



**National Qualifications 2013
Internal Assessment Report
Religious, Moral and
Philosophical Studies**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified:

F5A6 13 – Philosophy of Religion (Advanced Higher)
F5AM 13 – Medical Ethics (Advanced Higher)
F59E 12 – World Religion (Higher)
F59E 11 – World Religion (Intermediate 2)
F59E 10 – World Religion (Intermediate 1)
F59Y 12 – Christianity: Belief and Science (Higher)
F59Y 11 – Christianity: Belief and Science (Intermediate 2)
F59K 12 – Morality in the Modern World (Higher)
F59K 11 – Morality in the Modern World (Intermediate 2)
F59K 10 – Morality in the Modern World (Intermediate 1)

General comments

Twenty-eight centres were verified.

Once again the most popular World Religions studied in the sampled centres were Buddhism and Christianity.

Throughout the verification process the verification team found that the overwhelming majority of centres sampled had a very clear understanding of the national standards for RMPS and applied them in a consistent manner.

It was very heartening for the Verifiers to see clear evidence of cross-marking in the majority of assessments sampled and this is to be encouraged.

The assessments sampled demonstrated that most of the candidates had a good grasp of the Courses that they are studying and very good knowledge and analysis was demonstrated throughout the completed assessments.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Of the sample, the vast majority of centres demonstrated clearly that they are familiar with, and used, the Unit specifications as well as the correct instruments of assessment.

Evidence Requirements

Almost all of the sampled centres demonstrated their understanding of the Evidence Requirements by sending in the correct and completed evidence sample; however, one centre did send in the wrong evidence and this delayed their verification.

Administration of assessments

Again it was clear from the sample that the vast majority of centres are applying the assessments at the appropriate level for their candidates and in the appropriate way. Unfortunately, one centre did not use the appropriate assessment and this led to their candidates having to be re-assessed.

The verification team was pleased to report that centres, on the whole, are demonstrating clear and solid procedures in the way that they assess their candidates as well as in the way that they verify their own procedures and marking.

Internal verification procedures are becoming even more obvious from the sampled materials and this is an activity that centres are to be commended for, as well as being encouraged to make sure that this continues.

Areas of good practice

A centre had developed a front sheet for every candidate assessment and this clearly showed: their marks, what they got their marks for (Knowledge/Analysis), specific comments which stated their next steps, evidence of cross-marking. This sort of detail was obviously useful to the candidates (and the verification team) and centres should consider a similar approach as this could help to support candidates in a positive way.

Another centre had developed a marks grid that gave candidates a break down of their overall marks in such a way that they could clearly see which parts of the Unit they were strong in and also see their development needs. Again this was viewed by the verification team as good practice to be encouraged.

Comments were made throughout assessments in almost all of the sampled work. These comments were focused and served to help candidates see more clearly how they could develop their work further (as well as encouraging candidates about the quality of their work).

Some form of cross-marking was obvious in the vast majority of the assessments sampled. This was encouraging for the verification team and is something that we would want to see expanded to all centres. Remember that cross-marking could also be done between centres, and this would help single-person departments in their verification processes.

Specific areas for improvement

Attention is once again drawn to the practice of making sure that the assessment that is being used is indeed a valid SQA assessment.

A few centres were clearly too generous in their allocation of marks to their candidates. This generosity did not always affect the overall pass of candidates in the sample but it may have given them a false confidence about where they actually were in regards to the Course content.

One centre was viewed as being very harsh with their allocation of marks and this is also something that all centres have to be aware of, as candidates may be being failed when they have actually passed the assessment. A deeper understanding of how the Marking Scheme should be applied would help to avoid this. Again cross-marking could help in this situation.

Centres are reminded that the assessments should clearly show where the relevant marks are allocated. As well as clearly showing what the total mark is for the candidates. The breakdown of marks into Knowledge and Understanding and Analysis should always be clear, both for the candidate as well as the verification team.