



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Physics
Levels	N3 to N5
Date published:	July 2014

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	January 2014

National Courses/Units verified:

Physics (National 3, National 4 and National 5) Unit assessments

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres should ensure that they are making use of the most recent Unit assessment support packs (UASPs) and the appropriate Evidence Requirements.

Evidence for Outcome 1 should have a clear link to a key area of the Unit being assessed and the structure of the report should follow the advice provided within the Unit assessment support pack. It is important to note that not all activities are appropriate at both National 4 and National 5 level so care should be taken when selecting the practical experiment/investigation.

Outcome 1 requires the candidates to demonstrate experimental/practical skills through practical experimentation. It is usual to allow candidates to demonstrate all the Assessment Standards required through the use of a single experiment/practical investigation. If the selected practical does not allow all the Assessment Standards to be successfully achieved then it is possible to split the six Assessment Standards into independent assessments.

It is important that centres select an experimental procedure/practical investigation that can cover all Assessment Standards through full participation by the candidate rather than selecting an activity that results in some standards requiring to be covered separately later. An example of this is in the use of simulated radioactivity experiments where the candidate only records values from a computer simulation so cannot 'follow procedures safely' or 'evaluate the procedure effectively'.

It would be of benefit if centres marked on the candidate scripts where an Assessment Standard is achieved, as this would aid both internal and external verification.

Where centres decide to develop their own assessment instrument for Assessment Standards 2.1 and 2.4 they should ensure that the level of demand is at the appropriate level for Unit assessment. Care should be taken when selecting questions from resources such as past papers, as these may contain questions that assess the A-grade criteria, which would not be appropriate for Unit assessment. Care should also be taken to ensure that the questions are assessing key areas at the appropriate level. When constructing assessment instruments, centres should avoid over-assessing and should ensure that the assessment has an appropriate balance across the key areas. To aid centres in producing their own Unit assessments, UAS Package 3: the portfolio approach contains a table that provides advice on the appropriate number of questions for each key area.

When a centre develops its own assessment instrument, care should be taken to limit the number of objective type questions (multiple-choice) used and that the assessment instrument follows, at the maximum limit, the same proportion as the Course assessment, ie 20%.

When using the portfolio approach, the minimum 'chunk' that can be assessed for AS2.1 is a key area. A key area should not be subdivided into smaller assessments.

It is important to remember that when a question requires a value to be given as the response then the correct unit is also required. The unit is not required only where the answer is written into a table of results where the units are in the column heading.

Centres should be cautious when adding questions to UASPs, in order to avoid over-assessment of Assessment Standard 2.1 or presenting unnecessary barriers to candidates achieving a Unit pass.

Candidates should be given the opportunity to make accurate statements for all the key areas of each Unit.

Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3 must be linked to an appropriate key area within the Unit and level being studied. It is important that candidates select an

application that can demonstrate physics theory at the correct level and explain how this application has an effect on society or the environment. The effect(s) can be positive or negative or both.

The majority of the centres selected for Round 1 of verification used the Unit-by-Unit approach to assess Assessment Standards 2.1 and 2.4 and used the investigation topics suggested in the UASPs for Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3.

For Assessment Standard 2.4, it is not appropriate to allocate, for example, three marks to calculations and then award a pass for a candidate achieving two out of three. The candidate must get the question completely correct to have evidence of successfully achieving that problem solving skill. Centres are reminded that evidence of problem solving is transferrable, so if a candidate does not get, for example, an analysing or processing question correct in the first Unit assessment or re-assessment, they may generate evidence in subsequent Units.

Where centres are allocating marks to questions assessing 2.1, they should not allocate multiple marks to a question where the marking instructions require two (or more) things to be correct. For example, the question requiring candidates to label the angles of incidence and refraction on a diagram requires both to be correctly labelled, it would **not** be appropriate to make this one mark for each correct label. **½ marks should not be used under any circumstances**; the use of ½ marks has been discontinued in CfE qualifications.

