

## **Moderation Feedback - Visiting**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Technical Education**

**Qualification area**

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

**Craft and Design — Higher and  
Intermediate 2**

## Visiting Moderation

### General comments on visiting moderation activity

Session 2003-04 saw the introduction of a new initiative by the SQA in the form of the **Incomplete Evidence Visit**. The SQA was keen to assist and support Centres in the interpretation of standards and Craft and Design was one of four subjects selected to take part in this innovation. Thirty Centres throughout the country were visited by three moderators between November 2003 and January 2004.

The schools were selected because they had never been selected for moderation or had not been moderated for a number of years. It was made clear to the Centres selected that these visits were not Moderation Visits but were to be seen as supportive and developmental. It was also stressed that these visits did not imply that the Centre would or would not be selected for moderation at the Central Moderation event later in the session.

Centres were asked to provide as much candidate evidence as possible across all levels of the subject and it was explained to Centres that this was an excellent opportunity for a moderator to view as wide a range of evidence as possible for Units, coursework or individual outcomes. Moderators would not be expected to see complete Units nor would they be expected to 'officially moderate' the work they saw. Moderators were encouraged to give as much guidance and advice as possible to the Centres they visited.

### Specific issues identified

In every instance the moderators received a warm welcome from the Centres they visited and it was good to see that the Centres embraced so enthusiastically, the Incomplete Evidence initiative.

The feedback from the moderators was varied but, without exception, they reported that they had identified at least one problem regarding moderation in the Centre.

The majority of the problems documented appeared to stem from two situations. Firstly, Centres which had not been moderated were never told whether they were on the right track or not and consequently had been delivering the course in the same fashion year after year. Secondly, a number of recently qualified teachers were presenting Craft and Design without the benefit of having attended the Higher Still seminars and thus were not always aware of the required standards.

The specific issues identified by the visiting team were:

- ◆ the lack of knowledge of SQA procedures regarding the moderation process
- ◆ the doubts concerning the reduction of evidence requirements
- ◆ the correlation between the Units and the Design Assignment
- ◆ the standard and type of response required for the individual PCs
- ◆ the differentiation between the approaches to Higher and Intermediate 2
- ◆ the lack of consistency in the marking of NAB tests

## Feedback to centres

- ◆ centres should begin each session with the premise that they will be moderated
- ◆ teachers presenting the course must familiarise themselves thoroughly with the requirements of Product Design
- ◆ presenting teachers should endeavour to cross mark with another colleague to ensure the appropriate standard is achieved
- ◆ teachers should differentiate between the marking of Higher Units as opposed to those for Intermediate 2
- ◆ centres should not hesitate to contact the SQA for advice if they encounter any problems
- ◆ centres should be aware that an Incomplete Evidence visit does not mean that they will be exempt from selection in the current session nor does it imply that they will be selected