ANONYMOUS SUBMISSION

Thank you for offering the opportunity to contribute further to this process. I will provide comment on both the performance and role question and on the C for E board.

Performance and Role
The lack of accountability of the SQA is a huge concern for teachers, the examination body appear to be able to make large changes to both curriculum and assessment with little or no review process. The "Added Value Assignment" in Physics for Nat 5 and Higher is a dreadful hoop jumping exercise that does not properly assess the skills the SQA are trying to assess. They have also piled a huge invigilation burden on the teacher for the communication phase of the assignment. The SQA appear to have failed to grasp that pupils work at different speeds and all learning differences must be catered for in supervised conditions. This leads to disjointed learning experiences for pupils. The documentation surrounding the assignment is woeful - it is not clear what information can be given to pupils or when. Guidance direct from the SQA contradicts statements in the external assessment reports for Physics. The whole added value assignment in Physics must be redesigned as a matter of urgency. It is currently an embarrassment and is devaluing Nat 5 and Higher qualifications. At Advanced Higher level, again the guidance on how to gain marks is very poor and is being misunderstood by pupils and teachers alike. It should not require years of understanding standards events in order to gain a working knowledge of how to access 30 out of 130 marks of a course.

C for E Board
I would like the following questions asked if possible.

What evidence have the C for E board collected that shows the current assessments devised by the SQA correctly uphold the values embodied within the Curriculum for Excellence?

The Curriculum for Excellence was an opportunity to create a true 3 to 18 curriculum, great time and effort was put into the early years program to create cross curricular learning and assessment experiences, why have the C for E board allowed this to be eroded away in the Senior Phase?

The BGE phase of senior education has for many pupils resulted in a reduction of choice at S4 (many only get to select up to 6 subjects) (previously pupils would undertake 7 or 8 Standard Grade/Intermediate 2 qualifications). Is anyone from the C for E board willing to stand up and say that this is wrong and goes completely against the principle of a broad education?

Many schools appear to be "closing the attainment gap" by reducing the opportunities for pupils to achieve Advanced Highers (reduction of choice and reduced teaching allocation for these subjects) as opposed to encouraging more pupils to reach this level, is the C for E board in agreement with this policy of reducing opportunity for Scotland's young learners?