



# **NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports**

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Geography</b>
<b>Levels</b>	<b>N3 – Advanced Higher</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>October 2016</b>

**This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.**

## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Geography
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2016

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H7VJ	Advanced Higher	Geographical Skills
H7VK	Advanced Higher	Geographical Issues
H27G	Higher	Physical Environments
H27H	Higher	Human Environments
H27J	Higher	Global Issues
H27G	National 5	Physical Environments
H27H	National 5	Human Environments
H27J	National 5	Global Issues
H27H	National 4	Human Environments
H27G	National 3	Physical Environments
H27J	National 3	Global Issues

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

##### Good practice

The following examples of good practice in relation to assessment approaches were observed during Round 1 of verification:

- ◆ Most centres used Unit assessment support packs and prior verified assessments.
- ◆ Some centres had very effective centre devised assessments.

- ◆ Submissions included Unit and portfolio approaches.
- ◆ Submissions included interim and complete Unit evidence.
- ◆ Assessments included oral presentations, posters, leaflets, homework and written test submissions.
- ◆ Oral presentations included a transcript of the main points made.
- ◆ Where assessments are centre devised, the internal quality assurance process should include the validity of the assessment in relation to the Outcomes and Assessment Standards.

### **Areas for consideration**

Centres are advised to consider the following:

- ◆ From the start of session 2016–17 centres must assess candidates against the revised Outcomes and Assessment Standards.
- ◆ From the start of session 2016–17, centres using prior verified assessments must ensure that these have been prior verified in relation to the revised Outcomes and Assessment Standards.
- ◆ Centres that devise their own assessments are recommended to submit these for prior verification.
- ◆ When adapting the wording of Assessment Standards to candidate-friendly language, centres must ensure that the integrity of the Assessment Standard is maintained.

## **Assessment judgements**

### **Good practice**

The following examples of good practice in relation to assessment judgements were observed during Round 1 of verification:

- ◆ Assessment judgements were in line with national standards for most centres verified.
- ◆ Many centres included detailed and helpful comments about assessment judgements.
- ◆ Many centres indicated on candidate scripts where Assessment Standards were overtaken — the use of 1.1, 1.2 etc and the use of ‘d’ for description and ‘e’ for explanation provided clarity.
- ◆ The use of sticky notes and ticks to indicate where Assessment Standards have been overtaken was helpful.
- ◆ Many centres included a summary grid to indicate which Assessment Standards had been overtaken by each candidate.
- ◆ Where centres had robust verification policies, assessment judgements were more likely to be consistent and reliable.

## Areas for consideration

Centres are advised to consider the following:

- ◆ When candidates are assessed orally, evidence which indicates the oral prompt and the candidate response should be submitted.
- ◆ When candidates have been re-assessed orally their responses should be recorded by the assessor and submitted as evidence for verification.
- ◆ It is helpful for verification if ticks are placed at the place on the candidate script where an Assessment Standard is overtaken.
- ◆ Each Assessment Standard needs to be assessed once only.
- ◆ Candidates need to be re-assessed only for Assessment Standards they have not overtaken. There is no need to re-assess Assessment Standards which candidates have already achieved.
- ◆ It is only necessary to submit candidate materials which relate to the Unit being verified.
- ◆ Where cross-marking has taken place, assessors should agree the final decision for each candidate and include this decision in the evidence submitted for verification.

03

## Section 3: General comments

Many centres had clear internal verification policies to show how quality assurance ensures national standards had been applied.

Quality assurance templates were devised by some centres to give a clear and staged protocol for quality assurance.

The Verification Sample Form was completed appropriately by most centres.

The reasons for Not Accepted outcomes were as follows:

### Advanced Higher — Geographical Skills

AS 1.2 — candidates did not justify their choice of sampling method.

AS 1.2 — candidates selected only three sample sites which is insufficient at this level.

AS 2.2 — the data collected by candidates was not enclosed as evidence.

### Higher — Physical Environments

AS 1.2 — candidates labelled diagrams rather than annotating them with further/additional information.

AS 2.2 — candidates must explain the **impact** of the weather/climate on the physical environment.

