject Advisory Group and the Assessment Panel took the view that Model 2 as presented in the questionnaire was the preferred model. This would set Higher at AB Grade 5.

There were mixed views from meetings with nine local authority groups of principal teachers. There were five in favour of Model 1 and two in favour of Model 2. In the remaining two groups there were mixed views.

There were various arguments put forward by individuals and groups in favour of each. These are summarised below:

Model 1 (Higher at AB Grade 4)

- ◆ It follows on directly from Standard Grade Credit (AB Grade 3).
- ◆ It represents the minimum level of performance required in the current Course.
- ◆ It represents an appropriate level of demand for students who perform on classroom-taught instruments, ie those who are not receiving individual tuition from local authority or private instrument tutors.
- ◆ The demand for some students to progress two grades from Standard Grade (AB Grade 3 for SG Credit level) to Higher is too great.
- ◆ This model still allows candidates performing at a higher level to be assessed and certificated for the *Performing* Unit at the higher level as part of their Course.

Model 2 (Higher at AB Grade 5)

- ◆ Grade 5 is a reasonable demand given that students are only required to play one instrument.
- ◆ Higher education would not value a performance on one instrument at Grade 4.
- ◆ Grade 5 is the level already set for the 40-hour *Performing Extension* Unit and over 90% of candidates currently take this option.
- ◆ Intermediate 2 would be available to those candidates unable to reach Grade 5 in one year.
- ◆ Comparison with other awarding bodies shows that AB Grade 5 is the norm for Higher equivalent Courses.

Benchmarking against other awarding bodies

- ◆ The standard of performance required in Edexcel at AS level (Higher equivalent) is equivalent to AB Grade 5. This is in line with Model 2 in the consultation paper.
- ◆ AQA does not state an AB equivalent for AS level (equivalent to Higher), as there is no solo performance required in this Course; A2 level (equivalent to Advanced Higher) is stated as equivalent to Grade 6.
- ◆ OCR AS level requires a performance at the equivalent of AB Grade 5 in the higher bands of this award; in the medium bands a performance equivalent to Grade 4 is required.

3.2b Level of component Units: conclusion

There were mixed views on how best to set the level of component Units.

- ◆ The Subject Advisory Group and Assessment Panel preference was to set Higher performance at AB Grade 5. There are strong arguments in favour of this given that over 90 % of candidates at Higher already perform at Grade 5 level. Other Courses equivalent to Higher are set at AB Grade 5. However, there is concern that candidates currently achieving Intermediate 2 or Higher at the minimum levels of performance could be disadvantaged. Much depends on the Course structure adopted for development. If every candidate had 40 hours study time on performance, it could be argued that performance levels could be developed to the required standard.
- ◆ There are also convincing arguments to support Model 1, which reflects the current minimum performance levels required in the Courses at each level. Students who achieve beyond this level in *Performing* could be credited with a higher level Unit in *Performing* as part to their Course. There are precedents for this in other subjects. The Course caters mainly for candidates who are pursuing a general education. Only a small minority (5%) progress to specialist HE Courses in Music. These candidates can still be credited and certificated with Unit achievement at a higher level.
- ◆ Since the issue of levels is closely tied up with the Course structure, the assessment rationale and possible changes in weighting, there is a strong argument to delay final decisions until recommendations on Course structure are made. More time to research the impact of any changes on candidates at different levels would also help to inform conclusions.

3.3a Other issues raised during the consultation

Listening Unit

- ◆ A significant number (38) of responses to the questionnaire commented that the *Listening* paper should contain more literacy, notation and history.
- ◆ Meetings with Principal Assessors, local authority advisors, FE and HE representatives, Assessment Panel and Subject Advisory Group indicated there was a strong view that the literacy content and assessment in the Music Course should be reviewed.
- ◆ There was a strong view expressed from FE that the concept list should be revised to include jazz, rock and popular music. This view was also expressed by the Assessment Panel.

Internal and external assessment

Comments on reducing internal and external assessment were linked to comments on Course structure. In general, there was a view that the number of test papers had to be reduced and that internal assessments needed to be rationalised.

Administration

Representatives from FE, principal teachers in schools, SQA Schools Co-ordinators, and internal stakeholders in SQA expressed strong views about the complexity of administration because of the number of different codes, Courses and optional Units.

Timescale

There was a common view expressed throughout the consultation by all groups and individuals that the timescale for consultation was too short. The issues to be resolved in

Music are complex and need time to be discussed fully. Operational issues are also complex and the general view was that time would be needed to ensure that any changes were operationally sound.

3.3b Conclusions on other issues

There was a clear view that a review of the content and assessment of *Listening* was needed to meet the need of candidates moving to FE and HE. Strong views were expressed on the administrative complexities of the current Courses in Music and the need to make improvements to the Courses to make them easier for centres and for SQA to operate.

Internal and external assessment issues will be dealt with at a later stage of the review.

4 Recommendations

- 4.1 The consultation period should be extended to enable the Development team to investigate the third model of Course structure, which emerged during the consultation period.
- 4.2 Centres should be given feedback on the outcome of the consultation process to date by letter. Representatives from centres should be invited to a number of seminars, where the third model will be presented and responses will be sought on the structure and levels of component Units.
- 4.3 At the seminars, consensus will be sought on the desirability of retaining Performing, Listening and Inventing as mandatory elements of all Music Courses.
- 4.4 A report with final recommendations should be submitted to NQMG, in an agreed timescale, with a view to implementation in session 2005/2006. Arrangements should be published as early as possible to allow adequate transition time for all parties.

