



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

Subject	Art and Design
Level	National 5

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

Centres submitted a variety of evidence. Submissions ranged from one component to all components. Most centres chose to submit evidence for the expressive or design portfolios, or both. Many centres also included question paper evidence. A minority chose to submit question paper evidence only.

In general, evidence received from centres was clearly presented. All submissions were accompanied by supporting documentation.

Centres who submitted portfolio evidence photographed candidates' work and collated it for viewing using appropriate file formats.

Approaches to assessment were in accordance with SQA's guidance on gathering key evidence.

Many centres indicated that they made use of SQA Understanding Standards resources.

Many centres who submitted question paper evidence made effective use of the SQA 2021 NQ question paper assessment resource.

Some centres created their own question paper assessments, which replicated the approach, level of demand and structure of SQA assessments.

All centres who submitted practical evidence used the SQA portfolio assessment tasks.

Some centres made assessment judgements on completed portfolios, whereas others based their judgements on partially completed work. Some centres submitted a combination of completed and partially completed portfolios.

Assessment approaches were supported effectively by expressive and design portfolio evidence. There was evidence of assessment using the detailed marking instructions contained within the expressive and design portfolio assessment tasks.

In the majority of cases, evidence included assessors' comments and other relevant supporting evidence that showed clearly the basis on which assessment judgements had been made. Most centres provided clear evidence of effective and supportive centre and local moderation procedures.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

Most centres' assessment judgements for the question paper were in line with national standards.

Most centres' assessment judgements on the expressive and design portfolios were in line with national standards.

Centres' assessment judgements for the portfolios were clearly recorded against specific aspects of performance from the marking instructions.

Many centres provided commentary that gave useful insights into the application of portfolio marking instructions.

There were a few instances where marking instructions were applied leniently or severely to the expressive and design portfolios in Section 1: Process (investigation). In some cases, centre comments indicated that quality of work had influenced the assessment judgements. Centres should be aware that it is the relevance of the investigation material that is assessed in this section, rather the quality of the skills demonstrated.

Occasionally, marking instructions were applied leniently or severely to the expressive and design portfolios in Section 1: Process (development). Centres should be aware that it is the candidate's ability to demonstrate a single line of development that is assessed. This involves showing visual continuity and the refinement of one idea towards an outcome. Marks awarded for the development process should not be influenced by the level of skill demonstrated, as this is assessed in a separate section.

There were a few instances of the marking instructions being applied severely or leniently to the design portfolio in Section 2: Skills. Centres should refer to Understanding Standards examples of candidate portfolios when making assessment judgements on skills to ensure that decisions are appropriate for the level.

Candidates were broadly successful in meeting the required standards of attainment for this course.

There was clear evidence that teachers and lecturers are working hard to develop and to encourage the skills, knowledge and understanding necessary for this course.