

Moderation Feedback - Visiting

Assessment Panel:

Art and Design

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

Standard Grade

Visiting Moderation

General comments on visiting moderation activity

In general Moderation visits went very well with only one centre needing re-moderated and one other needing serious clarification and advice.

All other Moderations were within the necessary recommendations but there is some evidence of an increasing leniency in assessment particularly at Credit level.

Some centres also seem to be ignoring the process of reducing assessments where evidence is missing.

Specific issues identified

It was noted by some Moderators that much of the good practice instigated by the new procedures from NQ Design Units are filtering down to Standard Grade.

The amount of evidence is becoming more manageable as centres reduce to the evidence requirements set out at NQ.

Investigations are becoming more focused with market research being included to clarify the design problems being undertaken.

The vast majority of Design Briefs are designed for use by the whole class with the best of them being tight enough to give candidates support in understanding the problem to be solved but giving enough leeway for individual interpretation.

Design evaluations are generally thorough and verified or strengthened assessments. There is also a major disparity in the length and quality of design evaluations expected between NQ Units and Standard Grade. There is no recommendation as to expected wordage in Standard Grade evaluations and many are very long and detailed. While many are excellent they must be very time consuming and contrast significantly with what is expected when they progress to higher levels.

Moderators reported an increase in leniency particularly at Credit level (grade 1). This is not an immediate problem but should be noted. It may have been caused by centres giving more attention to NQ courses and being aware of a greater emphasis from SQA on National Courses.

A more worrying problem is being created by centres not applying deductions for missing evidence with one centre seemingly unaware of the necessity to include actual Design Evaluations as evidence.

Feedback to centres

Standards are generally very good with much of the good practice being undertaken at Higher and Intermediate levels being filtered down to Standard Grade.

Design Units are becoming more manageable with many units being limited to 4 or 5 A2 sheets. Moderators reported that this made units clearer and more focused.

The best centres are including market research and more relevant investigation of the problem to be considered.

Some centres are still including too many irrelevant observational drawing which have no bearing on the design problem. Most of these units seem to be overlong and often run out of steam during the Consideration/Development stage.

Most design briefs at Standard Grade are designed for the whole class and are tight and focused but leave enough leeway for individual research. Most problems with the design unit are encountered where candidates are given briefs that are too wide and with no real structure, which leads to candidates not being able to understand what the real design issues are.

While most assessment was accurate centres are becoming more lenient particularly at Credit level (grade 1) and in some cases this almost led to non concordance.

Centres must also be very aware of the procedures to be taken when elements of work are missing and be aware that all stages of the process including Evaluations, must be made available to Moderators. Missing elements could severely affect the concordancy of the centre.