Appendix 1: Issues and agreed actions from the Subject Review Report

Issue: Course structure and uptake of optional Units

The *Performing*, *Inventing* and *Listening* Unit covers three discrete skills, each of which is assessed separately, creating three hurdles for candidates to complete before passing the Unit.

In 2000/01, the level of optionality generated huge problems for centres and SQA. To eliminate the need for manual intervention and non-routine results processing, specialist Course codes were introduced as a short-term measure for session 2001/02. The introduction of the Course codes reduced complexity of administration and significantly reduced the numbers of errors. However, these changes have introduced a new form of complexity in that they have resulted in 26 specialist Courses in Music: 5 at Intermediate 1, 7 at Intermediate 2, 6 at Higher and 8 at Advanced Higher. This is still complex for centres and SQA to administer and for candidates to understand. A longer-term solution must be found.

However, there is relatively low uptake in a number of optional Units, and there are a large number of options at each level. Over 96 % of candidates choose Music with Performing (ie the *Performing Extension* optional Unit) at each level, with the remaining 4% spread over the other options. Just over 1% of candidates choose *Listening Extension* and the same proportion chooses *Accompanying*.

Action: re-structure Courses

Any re-structuring of Music Course would require consultation. Optional Units removed from National Courses could be retained in the NQ catalogue and be taken as free-standing Units.

Issue: level of component Units

Course component Units are not all assessed at the level of the Course. This is at variance with the design criteria for all National Courses.

The standards of performing and accompanying required in Music Courses in Scotland are equivalent to those required for Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music examinations. In National Qualifications the following grades are required:

	PIL Unit	Performing Extension Units	Accompanying Units
Intermediate 1	AB Grade 2	AB Grade 2	
Intermediate 2	AB Grade 3	Extension 1: AB Grade 3 Extension 2: AB Grade 4	AB Grade 3
Higher	AB Grade 4	AB Grade 5	AB Grade 4
Advanced Higher	AB Grade 5	Extension 1: AB Grade 6 Extension 2: AB Grade 7	AB Grade 5

Action: level of component Units

Revise Music Arrangement documents, NAB items and assessment requirements to ensure that Unit assessment is conducted at the level of the Course, and align the assessment with the appropriate Associated Board Grade. Clear Evidence Requirements that indicate the minimum standard for the performance could do this. For example, at Higher level the minimum standard of performance for the Unit and the Course could be AB Grade 4. Candidates would be credited at the standard of performance under the criteria established by SQA. Guidance should take account of candidates who perform beyond the level recommended for the Course.

Issue: assessment rationale

Music does not have an assessment rationale that facilitates understanding of the relationship between internal and external assessment. There is duplicate assessment in all aspects of Music.

Action: assessment rationale

Produce an assessment rationale that directs, justifies and clarifies the relationship between internal and external assessment. A viable model of assessment should be developed that clearly distinguishes between the evidence requirements for internal and external assessment.

Issue: content and structure of Performing, Inventing and Listening Unit

Music Courses are structured so that candidates complete a mandatory 80-hour Unit — *Performing, Inventing and Listening (PIL)*. The PIL Unit has three distinct and discrete Outcomes, each with its own assessment regime. There is no aggregation of the Outcome 'scores/grades' to attain a Unit pass. In effect, candidates must pass each Outcome in order to achieve a Unit pass, ie there are effectively three opportunities to fail the PIL Unit.

Because aggregation may take place across the elements of a Course, certain candidates may find themselves able to pass the Course despite one element being less strong than another - not so for the Unit, where Outcomes are assessed individually on a pass/fail basis.

Issue: number of internal assessments

There are a large number of internal assessments in Music Courses. Internal assessment is time-consuming for centres because assessments have to be carried out individually for each candidate.

Assessments are conducted Outcome-by-Outcome, and occasionally PC-by-PC, and not holistically across Outcomes. There are substantially more than two assessments per Unit, and there are different types of assessment within each Unit and, in some cases, Outcomes. Each assessment is assessed on a pass or fail basis. Candidates are required to pass each assessment to achieve a Unit pass. In effect, this means that a candidate has a number of opportunities to fail each Unit. For example, in *Accompanying*, candidates have five separate assessments and are required to pass all of them in order to achieve a Unit pass.

Action: number of internal assessments

There must be a substantial reduction in the number of assessments in each Unit. SQA should simplify and reduce the number of assessments to one or two per Unit, and remove all Outcome and PC-by-PC assessments. New assessments should be devised to assess across each Unit.

Issue: candidate log books and their role in the assessment process

A Course log or record is recommended in many of the Units. SQA's advice to centres is that these logs should be maintained throughout the Course/Units, although they are not officially used in the assessment process. Course logs are not part of the Evidence Requirements for internal assessment, nor are they part of the Evidence Requirements for external assessment. They are part of learning and teaching, but SQA should not insist on them being maintained.

Action: candidate log books and their role in the assessment process

SQA will issue clear guidelines on the use of Course logs in the assessment process. Any guidance should clearly define the Units for which documentary evidence is part of the Evidence Requirements, and should make clear to centres that there is no requirement for candidates to maintain Course logs. Centres should be told that Course logs do not contribute to any Unit/Course assessment and will not be called for in visiting examination, moderation or for appeals purposes.

