

NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Philosophy
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2015

National Courses/Units verified:

H24J 75 National 5 Philosophy: Arguments in Action
 H24K 75 National 5 Philosophy: Knowledge and Doubt
 H24M 75 National 5 Philosophy: Moral Philosophy

H24J 76 Higher Philosophy: Arguments in Action
 H24K 76 Higher Philosophy: Knowledge and Doubt
 H24M 76 Higher Philosophy: Moral Philosophy

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres adopted the Unit-by-Unit approach to assessment and utilised the Unit assessment support packs from the SQA secure site.

Most centres using the Unit assessment support packs had modified them in some way, but most of the changes were minor. There was clear evidence that centres made modifications to Unit assessment support packs with the intention of addressing the needs of candidates.

Centres that modified the Unit assessment support packs had mixed success — some significant changes produced acceptable approaches to assessment and some centres, having only made minimal changes, had their approaches ‘not accepted’.

Centres should be aware that assessments should be accessible to all candidates and enable candidates to generate the evidence required in order to meet the minimum competency in the Assessment Standards.

There was evidence that, while most centres had a good understanding of the principles of Unit assessments, there was a tendency to over-assess candidates.

Centres should be aware that candidate evidence can be gathered as a natural part of learning and teaching.

Some centres were still unclear about the difference between Unit assessment and Course assessment.

Assessment judgements

Most centres were judging the evidence according to the appropriate Assessment Standard. Many centres included the marking schemes to indicate where candidate evidence for an Outcome was identified. Many centres annotated the scripts of candidates indicating where the Assessment Standards had been judged to have been met by a candidate.

Some centres gave inadequate information to indicate what evidence had been used to make particular judgements.

Some centres seemed unaware that a single candidate response could provide evidence for more than one Outcome and that candidate evidence for a particular Outcome could appear throughout the evidence.

Many centres had included detailed documentation relating to internal verification, which was very helpful, however it was not always obvious that internal verification was having a significant effect on quality assurance.

Some centres had made commendable efforts to ensure accurate judgements by having cross-marking and/or internal verification take place in another centre, presumably because there was only one subject specialist — the assessor — in their centre. However, some centres did not include evidence for checking assessment judgements, eg cross-marking and recording judgement decisions.

03

Section 3: General comments

It would be helpful if centres made it clearer to candidates beforehand how Assessments Standards were to be achieved.

There was little evidence that centres had given enough consideration to personalisation and choice in producing evidence.

Centres should make more use of the 'making assessment judgements' column in the judging evidence table in the Unit assessment support packs.

It was evident throughout the verification process that good quality learning and teaching was taking place.