



Alternative Certification Model 2020–21: National QA Exercise Key Messages

Subject	Music Technology
Level	Advanced Higher

This report provides information on themes emerging from the national quality assurance exercise, which is part of the Alternative Certification Model for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses.

A sample of candidates' assessed work from selected centres was reviewed to determine whether assessment was in line with the national standard. The evidence submitted may have been partial or incomplete and is unlikely to have represented all of the evidence that will be gathered to allow the centre to determine a provisional result.

The centres selected for review in this subject and at this level have been provided with specific feedback on the evidence that they submitted. The comments below highlight key points about the assessment approaches and instruments used and the sampled centres' assessment judgements, for all centres delivering the subject at this level to reflect upon and make any appropriate adjustments.

Section 1: Comments on approach to assessment

From the evidence submitted, centres followed the [subject-specific guidance on gathering key evidence in session 2020–21](#) document for Advanced Higher Music Technology, and the [revised project task for Advanced Higher Music Technology for 2020-21](#).

As anticipated, candidate evidence was at different stages:

- ◆ Some centres submitted completed projects.
- ◆ Some centres submitted work from stages 1 and 2 only.
- ◆ Some centres submitted completed work from stages 1 and 2, and partially completed work from stages 3 to 6.

Most centres provided candidates with the media files produced by SQA for session 2020–21 to use in the production of their project. A few centres were able to capture their own audio, but did not include this in their assessment judgements.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

From the evidence submitted, on the whole, centres' assessment judgements were accurate. There were, however, instances where marking instructions were applied too leniently. This was apparent in stages 1 and 2. Sometimes centres had not accounted for missing mandatory evidence in their assessment judgements. This affected assessment judgements for stages 1 and 2, as well as stages 4e and 5a. You should refer to the marking instructions available in the [revised project assessment task document for session 2020–21](#).

A small number of candidates were awarded marks based on previous candidate performance at Higher. Assessment judgements must be evidence-based against the requirements for Advanced Higher Music Technology for session 2020–21.

For stages 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d and 6, the majority of centre assessment judgements were in line with national standards.

Overall, evidence included assessors' comments and other relevant supporting evidence that clearly showed the basis for assessment judgements. There was clear evidence in many cases that centre and/or local authority moderation processes were thorough, detailed and highly effective.

Centres should refer to the [Understanding Standards examples](#) available for Advanced Higher Music Technology on SQA's secure website. They detail the marks that have been awarded to specific examples of candidate evidence and the reasons why. The examples include the planning and capturing of audio, which is not mandatory in session 2020–21, but remains useful as an indication of the standards required.

There was clear evidence that teachers and lecturers are working hard to develop and encourage the skills, knowledge and understanding necessary for this course. Centres are commended for developing a wide range of approaches towards delivery of Advanced Higher Music Technology within the framework of the Scottish Government's COVID-19 guidance and restrictions.