Issue: variety and complexity of external assessments

The complex external assessment arrangements for Music Courses result in several anomalies. For example, the *Performing, Inventing and Listening* Unit forms two thirds of the Course but three quarters of the component marks are allocated to it.

Also, different external assessment demands are made of candidates depending on their choice of optional Units.

Issue: number of 'test papers' required for Music Courses

The total number of question papers required in Music Courses is 33.

Action: reduction in the variety and complexity of external assessments in Music Courses

As part of the revisions to the Courses, SQA must reduce the variety and complexity of external assessments for Music Courses.

This could be done by:

- ◆ removing one or more of the optional Units and their associated external assessment components
- ◆ reducing the number of external assessment components to the norms agreed by the subject review (normally one, or a maximum of four if these can be justified as covering distinct assessment objectives)
- ◆ reducing the complexity of individual external assessment components by moving away from using multiple test items within each component

Issue: use of visiting examination

Use of visiting examination for external assessment of components of Music Courses is a highly resource-intensive process for centres and SQA. Its effectiveness as a quality assurance mechanism has also been questioned, given the difficulties of standardising the large number of Visiting Examiners involved.

Action: use of visiting examination

Alternative models of quality assurance should be further explored and put in place as part of the wider revision of Music Courses, and in line with overall SQA policy and practice in other performance-based subjects. The revisions should ensure that the most reliable, practicable and cost-effective quality assurance is applied to performance-based subjects.

Issue: arrangements which minimise administration

In principle, National Courses should have arrangements which minimise the administration associated with Courses and their assessment – in Music this cannot be said to be the case. Administration procedures are complex and cumbersome.

Action: arrangements which minimise administration

Further simplification of administration arrangements must be made as part of the wider revision of Music Courses.

Appendix 2: Summary of responses to questionnaire

Centres

Responses were received from 161 schools.

Responses were also received from:

Stevenson College, Edinburgh (2)
Langside College, Glasgow
University of Aberdeen
Castlebrae Community Education Office, Edinburgh
Culloden Academy Community Education Centre, Inverness
Anderson High School evening classes, Lerwick
East Ayrshire Curriculum Management Team
Music Adviser, North Lanark
Dumfries & Galloway Music Panel
Inverclyde Principal Teachers
East Renfrew Music Co-ordinators
Instrument Teachers (6)

1 Course design

Based on the uptake figures for 2002, two models which comply with the design criteria and allow the maximum number of options are given below. The *Accompanying*, *Listening Extension* and *Training and Directing* Units would still be retained in the NQ catalogue and would be available as free-standing Units.

Please consider these models, and indicate your view

Model 1

Mandatory Units

Performing	40 hours (one instrument)
Listening	40 hours

Optional Units

Performing Extension	40 hours (one instrument)
Inventing	40 hours
MIDI Sequencing	40 hours
Sound Engineering and Production	40 hours

Model 2

Mandatory Units

Performing	40 hours (one or two instruments)
Listening	40 hours

Optional Units

Inventing	40 hours
MIDI Sequencing	40 hours
Sound Engineering and Production	40 hours

Response

Model 1	104
Model 1 (with reservations)	30
Model 2	39
Neither Model	27

Of the 134 who chose Model 1, 21 expressed serious concern that *Inventing* was no longer mandatory, 6 expressed a view that split level *Performing* had to be retained and 3 expressed serious concern that *Performing* might attract two-thirds of the available marks.

The figures should be interpreted in the light of the comments and concerns expressed.

104, ie just over half, opted for Model 1 without registering serious concern; 96 either opted for Model 2, or neither, or expressed serious concerns about aspects of Model 1. 25 explicitly supported the removal of *Inventing* from the mandatory section of the Course.

One further statistic, which can be drawn from the responses, is that a total of 152 out of 200 indicated acceptance of models which did not have *Inventing* as one of the mandatory elements. The 152 is made up of 113 who indicated a preference for Model 1 without any negative comment about *Inventing* not being mandatory, and 39 who indicated a preference for Model 2 without any negative comment about *Inventing* not being mandatory.

2 Level of component Units (Performing)

To meet the design criteria, all component Units would have to be assessed at the level of the Course. In this context, please indicate which of the following models you would favour, bearing in mind that candidates performing at a higher level than is required for the Course, can still be entered for an additional free standing Unit.

Model 1

Access 3	AB Grade 1
Intermediate 1	AB Grade 2
Intermediate 2	AB Grade 3
Higher	AB Grade 4
Advanced Higher	AB Grade 5

Model 2

Access 3	AB Grade 1
Intermediate 1	AB Grade 3
Intermediate 2	AB Grade 4
Higher	AB Grade 5
Advanced Higher	AB Grade 6

Responses

Model 1	78
Model 2	65
Either Model, with endorsements for Unit achievement above the level of the Course	32
Neither (presented other models which were not in a hierarchy)	8
Model 2 chosen because this would have credibility with HE but commented that preference was for Model 1	17

This presents a divided picture, with no clear consensus emerging.

3 Quality assurance of performance

Respondents were asked to give any comments which would feed into the wider SQA review of the quality assurance of performance-based subjects.

There was a strong view that the arrangement of a Visiting Examiner assessing performance should be retained. Many recognised the resource problems which arose from this arrangement but commented on other methods of reducing the problem. By far the most common solution suggested was to reduce the performance times.

4 Reducing the volume of assessment

The majority of returns contained little or no response to assessment issues. Those who did offered various comments but no general viewpoint emerged.