### **Higher — Human Environments**

AS 1.2 — gather techniques should be appropriate to Higher — eg downloading a photograph from the internet is not appropriate at this level.

AS 1.3 — processing techniques should be appropriate to Higher — eg a simple bar/line graph is not appropriate at this level.

### **N5 – Physical Environments**

AS 1.1 — candidates did not identify and explain the key patterns found.

## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Geography
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2016

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H27K 74      National 4      Added value unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

##### Good practice

The following good practice was found in relation to assessment approaches:

- ◆ All centres used the unit assessment support package.
- ◆ All submissions included complete unit evidence.
- ◆ Candidates had been encouraged to produce evidence in a format suitable for them. This included posters, leaflets, PowerPoint presentations and written reports.

#### Assessment judgements

##### Good practice

The following good practice was found in relation to assessment judgements:

- ◆ Assessment judgements were in line with national standards for all centres verified.
- ◆ Many centres included detailed and helpful comments about their assessment judgements.

- ◆ Many centres indicated on candidate scripts where assessment standards were overtaken — the use of 1.1, 1.2, etc and the use of ‘d’ for description and ‘e’ for explanation.
- ◆ The use of sticky notes and ticks to indicate where assessment standards had been overtaken was helpful.
- ◆ Many centres included a summary grid to indicate which assessment standards had been overtaken by each candidate.
- ◆ Where centres had robust verification policies, assessment judgements were more likely to be consistent and reliable.

Good practice in relation to each assessment standard included:

1.1 Candidates giving their added value submission a full title or aim, eg:

*‘Is Dennistoun a tourist attraction?’*  
*‘Is heart disease a global problem?’*

Candidates who had a good choice of topics were able to undertake appropriate research and explain their findings. If topics were too narrow/limited candidates struggled to give two explanations for AS1.4.

1.2 Candidates included a bibliography to indicate the sources of information. Candidates listed fieldwork undertaken stating how and when this was done. Assessors confirmed in writing the sources used by candidates.

1.3 Candidates produced simple graphs from data collected, both first and second hand. Candidates produced tables to organise written sources of information, eg advantages/disadvantages; problems/solutions. Candidates annotated maps, graphs and diagrams to process information in a clear and concise manner.

1.4 Candidates gave two brief descriptions and two brief explanations of their chosen topics. This appeared to be more straightforward for candidates when the explanation was linked to the description, eg:

*‘There were more children than adults at the shops (d) because it was school dinner time (e).’*  
*‘More people were killed in the Japan earthquake (d) because it was bigger at 9 on the Richter Scale (e).’*  
*‘Malaria bed nets are effective (d) because poor people can afford them and it stops them paying more money for drugs (e).’*

1.5 Candidates gave clear statements about what their graph, map/diagram/table showed, eg:

*‘There were three times as many people injured by the earthquake than were killed.’*  
*‘There were more vehicles at 5pm.’*  
*‘Three-quarters of the people like windfarms.’*

1.6 Candidates communicated their research findings effectively using geographical terminology appropriate to National 4. Many candidates used headings to give coherence to their presentation. All candidates used terminology appropriate to National 4 and demonstrated their understanding of the words they used, eg '*global warming*', '*congestion*', '*tsunami*'.

### **Areas for consideration**

Centres are asked to consider the following:

- ◆ It is helpful for verification if ticks are placed at the place on the candidate script where an assessment standard is over taken.
- ◆ Each assessment standard needs to be assessed once only.
- ◆ Candidates need to be re-assessed only for assessment standards they have not overtaken. There is no need to re-assess assessments standards which candidates have already achieved.
- ◆ Where internal verification has taken place, assessors should agree the final decision for each candidate and evidence this.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Many centres had clear internal verification policies to show how quality assurance ensures national standards had been applied.

Quality assurance templates were devised by some centres to give a clear and staged protocol for quality assurance.

Centres used agreement trials, dual-assessment, cross-assessment, evidence review, double marking, blind marking and sampling as part of their internal verification processes.

The Verification Sample Form was completed appropriately by all centres.