

Moderation Feedback -Central

Assessment Panel:

Social Sciences

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

Psychology Higher and Intermediate 1 and 2

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

12 centres were asked for candidates' work. Only 6 centres submitted work, although SQA were willing to accept incomplete work. This means that 6 visits will have to be arranged between now and June, which is an inconvenience, as it requires more time for moderators away from their own centres. It is important that these visits do take place. Units at Advanced Higher level will now be moderated using a visiting moderator as well as others at Intermediate 2 and Higher.

Four different Units were moderated at this central event, two at Higher level, two at Intermediate 1 / 2.

Specific issues identified

At Intermediate 2 some centres are lenient in marking Outcome 2 (specific studies) for Psychology: An Introduction and Psychology of Individual Differences Units.

Centres should ensure assessors use an appropriate checklist on candidates' work. This should show what total marks are given for each outcome and state whether candidate has achieved 60% cut-off score.

Only one centre showed evidence of Internal Moderation activity for a Unit. Centres should provide this evidence.

Lack of written feedback on some candidates' work was a concern. Written feedback can aid a candidate to improve. Some centres may give verbal feedback instead but written feedback would allow the moderation team to be aware of what advice etc is being given.

An issue with different marks being applied to different groups across a centre, using the same NAB assessment. Marking should be consistent across a centre. Although centres can reallocate marks, a marking scheme should be supplied and all candidates should be marked in the same way.

Feedback to centres

One centre had one Unit not accepted. One NAB assessment was used across the centre but in certain groups the assessment was marked out of 100 instead of out of 45marks. Although marking scheme could be adjusted it is inappropriate to mark different groups in a different way, using the same assessment instrument. Also, no Marking Instructions were included, so the team could not determine if the new marking scheme (out of 100) was appropriate. The centre has been asked to remark the sample (those marked out of 100) to the actual marks given on the NAB and arrange to have this remoderated. In future all candidates should be marked to the same scheme when using same assessment instrument. The Internal Moderator should check that this is done.

For the other Units moderated, there were some issues identified for each. Lack of checklists for each individual candidate, lack of written feedback on candidates' work and leniency in marking in some areas was commented on. It would also be useful to have some evidence provided that the Units had been Internally Moderated (such as sampling list or other indication). Only one centre out of the five accepted showed any evidence of this.