Reducing internal assessment

- ◆ remove the need for audio tape recording (this is a requirement for appeals)
- ◆ revert to a prelim (this can already take place under the current arrangements)
- ◆ allow aggregation of marks for internal assessment

Reducing external assessment

- ◆ accept Associated Board certification for performance
- ◆ reduce performance times
- ◆ only have visiting examining for external assessment of performance at Intermediate 2 to Advanced Higher

Appendix 3: Summary of responses from other key stakeholders

Music Subject Advisory Group Membership

Fiona Scott	Qualifications Officer SQA
Alan McGuire	Development Officer SQA
Elda Fleck	SFEU representative
Hughina Naylor	LTS representative
Andrew Adamson	PT Music, Dingwall Academy
Celia McEachan	PT Music, St Aidens High School
May Barnes	PT Music, Holyrood Secondary
Richard Michael	PT Music, Beath High School
John O'Dowd	Music Adviser, North Lanark Education Dept
John Mabon	Principal Assessor, Kelso High School
Dorothy Carnegie	Aberdeen College

Note of Subject Advisory Group Meetings

Summary of key points raised: 3 and 19 March 2003

- ◆ The issue of possible extension to timescales was discussed.
- ◆ The purpose of NQ Music Courses was confirmed. The Courses provide breadth but also cater for the specialist through a range of options. The rationale underpinning Music Courses rests on the three essential elements of the Course: Performing, Inventing and Listening. The view was that all three should be mandatory.
- ◆ It was agreed that the review could be an excellent opportunity to address the concerns of both teachers and HE regarding literacy skills.
- ◆ Any increase in percentage of marks allocated to performance in any model would have to be carefully considered due to the effect on relative ratings.
- ◆ The possibility of the 80-hour Unit being retained was discussed. It was felt that Question 1 in the questionnaire did not reflect this possibility.
- ◆ It was confirmed that 80-hour Units were possible within the design criteria, but a strong rationale had to be given. Issues with the 80-hour PIL Unit had to be addressed. No decisions had been taken as to how those issues could best be addressed. The consultation exercise was completely open. If a satisfactory model could be produced with an 80-hour Unit, this would be considered.
- ◆ The 80-hour Unit available in Modern Languages was discussed and it was agreed that this would be investigated in more detail regarding assessment and rationale. The possibility of two mandatory Units in *Performing* and *Inventing*, each with a Listening Outcome was discussed (following the model used for Speaking in Modern Languages).
- ◆ Optional Units could be reduced to four to comply with design rules. Merging some optional Units would retain breadth. eg MIDI with *Inventing*, *Training* and *Directing with Accompanying*.
- ◆ Higher Grade at Associated Board (AB) Level 5 with a two instrument *Performing* Unit (Model 2 in questionnaire) would have to be phased; two instruments at Level 5 would be too difficult for FE.
- ◆ The volume and variety of assessment is a concern to practising teachers. Taping is time consuming.
- ◆ It was felt that reductions in performance times for visiting examination would alleviate the pressures on the present system but would still ensure an acceptable

level of quality assurance. The possibility of retaining 100% visiting examination for the *Extension* Unit only was discussed.

Summary of key points raised: 4 April 2003

- ◆ The arrangements of the Modern Languages 80-hour Unit had been investigated. Discussion followed and the general feeling was that the Modern Languages Model could present problems when applied to Music. The *Performing* Unit and *Inventing* Unit, each with a Listening Outcome, was viewed as an artificial, contrived split.
- ◆ A possible third model was discussed which would address stakeholder concerns. It was agreed that this model did have merits and could be presented to stakeholders as a viable model. The model was *Performing* (with one or two instruments), *Listening* (with content and assessment reviewed), and *Composing* (choice of composing, composing with MIDI, composing with sound engineering). *Accompanying* could be included with *Performing* from Intermediate 2 to Advanced Higher. At Advanced Higher, *training* and *directing* could be incorporated in *Performing* or retained as an option.
- ◆ Although no final agreement was reached, it was thought likely that a weighting of 40% for *Performing*, 30% for *Listening* and 30% for *Composing* would be appropriate.
- ◆ The view was that this model best addressed issues in the Subject Review Report and stakeholder concerns.

Local authority responses

Curriculum panels, principal teachers, advisers and other representatives from the following Local Authorities were consulted in February and March 2003.

- ◆ North Lanarkshire
- ◆ Renfrewshire
- ◆ East Renfrewshire
- ◆ Dumfries & Galloway
- ◆ Fife
- ◆ North Ayrshire
- ◆ East Ayrshire
- ◆ South Ayrshire
- ◆ Perth & Kinross
- ◆ Inverclyde
- ◆ East Dunbartonshire (written response)

Perth and Kinross

- ◆ There was a general consensus that *Inventing* should be mandatory within the Course although a simplified version of the present arrangements would be welcome.
- ◆ AB Grade 5 should be the standard for Higher Grade.
- ◆ Live examination of performance should continue, perhaps with reduced required timings.
- ◆ Internal assessment should reduce naturally if options are reduced.
- ◆ Combinations of technology, or technology and *inventing* should be considered.
- ◆ The problem of aggregation of marks in external assessment, but not in internal assessment, was highlighted.

Renfrewshire

- ◆ Model 2 on levels was felt to be too difficult for the majority to achieve following on from Standard Grade. Model 1 was favoured due to its match with Standard Grade, although concern was expressed that this model was a lowering of standards.
- ◆ There was support for the present system of visiting examination although it was understood the difficulties which occurred for larger centres. No real solutions were offered.
- ◆ There was general agreement regarding the need to reduce internal assessment.