Assessment judgements

For Outcome 1, it is important that a clear aim is made at the start of the candidate's report in order to allow an effective conclusion to be made in connection with the stated aim. Some centres accepted conclusions that did not relate to the aim stated by the candidate.

During the process of planning an investigation it is not necessary, in physics, for the candidates to make explicit statements indicating the dependent and independent variable, as long as the description of the procedure to be carried out states what is going to be altered and what is going to be measured. The procedure should be described in enough detail to allow another person to replicate the experiment without the need for additional information. Candidates should be encouraged to record experimental procedures in their own words. Some centres accepted vague and/or incomplete descriptions of procedures.

For Assessment Standard 1.4, as well as tabulating the data, candidates should be encouraged to draw a valid graph where appropriate. This gives the candidate two opportunities to achieve this Assessment Standard as the table of results or the graph can be used as evidence. Some centres had 'failed' candidates owing to omissions in the results table even though the candidate had also produced a completely correct graph. Centres should note that this is not a 'mix and match' approach with some parts of the table correct and some parts of the graph

correct. One or the other should be correct to demonstrate successful achievement of this Assessment Standard.

It is also important that assessors record on the candidate scripts where they decide that an Assessment Standard is achieved. This would aid support for the candidates, internal verification of the candidates' work and eventually the external verification process.

For a candidate to pass Assessment Standard 2.1 the minimum requirement is that half the responses must be correct **across** the whole Unit for each assessment instrument used. It is important that centres note that it is half of the opportunities to make correct statements that cover the Assessment Standard and not half of the responses for each key area. This means that some key areas might not be 'passed individually' but the candidate can still have achieved Assessment Standard 2.1.

The marking instructions in each Unit assessment support pack, along with the grid that identifies the question type and the key area, clearly indicate what is classed as an opportunity to make a statement. For example, in a question asking candidates to label the forces acting on a skydiver, both labels must be correct — this would count as one opportunity to make an accurate statement.

It is also important that detailed marking instructions are used, and annotated if/where appropriate when the centre accepts an alternative answer from those suggested. Centres should take care not to accept answers that haven't been accepted in previous SQA examinations.

As exemplified in the UASPs, where a centre is using a centre-devised assessment instrument, it is important that an assessment grid is produced to show which key areas are being covered by each question to demonstrate the number of opportunities per key area that candidates are given.

To pass Assessment Standard 2.4 it is important that there is evidence for successful achievement of each problem solving type associated with the level of study; three types for National 3 and National 4 and four types for National 5. Again the candidate must get at least half of the opportunities correct for each of the problem solving type questions to demonstrate successful achievement of that type of skill. For example, if a test has three questions testing the skill of processing information the candidate should have two or more correct to achieve that skill.

A use of a recording grid for this Assessment Standard would make it clear when a candidate has achieved particular skills.

For Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3, it is important that the candidates include sufficient physics knowledge at the appropriate level of study. For example, 'x-rays are part of the electromagnetic spectrum and can be used to help detect

broken bones' would not be sufficient physics at National 5 to pass the Assessment Standards.

For Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3, the short report should, as far as possible, be in the candidate's own words. There were a few instances where candidates had simply copied and pasted large sections of information from websites and this had been accepted by the assessor as meeting the standards.

A good number of centres made it clear where candidates had achieved each Assessment Standard and where verification took place.

It is important that centres record clear assessment decisions both on the candidate scripts and on an appropriate recording sheet that would allow verification of assessment decisions to be made. During the internal verification process it is vital that the Verifier's markings are clearly visible and any final decision is clearly communicated where any difference of opinion is made. Some centres had internal verification procedures evident but it was difficult to tell what the final assessment decision was.

03

Section 3: General comments

Centres should submit evidence for a candidate only for the level that they have indicated on the verification sample form. For example, if a candidate is part of the centre's National 4 sample then they should not include either National 3 or National 5 evidence for that candidate.

If a candidate has been assessed on any aspect orally, then a record of the questions asked and the candidate's responses should be provided to allow both internal and external verification of the assessment decision(s).

