

## **Moderation Feedback - Visiting**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Art and Design 65**

**Qualification area:**

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

**National Units, HN Units, SVQ,  
Advanced Higher and Higher**

## Visiting Moderation

### General comments on visiting moderation activity

This year there was a noticeable increase in the number of centres visited over previous years. The Moderation team covered a broad range of National Qualifications and completed both Development and Moderation visits.

In the main Higher National Qualifications were included and these were spread evenly over the country.

In most cases groups of units were sampled and in general the work produced was of a reasonable to good standard.

**In some cases the quality and breadth of work was of a very high standard, displaying both excellent creativity and professional technical skill.**

Documentation was of a good standard and all centres had a Quality Assurance policy in operation. Though National Assessment Bank's were not used in all cases, other relevant assessment documentation was available.

Higher Still courses were moderated and found to be concordant, again there was still **a perceived need for discussion on development type issues**, especially determining standards, raised by staff.

### Specific issues identified

In general centres welcomed **a more rigorous approach to moderation** being instigated. Many centres felt that for their own sakes **a 2-4 year cycle of visits** would help maintain awareness of and reinforce understanding of National Standards.

There was a lack of co-ordination between centres and SQA in regard to registering of students and in some cases it was difficult to obtain student numbers or names from SQA prior to the visit, this was more the case with colleges than schools.

Moderation details for centres should be **available earlier** in the session to allow some visits to be carried out before the New Year. This would avoid the concentration of moderation visits around May/June.

National Standards are not being met for a number of reasons in certain centres:

- lack of regular Moderation visits
- failure of centres to correctly interpret range statements and assessment criteria
- this was evidenced especially in retrospective moderation
- to avoid this it should be possible to target those centres that have not been moderated for a while or those with a poor record. More isolated centres are most at risk through lack of contact with either **Moderators or colleges with a good presentation record.**

## **Feedback to centres**

In most cases feedback to centres has been good and welcomed by the staff of these centres.

Further training in report writing and feedback both verbal and written should be given at the update sessions and perhaps of a less generic format – this could be done specifically at cognate group meetings.

In all cases feedback was given to the relevant staff and section heads. It was not always possible to give feedback directly to the SQA Co-ordinator.

However, this is covered by sending the copy of the report to the Co-ordinator in the first place.

Feedback was based on the work moderated and how it compared to National Standards as well as possible improvements to documentation and delivery of the units. Other items discussed were integrated assessment and development of material relevant to future courses.