East Renfrewshire

- ◆ None of the PTs present had seen the original report.
- ◆ They were concerned at the timescale for return of responses.
- ◆ It was intimated that the present PIL Unit was just settling in and the view was that it was working well. The proposed changes appeared to be far-reaching.
- ◆ Model 1 in the questionnaire allowed candidates to complete a Course without covering creative skills (inventing). This did not follow on from 5-14 and Standard Grade, which try to encourage the 'whole musician' approach.
- ◆ Delegates favoured creating an option entitled "Music Technology" encompassing MIDI sequencing and sound engineering.
- ◆ Delegates wanted the *Accompanying* Unit to be retained.
- ◆ On levels, Model 2 was generally discarded due to the requirement to achieve Grade 5 standard at Higher level. There were also concerns that adopting this model would mean there was no equivalence between Standard Grade and Intermediate Courses.
- ◆ On levels, Model 1 was favoured. However, it means that candidates who achieve Grade 6 and Grade 7 standard (Advanced Higher Extension 1 and Extension 2) could no longer be credited for their achievements. It was suggested that the Advanced Higher *Performing Extension* Units should be retained within the NQ Catalogue as stand alone Units.
- ◆ Whilst the majority realised that visiting examining was time consuming and that there were increasing difficulties with administration, they registered the view that performance should be assessed 'on the day'. There was some consensus that the required timings for performance could be reduced.

Dumfries and Galloway

- ◆ The majority was in favour of retaining Performing, Inventing and Listening as mandatory elements of the Course, but some felt that Inventing should be an entirely optional element.
- ◆ Majority keen that existing options should remain, preferably as part of the Course.
- ◆ Students sitting Advanced Higher level should have flexibility to specialise and discontinue the element least relevant to them (as in former Sixth Year Studies).
- ◆ There was extensive discussion on how to achieve the best 3 x 40-hour Unit structure. Various possible Course models were discussed.
- ◆ There was a unanimous view that visiting examining should be retained in some form, despite the obvious strains on the system. A more streamlined approach would have to be adopted to make it viable.
- ◆ On levels of *Performing* Units - majority view was that if status quo was not an option then Model 1 would have to be the choice, as jump from Access 3 to Intermediate 1 (Grades 1 to 3) would be unattainable for too many students.

North Lanarkshire

- ◆ Concerns with Model 1 in structure as candidates could gain two thirds of the total marks through *Performing*. This would result in higher grades in a subject which already achieves high averages. Could lead to a devaluing of the subject award.
- ◆ Suggestion that the Course should be made up of three mandatory Units, *Performing* (two instruments) *Listening* and *Inventing*.
- ◆ The *Accompanying* Unit should be retained as a free-standing Unit.
- ◆ MIDI and sound engineering could be combined in one Unit.
- ◆ Model 1 on levels was favoured due to match with Standard Grade.
- ◆ Strong support for visiting examination, although there was an appreciation of difficulties with the system. Reduced performance times would help.
- ◆ Principal teachers noted they had only seen Subject Review Report a few days before the meeting.

Music Panels of East, North and South Ayrshire

- ◆ Varying opinions on level of component Units although it was recognised that a problem existed with National Ratings - Music seen as an 'easy subject' to some.
- ◆ *Listening* Paper should contain more literacy.
- ◆ Keep performance live but reduce the performance times.
- ◆ Aggregation of marks for external assessment, while no aggregation of marks in PIL Unit for internal assessment, was seen as a problem.
- ◆ Suggestion for moving the dates of either *Inventing* submissions or Performance examination.

Principal Teachers, Inverclyde

Course structure

- ◆ Preferred Model 1, because candidates can choose between *Performing* on two instruments or *Inventing*.
- ◆ The status quo is felt to be manageable but very time consuming and tended to make students 'Jack of all trades, master of none'.

Level of component Units

- ◆ Preferred Model 1, Higher at Grade 4 as this makes for easier progression from Standard Grade.
- ◆ Students performing above the stated grade could be given extra recognition on the certificate.

Visiting examination

- ◆ The Performance element must be assessed in a live situation.

Assessment

- ◆ External assessment arrangements should stay as they are to maintain standards.

Further comment

- ◆ Simplification of the present system is welcome.
- ◆ There must be a reduction in internal assessment.

East Ayrshire Curriculum Management Team

- ◆ Suggested model: *Performing* - one instrument at Grade 5; *Listening* - incorporating a 'General Musicianship' paper based on AB Grade 5 theory and knowledge of basic harmony.

- ◆ Options – *Performing*, one instrument at Grade 5, *Inventing*, *MIDI Sequencing*, *Sound Engineering*.
- ◆ Welcomed the *Inventing* Unit being optional - for the vast majority of Standard Grade and Higher students, the folio of inventions will probably be the last time they ever compose music - intensive part of the curriculum, with all students requiring individual attention. Time could be used more efficiently.
- ◆ Level of component units - suggested a further model: Access 3 (Grade 1), Intermediate 1 (Grade 2), Intermediate 2 (Grade 3), Higher (Grade 5), Advanced Higher (Grade 6).
- ◆ Strong view that live performance should be retained for external assessment.
- ◆ Suggested reduced times for performance.
- ◆ Suggestions for assessment: Performance - record prelim performance as predictor of grades; *Listening* - written paper for prelim and final exam as at present.
- ◆ *Inventing* — make this optional; this will only be taken by students who wish to continue studying music or those who have a particular flair for inventing.

