

# NQ Verification 2015–16

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Media
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2016

#### National Courses/Units verified:

National 4	National 5	Higher
H239 74 Media Assignment Added Value Unit	H238 75 Creating Media Content Unit	H238 76 Creating Media Content Unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Round 2 verification focused on the Added Value Unit at National 4 as well as a small sample of Creating Media Content Units from National 5 and Higher.

#### N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Units

Most centres are using the Unit Assessment Support Packs effectively at all levels. Some centres are customising the Unit Assessment Packs to take into account local conditions in the manner of delivery, eg using a themed approach, allowing the candidates the opportunity for personalisation and choice, whilst maintaining the integrity of the assessment. In most cases the modification of the UASP is minor and does not affect the integrity of the Assessment Standards, but where there are major changes to the assessment tasks, it is recommended that

centres submit these to the prior verification service. This will check validity of the amended or centre-developed assessment instrument to ensure that it allows candidates the opportunity to generate appropriate evidence to meet the Outcome and Assessment Standards. This service is free and available to all centres.

Some centres have developed broad-ranging briefs that allow candidates more choice to demonstrate creative approaches and build on previous knowledge and skills.

At Higher there is a requirement that the level of finish is a completed media product. This would require for example, some edited footage of moving image texts or edited poster etc. For the purposes of verification this evidence should also be submitted as part of the candidate's work.

#### **N4 Added Value Unit**

There is no longer a mandatory requirement to use the SQA-produced UASP, but centres should be aware that this UASP has been amended for 2016–17. For centres wishing to develop their own approach to assessment, the use of the Judging Evidence Table in the UASP can provide a guide on how to create appropriate assessment instruments that provide sufficient scope to generate evidence which meets the Assessment Standards. Again, centres that wish to devise their own assessment instruments are reminded that there is a free prior verification service.

A large number of centres made appropriate use of the Judging Evidence Table in their approach to assessment and developed a brief that was appropriate to the teaching and learning in that centre. These generated a range of candidate evidence which was appropriate to achieving and overtaking the Assessment Standards.

In a very small number of cases the content of the centre-devised assessment instruments did not enable candidates to produce evidence which would meet the Assessment Standards.

It is recommended that when devising Assessment Instruments for use in individual centres the details of the Assessment Requirements, which are set out on pages 16 – 19 of the revised UASP, are used for guidance.

### **Assessment judgements**

#### **N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Units**

The vast majority of centres have delivered judgements which are reliable.

At Higher, the majority of evidence sampled demonstrated complexity and detail. Many centres have included the feedback given to each candidate; this is useful in demonstrating the positive impact practitioner that feedback has had on the

quality of candidates' responses and in allowing candidates to maximise their potential.

The evidence from some centres, however, requires greater detail in linking the assessment judgements explicitly to the Assessment Standards. In some cases, more use of textual referencing and examples from the created product would improve responses, as would more detailed justification of choices made in terms of technical and cultural coding, content and audience pleasures and expectations.

#### **N4 Added Value Unit**

The majority of centres applied the JET accurately to the candidate evidence to produce accurate and reliable judgements.

A number of centres produced interim rather than complete candidate evidence. This is acceptable as candidates may still be completing this Unit. However, in a small number of cases the assessment judgements were inconsistent. This was caused in the main by either the inappropriate adaptation of the UASP resulting in inappropriate or insufficient evidence, or where the evidence from candidates moving from the N5 Assignment to the N4 AVU failed to meet all the requirements for the AVU, particularly in overtaking Assessment Standard 1.1 (Generating ideas in response to a brief) and 1.4 (Reflecting on the Process and the Product), where the demands of N4 are somewhat different to those of the N5 Assignment.

Evidence gathered from the N5 Assignment is acceptable to be used to fulfil the requirements of the N4 AVU, but care must be taken to ensure that Assessment Standards 1.1 and 1.4 have been addressed. Submission of the Assignment alone does not meet all of the Assessment Standards at National 4.

Some centres adapted the Candidate Assessment Records for their candidates to show more clearly how assessment judgements were made by the centre. This is good practice.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

#### **N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Unit**

There is significant evidence of internal verification in the vast majority of centres.

Documentation is generally very well done, especially where centres record assessment judgements using individual Candidate Records taken from or adapted from the support packages.

Centres are reminded that the IV toolkit, available here <http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/74671.html>, provides additional support in ensuring that an effective cycle of quality assurance is in place.

A number of centres showed good practice in the delivery of the approaches, eg a broad brief covering content, purpose and audience allowed candidates to generate evidence taking into account their personal choices and previous knowledge.

Other good practice was identified in the manner in which assessment judgements were generated. For example, some centres used a colour coding system to identify where candidate evidence had met the various Assessment Standards for the unit. This was an effective way to provide support for the candidate while at the same time collecting examples of naturally occurring evidence from across the body of the candidate's work (some examples of this will be published on the Secure site in due course).

#### **N4 Added Value Unit**

Many centres showed good practice by providing a brief that could be widely interpreted, thus allowing candidates opportunities for personalisation and choice.

Most centres showed clear evidence of effective internal verification. Comments made by internal verifiers clearly confirmed the assessor's judgement and were supportive of their candidates.

Centres are reminded that they should submit a copy of the brief as part of their evidence.

Centre assessors should indicate which assessment standard they are crediting.

Assessors are reminded that assessment judgements are either pass or fail.

When submitting evidence that had originally been gathered in response to the N5 Assignment, to support the award of N4 Added Value Unit, the evidence must be clearly identified with the N4 Assessment Standard that it is linked to, along with the assessor's judgement of pass or fail.

Centre assessors and verifiers should be aware that the judgement entered on the Verification Sample Form is not necessarily final. There may be time for candidates to be re-assessed.

In a small number of cases at all levels, some centres are potentially disadvantaging candidates through over-assessment. Most centres effectively use a holistic approach, which takes into account naturally-occurring evidence.