



# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2015

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H23R 74 Modern Studies National 4 Added Value Unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

There was evidence that centres were managing the National 4 Added Value Unit well.

Many centres made good use of SQA materials, using these to develop their own approach to the Added Value Unit.

Many centres developed their own prompt sheets, recording of evidence sheets and candidate log books, and these were used to good effect — in terms of providing supporting evidence for candidates.

There was evidence of personalisation and choice in relation to the candidates' choice of topic to be researched.

However, some centres could improve their approach to the Added Value Unit by:

- ◆ ensuring that the task corresponds to the demands of the National 4 Added Value Unit
- ◆ raising candidate awareness of the demands of the Assessment Standards, especially 1.4 which requires a brief explanation, and Assessment Standard 1.5 which requires development of the justification
- ◆ introducing personalisation and choice into the process of choosing a topic

- ◆ encouraging a focus for research, perhaps by use of a hypothesis or a question relating to the topic chosen — this focus should allow candidates to meet the Outcome
- ◆ discouraging the use of ‘cut and paste’ especially in relation to PowerPoint presentations and posters
- ◆ ensuring that the material presented relates to the topic chosen. Use of verbal prompts would be appropriate here
- ◆ encouraging the use of referencing — including specific reference to sources when describing and explaining

Centres are reminded that the use of appropriate verbal prompts can help candidates fully achieve an Assessment Standard.

## **Assessment judgements**

Most centres made accurate and consistent judgements regarding their candidates’ achievement of Assessment Standards.

There was evidence of good practice regarding the assessors’ marking of scripts with good annotation of where candidates had met specific Outcomes, cross-marking and the use of assessor/cross-marker initials and comment (often colour coded).

Good use was made of candidate record of assessment sheets with appropriate comments as to the achievement of the Assessment Standards.

Centres made excellent use of log books to structure, check and assess progress. Centres are encouraged to include candidate logbooks when submitting evidence.

There was evidence of good use of the ‘Judging evidence’ tables with assessors assessing the evidence according to the Assessment Standards. This seemed to have helped centres achieve consistency in applying the Assessment Standards.

Some centres made use of oral prompts indicating where the candidate had responded orally and including notes to support this.

Some centres still failed to produce evidence of their internal standardisation approach. These centres tended to have an inconsistent approach to making assessment judgements. It would be good practice for centres to develop an internal verification procedure and provide evidence that this has been adhered to in the assessment process.

Some centres were inconsistent in making assessment judgements relating to Assessment Standards 1.4 and 1.5. This was especially the case with candidates presenting PowerPoints or posters. Centres are reminded that they should make use of the ‘Judging evidence’ table to ensure accurate and consistent assessment judgements.

## Section 3: General comments

Generally, the improvement noted in Year 1 continued. Centres' submissions were thorough and related to the evidence required for the National 4 Added Value Unit.

There was evidence of well-developed internal verification policies within centres. Centres provided evidence detailing meetings, decisions made and also evidence of these decisions being carried out. There was evidence that assessed scripts had been sampled by an internal verifier and there was good evidence of cross-marking.

There are still some centres, however, that would benefit from developing more robust internal standardisation procedures to ensure consistency of approach and accurate assessment judgements.

Centres, on the whole, showed consistency in their approach and made accurate judgements relating to the Assessment Standards.

Centres, on the whole, provided clear and well organised evidence to support their decisions.

Centres should ensure that their assessment approach and assessment procedures follow closely the procedures set down in their internal verification document. This will ensure consistency.

In terms of use of sources, some candidates still refer to the internet as a source of information. This is incorrect. The internet is a vehicle to finding sources not a source in itself. Likewise, a library is not a source but a place where many sources could be found.