Music Panel of Fife

- ◆ General agreement that the timescale for consultation was too short.
- ◆ Support for the present PIL Unit as it contained *Inventing* as mandatory to the Course.

Response submitted on behalf of East Dunbartonshire Council

Question 1

- ◆ Model 1 preferred but major concerns regarding two thirds of marks being for *Performing*. This weighting would increase the number of 'A' passes.
- ◆ The *Listening* paper should contain more theory/knowledge of rudiments.
- ◆ Some were concerned at the lack of creativity as mandatory.
- ◆ Retaining *Inventing* as an option was welcomed by several schools.

Question 2

- ◆ There was a marked preference for Model 1.

Question 3

- ◆ Visiting Examination must be retained.
- ◆ Reducing the programme could be an option, or the core instrument could be moderated with VE retained for the *Performing Extension*.

Question 4

- ◆ Restrict internal assessment to a 'prelim style' exam.
- ◆ Reducing the number of optional Units will reduce internal assessment.
- ◆ External assessment should remain to maintain validity.

Further comments

- ◆ Free-standing Units could be introduced for Music Theory/Literacy. Endorsements for AB Grade 7 and Grade 8 *Performing* should be available.

Summary of responses from HE and FE

Stevenson College, Edinburgh

- ◆ Large number of Courses and codes very difficult to administer.
- ◆ Favour idea of a more streamlined Course with *Performing* and *Listening* mandatory and options in *Inventing* Unit to include technology.
- ◆ Grade 5 is right for Higher and Grade 6 for Advanced Higher *Performing*, with the option to play one or two instruments.
- ◆ Possibility of playing a prepared accompaniment or jazz improvisation could be included in the performance programme.
- ◆ *Listening* paper needs much revision, with concepts revised to take in both classical and popular music terms.
- ◆ Musical literacy must be addressed more fully instead of the token inclusion at present.
- ◆ FE needs to have access to stand-alone Units, in particular *Accompanying*, *Training and Directing*, *AH Performing Extension* (for more able students) *MIDI Sequencing* and *AH Listening Extension*.
- ◆ *AH Listening Extension* does not need an exam or examiner and it provides students intending to go to college or university with the only practice they will get to write about music, something included in every HE course.

University of Aberdeen

- ◆ Higher at AB Grade 4 will not, on its own, prepare candidates for entry to higher education Music courses. An applicant with Advanced Higher Music who had only achieved AB Grade 5 could be well below the standard required for audition. (Current Higher, even at A Grade, tells HE little about the student. An Associated Board certificate tells them more.)
- ◆ Students require more analytical skills; standard of literacy among Scottish students is generally poor. Remedial classes have to be taught in first year to make up the gap between school standards and HE requirements.
- ◆ Compositional skills must remain mandatory so that students understand processes in music.
- ◆ Is diversity, with so many options, making progression a casualty?

Glasgow University

- ◆ *Inventing* is recognised as most difficult part of the Course to both learn and teach. Its removal as mandatory will undermine the three element foundation of the subject.
- ◆ Reduction in options would mean teachers who have ‘tooled up’, both in resources and training, will feel their efforts have been wasted.
- ◆ The timetable for this important exercise appears to be unrealistic.

Key points raised at Assessment Panel meetings

The Panel considered:

1. Whether the integrated 80-hour Unit with its inherent whole musician approach, should be retained. If not, what alternatives might there be.
2. Whether performance levels at Higher should be AB Grade 4 or AB Grade 5.
3. How the depth and breadth of opportunities available to students through the choice possible via current optional Units could be retained, albeit in a different format.

Panel response:

The Panel recommends that the 80-hour Unit be retained, because it encourages candidates to integrate the three Outcomes of *Performing*, *Inventing* and *Listening*, although these three Outcomes have different assessment systems. Internal assessment of the PIL Unit operates differently from that externally. The external assessment system allows the three elements to be aggregated to reach a final mark. It was suggested that consideration should be given to operating the same system internally, albeit with some weighting of elements/balance across all three Outcomes, thereby ensuring the whole musician approach is not compromised. An alternative approach would be to remove aggregation from the external system. This could have an effect on National Ratings which are causing some concern at present with music being perceived as an easy qualification. Both approaches would require further discussion.

Mindful of the profile of the subject, the expectations of further and higher education and the improvements made in recent times in S 1 and 2 and beyond, the Panel felt it was crucial that standards should not drop. The mandatory standard at Higher is Grade 4 AB equivalent (instrument 1) and that of the Extension Unit, Grade 5 (instrument 2). The Panel recommends that the standard of performance for two instruments should be retained at the level of the current Extension Unit. For example, the level of performance for two instruments at Higher level would be Grade 5 equivalent. Other levels would be as follows: Access 3 - Grade 1, Intermediate 1 - Grade 3, Intermediate 2 - Grade 4, Higher - Grade 5, Advanced Higher - Grade 6. There is a difficulty in terms of consistency at Access 3 – Intermediate 1 levels as there would now be a gap between Access 3 and Intermediate 1. The group felt that the compromise had to be in favour of the levels from Intermediate 1 upwards.