Outcome 1: A scientific report of an experiment

In the achievement of Outcome 1, it is likely that candidates will work in small groups and will therefore have the same experimental results but centres should ensure that the actual scientific report is the work of the individual candidate.

For Assessment Standard 1.1, a diagram on its own is not sufficient for the method. Sufficient information should be provided which would allow another candidate to follow the method, and replicate the experiment.

For Assessment Standard 1.2, an observation checklist to record assessor comments is sufficient.

For Assessment Standards 1.3 and 1.4, candidates should use SI units and standard abbreviations where appropriate (eg s *not* secs).

For Assessment Standard 1.6, at National 5, an evaluation should be supported by justification. At least one possible improvement to the experiment should be

provided. Stating 'to improve this experiment I would use a better meter' is not an appropriate evaluation in physics.

Assessment Standard 2.4: Solving problems

Candidates are only required to demonstrate each skill on one opportunity. If candidates have more than one opportunity they must demonstrate a particular skill on at least half of those opportunities.

Centres may wish candidates to have many opportunities to practise a particular problem solving skill in preparation for the external exam at National 5, but multiple opportunities are not required to achieve Assessment Standard 2.4.

If a candidate achieves a particular problem solving skill in one Unit, and is given further opportunities to demonstrate that same skill in another Unit but fails to do so, this will not cancel out the earlier achievement. Once Assessment Standard 2.4 has been achieved, it cannot be removed.

Please note that presenting data is not a problem solving skill in Assessment Standard 2.4 at any level.

Whilst SQA assessments and documents use negative index notation for units, candidates should **not** be penalised for quoting units correctly using solidus notation.

Re-assessment

It should be noted that for re-assessment purposes of Outcome 1 and Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3 it is possible to ask candidates to redraft the final reports to allow issues to be corrected. Assessors should ensure that any feedback/support regarding redrafting isn't overly directive. For example, asking a candidate to 'fix the mistakes on the graph' would be acceptable, whereas saying 'the label and units on your x -axis should be...' would be providing a model answer which is considered to be an inappropriate level of support.

For re-assessment of Assessment Standard 2.1, centres may choose to re-assess candidates either by giving another test covering all of the key areas of the Unit, or by giving a test which covers those key areas in which the candidates haven't done well (eg answered half or more of the questions correctly). For example, a candidate may have two key areas in which they performed poorly in the original assessment which caused them not to achieve the 50% threshold, so they could be given a re-assessment opportunity on just those two areas rather than a whole Unit test.

Exemplification will be provided to support aspects of this key messages document in due course.



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2014

National Courses/Units verified:

Physics (National 3, National 4 and National 5) Unit assessments

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

With the changes to the Unit assessment support packs that took place shortly before the Courses went live, it is important that centres ensure they are using the most up-to-date version and that they provide appropriately assessed evidence that matches the requirements of the Assessment Standards.

Outcome 1 should relate clearly to a key area of the Unit being assessed and candidates should be encouraged to follow the structure of the report in the advice provided within the Unit assessment support pack. It is important to note that not all activities may be appropriate at both National 4 and National 5 level so care should be taken when making final assessment decisions. It is also important that the activity used is at the appropriate level for the Course and care should be taken not to set too difficult an activity for Unit assessment.

For all Outcomes it would be of benefit if centres marked on the candidate scripts where an Assessment Standard, or any part of an Assessment Standard, is achieved as this would aid both internal and external verification.

Where centres decide to develop their own assessment instrument for Assessment Standards 2.1 and 2.4 they should ensure that the level of demand is at the appropriate level for the National level being covered. The advised number of questions that could be asked for each key area within a Unit can be found in Package 3: the portfolio approach. It is recommended that the centre should submit any centre-devised assessment instrument for prior verification.

When a centre develops its own assessment instrument, care should be taken with regard to the number of objective type questions used. Also, the assessment instrument should have no more than the proportion of objective questions in the final exam. If multiple-choice questions are used, the number of distractors should normally be the same as in the examination; however, there may be questions where it is appropriate to have fewer distractors per question for Unit assessment purposes.

