



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H266 74 National 4 RMPS assignment Added value unit

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

During verification the following examples of good practice were observed:

All centres successfully verified at the event were deemed to be either 'accepted' or 'accepted*'. Centres are to be commended on this.

Once again, many centres had produced research booklets for their candidates, to aid the process of collecting relevant information.

The vast majority of centres had clearly worked with their candidates to ensure that the topic/issue for study was appropriate for research, within the context of RMPS.

Most centres had built prompts into their candidate instructions. This helped support candidates with the assessment process, clearly showing what was expected for a pass.

A few centres had developed approaches that involved the use of visual and audio media, and this allowed candidates to present in a less formally structured way. It also allowed centres to deal with specific educational needs, when devising assessment approaches for candidates.

Again, a few centres had candidates who chose to submit their findings in a poster approach. This approach allowed for personalisation and choice.

Action points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

Most centres submitted written reports. Centres should consider whether an extended piece of writing is an appropriate vehicle of assessment for all of their candidates.

A few centres need to provide clear guidelines with regard to what candidates are expected to achieve for each assessment standard.

Some centres seemed to have 'over-structured' their support materials. This could have potentially limited opportunities to achieve the assessment standards, based on their candidates own work.

Assessment judgements

During verification the following examples of good practice were observed:

Most centres clearly marked exactly where candidates had met particular assessment standards. Centres have to be commended on this, as it makes the verification process more straightforward.

For assessment standard 1.4, many centres had developed a clear coding system to clearly show in candidate submissions where the different parts of this assessment standard were being met.

The majority of centres that were sampled demonstrated a clear understanding of what was needed to achieve each individual assessment standard.

A good number of centres submitted detailed candidate record sheets relating to internal verification. These included evidence of dialogue regarding decisions about the final judgement of the centre. This practice supported the verification process and is to be commended.

Action points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

A very small number of centres submitted candidates' work with no marking indicated and this meant that the verification process could not take place. Centres are reminded that the verification process is checking that centres are applying the assessment standards correctly (not whether the candidate has passed or failed).

Assessment standard 1.2 asks for the candidate to provide '*evidence of having collected evidence from at least two sources of information*' and '*at least one of these sources should include a religious viewpoint*'. A few centres seemed to think that this meant a bibliography is needed from candidates. This is not the

case, although a bibliography would meet the standard. This standard can be met throughout the presentation in a variety of different ways.

Once again, some centres linked assessment standard 1.6 to candidates giving a conclusion, which is not correct. Assessment standard 1.6 is awarded for the final presentation of the findings, in whatever format the candidate chooses to do so. This assessment standard is not linked to a conclusion.

A few centres had marked candidate submissions using ticks and did not always link these ticks to specific assessment standards on the candidates' scripts. This meant that verifiers had significantly more work to do to match up centres judgements with candidate responses.

03

Section 3: General comments

There was again a wide variety of topics/issues selected by candidates and centres are to be congratulated for encouraging this approach.

There were no 'not accepted' decisions this year and this demonstrated that centres, on the whole, are clearly grasping the requirements for meeting the assessment standards at this level.

Some centres submitted extremely detailed candidate record sheets and these made it very clear where each assessment standard had been met. They also included feedback on the candidates work and this helped the verification process immensely.

Many centres submitted their candidate resource/record booklets as well as the final presentation and this extra information helped the verifiers in their duties. Centres are encouraged to take this approach where practical.

It was encouraging to see that centres had sought to ensure a robustness and reliability regarding the sources that candidates or centres are using.

Centres that submitted audio/visual materials as evidence had clearly shown on these materials where each assessment standard had been met. This was done by noting timings, giving transcripts, etc. and this approach was again helpful to the verification process.

A few centres still need to ensure that they are fully conversant with all the assessment standards, especially assessments standards 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6.

Centres are reminded that assessment standards can be met at any part in the final presentation and indeed some can be met through the candidates' research materials.

Centres should ensure that all SQA paperwork is carefully completed before submitting materials for verification.

A very small number of centres were given a verification 'cannot proceed' decision because they had submitted candidate evidence with no marking on the materials submitted. This meant that the verification process could not take place as there was nothing to verify.

Centres and local authorities are once again reminded that they could find it very helpful to enlist the help of RMPS nominees in their area for support and guidance.