Panel members were of a strong view that choices currently available as options should continue. Although stand-alone Units will continue to be listed within the Unit catalogue, they will not be able to be included in a Course award. In an attempt to meet the criteria, discussion followed on ways in which optional Units might be integrated. Integrating Units was seen as a suitable approach given that many centres already deliver different optional Units together. Further discussion on ways to integrate optional Units is clearly required. The Panel would be anxious to be given the opportunity to contribute to such discussions.

Suggestions for integration of Units are as follows:

- ◆ *Performing and Accompanying*
- ◆ *Performing and Training and Directing*
- ◆ *Creative Technology Unit.*
- ◆ *Listening and Inventing*

These combinations allow all of the current options to continue to be available. Feedback from the Panel member from further education indicated strongly how crucial it is to retain all of the choices currently available if student needs are to be met. It was suggested that should these choices become unavailable, colleges might decide to move to another qualification system. Members from schools were of a similar view with regard to preparing their students for the diverse tertiary Courses now available in music, many of which involved the skills contained within the optional Units.

It is important to emphasise that considerable in-depth discussion will be required to ensure that integration of elements is not contrived, and the content of each element is not compromised. Option/Extension Units were initially devised to offer choice as well as opportunities for study in depth/breadth. It is inevitable that such choice will result in differing numbers from option to option.

Other issues: Listening

The issue of whether *Listening* papers should include greater demands in terms of musical literacy was raised. Fuller discussion of *Listening* will be required because listening papers overall will change in other ways if Units are to be integrated. There is a view that at Higher and Advanced Higher levels, consideration should be given to devising papers which would allow candidates to describe music related to their centre of interest/specialism, for example, jazz, rock, folk, rather than insisting that candidates learn concepts which do not feature in the music such students are composing, performing and studying. There would be an associated need to revisit the concept list. Further discussion on the above issues is required.

Other issues: timescale

Given the success of music to date, the Panel felt that it would be unfortunate should there be a perception that music requires more time because it is in some way flawed. On the other hand, Panel members regret that music is in the position of having to make adjustments on a scale which appear impossible to meet within the agreed timescale of a year.

Meetings with individual stakeholders

Consultation with Senior Moderator, 2 April 2003

- ◆ Musical literacy content should be raised to 20% of the *Listening* paper.
- ◆ Grade 5 should be the level for Higher Grade.
- ◆ A *Performing* Unit equivalent to Grade 7 should be retained to enhance the qualification of candidates who perform at a higher level than the Course.
- ◆ The model of *Performing* and *Listening* as mandatory Units, with Composing options was welcomed. The idea of integrating technology and composition was favoured.
- ◆ *Training and Directing* should be retained as part of the Course award if possible.

Consultation with Principal Assessor for Advanced Higher

- ◆ Higher at Grade 4 is of great concern, especially with regard to the view of the tertiary sector.
- ◆ The *Listening* paper must remain externally marked. Tertiary education requires this.
- ◆ Extend the musical literacy aspect of the *Listening* paper to raise the status and give more depth.
- ◆ *Training and Directing* Unit – assessment is far too complex.
- ◆ Consider amalgamating technologies.
- ◆ Mandatory section should include *Inventing*.
- ◆ Live performance is essential to the subject but performance times could be reduced.

Consultation with SQA Music Technology Co-ordinator

- ◆ *Listening Extension* Unit should go and the *Listening* paper should be expanded.
- ◆ The *Accompanying* Unit is too complex.
- ◆ Combining MIDI and sound engineering is not viable due to resource implications for schools. Many have resources for one or the other, but not both.
- ◆ Remove the MIDI question paper.
- ◆ The technology Units require constant updating.

- ◆ To a certain extent the top end of the subject is being driven by 5-14. This is flawed.
- ◆ We have reduced musical literacy to allow for drums, keyboards etc. This should be addressed.

Consultation with SQA School Co-ordinators

- ◆ Problems in Music are caused by various aspects of the Course design.
- ◆ Multiplicity of entries.
- ◆ Too many Courses and Units.
- ◆ Duplication of Units in Courses.
- ◆ Why not one code for a Course? We need one code for Higher Music.

Consultation with subject specialist HMIE

- ◆ Performing, Inventing and Listening as mandatory elements is in keeping with the whole musician approach and matches the breadth and balance of Standard Grade and existing music provision.
- ◆ Stylistic freedom and breadth should be maintained through allowing centre choice.
- ◆ Integration of optional Units would reduce number to within design parameters.
- ◆ Higher profile should be given to musical literacy. Conceptual knowledge and understanding should be further developed through a range of perspectives.

Further comments from individuals throughout the consultation process

- ◆ More feedback needed on external assessment.
- ◆ Use local staff for visiting examination.
- ◆ *Inventing* is valued by Further Education.
- ◆ Music is a performing art; an examination in this core element of the subject is essential. Sampled examination or the moderation of internal assessment of performance debases the value of the Courses.
- ◆ *Inventing*: reinstate arranging and improvising.
- ◆ Discussion with candidates showed they felt impartiality went hand in hand with external examination.
- ◆ Raising the levels would enhance the subject.
- ◆ The *Listening* Paper should use concepts from popular music.
- ◆ Grade 5 at Higher is a problem with pop songs. Students have to refer to show songs.
- ◆ Grade 4 at Intermediate 2 and Grade 5 at Higher are not achievable for most drummers and guitarists on two instruments.
- ◆ The fact that 92% of candidates take *Performing* is misleading; it is the default option from Standard Grade. Many schools only offer two instruments and do not have the training or resources to offer the Technology option.
- ◆ In the real world, musicians have favoured instruments, so the present arrangements cater for this.
- ◆ We are already selling good students short, they are ill equipped to enter HE in music having no basic skills in four-part harmony and counterpoint.

