



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

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Philosophy</b>
<b>Level</b>	<b>National 5</b>

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**

The approach to assessment at all centres selected was in accordance with SQA's guidance on gathering key evidence. The assessments were valid, reliable and in line with national standards.

All evidence submitted was partial in relation to course coverage. The evidence covered one section of the course or two sections of the course.

The evidence included:

- ◆ one or two sections from the 2021 National 5 Philosophy question paper
- ◆ one or two sections of a question paper, containing questions drawn from different past papers and the specimen question paper — the level of demand was in line with national standards
- ◆ one or two sections of a question paper, containing questions devised by the centre — these questions were well-focused and the level of demand was in line with national standards

## **Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements**

Generally, judgements were consistently in line with national standards. Any issues with marking or marking instructions were communicated to the centres concerned.

It was helpful to see assessors' (marker and moderator) comments and other relevant supporting evidence that showed the basis for judgements. All centres are encouraged to adopt this approach.

There was clear evidence from some centres that centre moderation processes were thorough and detailed. It was useful to have written explanations of how markers and moderators discussed and arrived at decisions. This was especially helpful if there had been areas of disagreement.