The minimum content for an assessment instrument for Assessment Standard 2.1 is a key area. These should not be further subdivided, even when the portfolio approach is being used.

Candidates should be given the opportunity to make accurate statements for all the key areas of each Unit. If a candidate needs to be re-assessed for 2.1 then there are two possible approaches to re-assessment. The candidate could be given another test covering all of the key areas within a Unit and if they get 50% or more of the responses correct they would pass 2.1. Alternatively, the centre could analyse the candidate's performance in each key area in the first test and then re-assess the candidate on those key areas in which they performed poorly (taken to be less than half the opportunities correct). In the second example, the candidate would pass if they scored 50% or more of this re-assessment. You would not add the original assessment and the re-assessment together and apply a 50% threshold.

To illustrate this second point, suppose a test for Assessment Standard 2.1 covered a Unit with four key areas and the number of questions in each key area was 1, 4, 4, and 3 respectively. In the test, the candidate scored 1/1, 1/4, 2/4 and 1/3, so they scored 5/12 and therefore they have not passed Assessment Standard 2.1 for the Unit. The centre could then choose to re-assess this candidate on the second and fourth key areas. If the centre re-assessment for this candidate consisted of, for example, three questions on each of these two key areas and the candidate scored 3/6 in this re-assessment, they have passed Assessment Standard 2.1.

It is important to remember that when a question requires a value to be given as the response then a unit is also required. The unit is not required only where the answer is written into a table of results where the units are in the column heading.

Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3 must relate to an appropriate key area within the Unit and level being studied. It is important that candidates select an application that can demonstrate physics theory and explain how this application

has an effect on society or the environment. It is recommended that both Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3 are assessed together as the physics theory for the application and the effect can be combined in the one assessment and considered more holistically.

The majority of the centres selected for Round 2 used the Unit-by-Unit approach to assess Assessment Standards 2.1 and 2.4, and used the investigation topics suggested in the Unit assessment support pack for Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3.

Assessment judgements

Outcome 1 requires the candidates to demonstrate experimental/practical skills through practical experimentation. It is usual to allow candidates to demonstrate all the Assessment Standards required through the use of a single experimental/practical investigation. If this does not allow all the Assessment Standards to be successfully achieved, then it is possible to evidence the six Assessment Standards in different assessments. Assessment Standard 1.1 should not be split up into smaller assessment items, eg at National 5 all six pieces of evidence for Assessment Standard 1.1 should be evidenced in the same plan. Where a candidate does not pass AS1.1, perhaps because one or two of the pieces of information required are incorrect or missing, it is acceptable to ask a candidate to redraft the response as a means of re-assessment. Alternatively, the candidate may produce a plan for a different experiment/investigation in which all the required evidence is present and correct.

It is important that centres select an experimental procedure/practical investigation that can cover all assessment standards though full participation by the candidate rather than selecting an activity that results in some standards having to be covered separately later. An example of this is in the use of simulated radioactivity experiments where the candidate only records values from a computer simulation so cannot evaluate the procedure effectively.

It is also important that a clear aim is made at the start of the experimental/practical technique to allow an effective conclusion to be made in connection with the stated aim.

During the process of planning an investigation it is not necessary for the candidates to make explicit statements indicating the dependent and independent variable as long it is clear from the description what is being altered and how it is being altered (the independent variable) and what is being measured and how it is being measured (the dependent variable). The procedure should be described in enough detail so that another candidate could follow the procedure and replicate the experiment.

For Assessment Standard 1.4 at National 4 or National 5 or Assessment Standard 1.3 at National 3, candidates should be encouraged to draw a valid graph where the results/aim clearly demonstrates that this is appropriate. This

gives the candidates two opportunities to achieve this Assessment Standard as the table of results or the graph can be used and the achievement of half of the opportunities to demonstrate achievement applies. The units and headings of the table of results must be correct as is the need to have correct labels and units on the graph. It is also important to mark the origin on the graph as per the general marking instructions. Centres should note that this is not a 'mix and match' approach where some of the table is correct and some of the graph is correct to evidence this Assessment Standard, either one or the other must be correct.