Appendix 4: Existing and proposed Course structures

Existing Course structures

Level and Mandatory (80 hrs)	Options (40 hrs)
Intermediate 1 Performing, Inventing & Listening	Performing Extension Listening Extension Inventing Extension Sound Engineering & Production MIDI Sequencing
Intermediate 2 Performing, Inventing & Listening	Performing Extension 1 Performing Extension 2 Listening Extension Inventing Extension Sound Engineering & Production MIDI Sequencing Accompanying
Higher Performing, Inventing & Listening	Performing Extension Listening Extension Inventing Extension Sound Engineering & Production MIDI Sequencing
Advanced Higher Performing, Inventing & Listening	Performing Extension 1 Performing Extension 2 Listening Extension Inventing Extension MIDI Sequencing Sound Engineering & Production Accompanying Training and Directing

Structure of the emerging preferred Course model

During the consultation period comments and concerns from stakeholders led to Model 3 emerging as a possible way forward to address those concerns and the issues raised in the original Subject Review Report.

The Model consists of three 40-hour Units, one each of *Performing*, *Listening* and *Composing (Inventing)* with choice available within the *Performing* and *Composing* Units to maintain breadth within the Course.

The suggested assessment regime is outlined below. This will be further investigated and developed.

Level	Mandatory (40-hour Units)
Intermediate 1	Performing – one or two instruments Listening Composing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ composition ◆ composition with MIDI ◆ composition with sound engineering
Intermediate 2	Performing - choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ one or two instruments ◆ one instrument with accompanying Listening Composing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ composition ◆ composition with MIDI ◆ composition with sound engineering
Higher	Performing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ one or two instruments ◆ one instrument with accompanying Listening Composing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ composition ◆ composition with MIDI ◆ composition with sound engineering
Advanced Higher	Performing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ one or two instruments ◆ one instrument with accompanying ◆ one instrument with training & directing Listening Composing – choice of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ composition ◆ composition with MIDI ◆ composition with sound engineering

Appendix 5: Draft assessment rationale for the emerging Course model

An assessment rationale could be developed for the emerging Course model which builds on the following initial suggestions:

Performing (40 hours)

Evidence could take one of the following forms:

- ◆ A performance on one or two instruments. There would be a set performance time which would vary depending on the level of presentation. Candidates opting for two instruments would be required to play a minimum of one piece on the second instrument.
- ◆ A performance on one instrument and an accompanying task (at Intermediate 2, Higher and Advanced Higher). There would be a set performance time which would vary depending on the level of presentation. Candidates would be required to play on one instrument and demonstrate accompanying skills.
- ◆ A performance on one instrument and evidence of training and directing (at Advanced Higher only). There would be a set performance time on one instrument. Candidates would also be required to provide evidence of training and directing in the form of a video and log.

Internal assessment would confirm a minimum level of competence on the whole performance programme. It would also confirm minimum competence in accompanying or training and directing tasks, as appropriate.

For **external assessment**, candidates would perform a sample of the complete programme to confirm competence and be awarded a grade. Candidates choosing to perform on two instruments would be required to perform a minimum of one piece on their second instrument. Candidates choosing to perform on one instrument with accompanying would be required to perform a sample of the complete performance programme and perform an accompanying task. This would count for 40% of the external assessment mark.

Listening (40 hours)

For **internal assessment**, candidates would be tested on their awareness of aural concepts.

For **external assessment**, there would be an externally set and marked question paper of about one hour's duration which would sample the knowledge and understanding gained throughout the Course. Candidates would be required to demonstrate awareness of aural concepts in unfamiliar contexts. They would also be required to demonstrate knowledge of the main developments in music. This would count for 30% of the external assessment mark.

Composing (40 hours)

This Unit would merge the existing content of the Inventing and music technology Units. The present music technology Units (MIDI and Sound Engineering) would still be available as free-standing Units in the NQ catalogue.

Evidence for **internal assessment** could take one of the following forms:

- ◆ a folio of composition(s)

- ◆ a folio of composition(s) and demonstration of knowledge and skills using MIDI software
- ◆ a folio of composition(s) and demonstration of knowledge and skills using multi-track recording equipment

External assessment would take the form of a folio of composition(s) which could include MIDI files, audio tapes, scores, performance plans etc as appropriate to the option chosen. This would be marked within the centre and subject to central moderation. This would count for 30% of the external assessment mark.

This pattern would ensure the same pattern of internal and external assessment for all candidates. There would be three components of external assessment for every candidate.

Appendix 6: Uptake figures for the past three years

Courses	2001				2002				2003			
	Int 1	Int 2	H	AH	Int 1	Int 2	H	AH	Int 1	Int 2	H	AH
C065	141	715	3039	198								
C090					6	34	175	38	7	46	177	36
C091					14	22	38	14	19	24	38	10
C092					168	0	2682	0	235	0	2922	0
C093					0	583	0	339	0	699	0	403
C094					5	12	61	15	10	15	59	15
C095					7	51	107	18	12	54	121	17
C096					0	2	27	12	0	2	28	13
C097					0	0	0	19	0	0	0	18
C098					0	197	0	208	0	214	0	196
Totals	141	715	3039	198	200	901	3090	663	283	1054	3345	708