It is also important that assessors record on the candidate scripts where they decide that an Assessment Standard is achieved. This would aid the internal verification of the candidate work and eventually the external verification process.

For a candidate to pass Assessment Standard 2.1, the minimum requirement is that half the responses must be correct across the whole Unit for each assessment instrument used. It is also important that detailed marking instructions are used, and annotated if/where appropriate when the centre accepts an alternative answer from those suggested.

Where a centre devises its own instrument of assessment, it is important that an assessment grid, similar to the ones in the Unit assessment support packs, is produced to show which key areas are being covered by each question to demonstrate the number of opportunities per key area the candidates are given.

It is important that centres note that it is half of the opportunities to make correct statements that cover the Assessment Standard and not half of the responses for each key area. This means that some key areas might not be 'passed' but the candidate can still have passed Assessment Standard 2.1.

If a portfolio approach is being used the achievement of 50% of the statements being made for Assessment Standard 2.1 still applies and should be checked at the end of the Unit when the summing up of the successful responses is made and checked against the total number of opportunities given to make accurate statements.

To pass Assessment Standard 2.4 it is important that evidence exists for successful achievement of each problem solving type associated with the level of study: three types for National 3 and National 4 and four types for National 5. Again where a test contains more than one opportunity for a particular problem solving type, the candidate must get at least half of those opportunities correct to evidence that type of skill.

A recording grid for this Assessment Standard would make it clear when a candidate has achieved that skill.

For Assessment Standards 2.2 and 2.3 it is important that the candidates include sufficient physics knowledge at the appropriate level of study.

It is important that centres record clear assessment decisions both on the candidate scripts and on an appropriate recording sheet that would allow verification to be made. During the internal verification process it is vital that the verifiers' markings are clearly visible and any final decision where there was a difference of opinion is made clear. For some evidence submitted, it was not clear what the final decision was. However, a good number of centres made it clear where candidates had achieved each Assessment Standard and where verification took place.

03

Section 3: General comments

In the achievement of Outcome 1, it is possible for the candidates to work in groups to plan and carry out the experiment/investigation so that they have the same set of results as others in the group. When it comes to the report, it is important that it is the individual work of the candidate and not a joint final report, ie the plan and the report should be in the candidate's own words.

It should also be noted that it is possible to get candidates to redraft the final reports where they have not passed a particular Assessment Standard. Appropriate feedback should be made by the assessor to help this process. Prompting is an acceptable level of help but care needs to be taken that candidates are not given model answers or prompts that give an inappropriate amount of guidance. For example, identifying to a candidate that they haven't passed Assessment Standard 1.4 because the units in their table are incorrect and they need to correct these, would be an appropriate level of support for re-assessment. Saying to a candidate 'the units in your table should be m s^{-1} , you need to correct this' would not be appropriate.

Centres are reminded that, as part of the SQA processes for a centre to be authorised to present candidates for a Course that an effective internal verification process is in place. This allows the centre to check that each candidate is given the same opportunities and that the standards being applied by one member of staff are the same as other staff in that centre. For external verification purposes, it is important that evidence is supplied to demonstrate this internal verification process, not only in the provision of a school/department policy but on the effective use of the policy on the candidates' work.

When a centre is selected for external verification it should only submit one Unit for each level being verified, ie if National 4 and National 5 are being sent then one Unit for the candidates at National 4 and one for the candidates at National 5 should be submitted for verification. Centres should only submit evidence for a candidate at the level they indicate on the Verification Sample Form. For example, if a centre is submitting evidence for a candidate they are entering for National 4 they should not submit failed National 5 evidence for this candidate or evidence marked as a pass at National 3.



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 3

01

Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units verified:

National 4 Physics Added Value Unit

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Outcome 1 should relate clearly to a key area from one of the other three Units of the Course, and candidates should be encouraged to follow the structure of the report in the advice provided within the Unit assessment support pack. It is important that the activity used is at the appropriate level for the Course and care should be taken not to set too difficult an activity for Unit assessment.

For the evidence for this Unit, it would be of benefit if centres marked on candidate scripts where an Assessment Standard, or any part of an Assessment Standard, is achieved as this would aid both internal and external verification.

Assessment Standard 1.1 must relate to a key area from any of the Units covered within the Course and at the appropriate National 4 level being studied. It is important that candidates select an application that can demonstrate physics theory and explain how this application has an effect on society or the environment.

For Assessment Standard 1.2, the candidate must produce evidence of the use of a minimum of two sources for the research stage. One source can be from an experiment, carried out by the candidate either individually or as part of a group, recorded as a title and an aim — and one other source either from the internet, a

book, a newspaper, a journal or a relevant publication. The recording of the source must be in a format that would allow it to be checked easily by a third party.

It is also a requirement that the evidence from the sources used is recorded to allow the selecting of relevant data to be confirmed.

Assessment Standard 1.3 requires one of the original sources of data to be presented in a different and appropriate format, eg a table of data may be presented as a line graph. This Assessment Standard can only be assessed if the raw data from Assessment Standard 1.2 is available and the original source identified.

For Assessment Standard 1.4, the candidate is required to explain the impact the chosen topic has on the environment or society, in terms of appropriate physics. The impact can be either positive or negative but must be backed-up with physics theory.

Assessment Standard 1.5 is where the candidate brings all the Unit work together and communicates the overall findings in an appropriate way. This includes a clear aim and a final evaluation of the evidence presented by the candidate.

All of the centres selected for Round 3 used the standard scientific report to convey the relevant information/findings.

Assessment judgements

Assessment Standard 1.1 was well assessed by all centres with the identification of an area of physics clearly shown with justification for the choice at the beginning of the candidates' work. All topics, within the evidence submitted by centres, clearly linked to a key area of the National 4 Physics Course as required.

Most centres accepted the achievement of Assessment Standard 1.2 as the production of a list of sources that would allow someone to check the source. It is important that any source website addresses are given in full to allow the data to be checked with the minimum requirement for the assessor to search for it.

It is also important that at this point the evidence from the source(s) is included to allow Assessment Standard 1.3 to be assessed effectively. It was clear from some centres that this evidence was being counted in Assessment Standard 1.3, the presenting phase, but in order to make it clear that it is the source evidence, it should be assessed under Assessment Standard 1.2 in the future.

For Assessment Standard 1.3 at National 4, candidates should be encouraged to draw a valid graph where the results clearly demonstrate that this is appropriate. This gives the candidates two opportunities to achieve this Assessment Standard as the table of results or the graph can be used and the achievement of half of the opportunities to demonstrate achievement applies. The units and headings of the table of results must be correct as is the need to have correct labels and units

on the graph. It is also important to mark the origin on the graph. Centres should note that this is not a 'mix and match' approach where some of the table is correct and some of the graph is correct to evidence this Assessment Standard, either one or the other must be correct.

It is also important that assessors record on the candidate scripts where they decide that an Assessment Standard is achieved. This would aid the internal verification of the candidate work and eventually the external verification process.

Centres should note that for Assessment Standard 1.5 it is not just the final conclusion that is required, but the full report or presentation that is being assessed.

It is important that centres record clear assessment decisions both on the candidate scripts and on an appropriate recording sheet to allow both internal and external verification to be carried out effectively. During the internal verification process it is vital that the verifier's markings are clearly visible and any final decision where there was a difference of opinion is made clear. For some evidence submitted, it was not clear what the final decision was. However, a good number of centres made it clear where candidates had achieved each Assessment Standard and where verification took place.

03

Section 3: General comments

In the achievement of Outcome 1, it may be possible for the candidates to use an Outcome 1 report from one of the other Units as a source of evidence — if it is appropriate to the topic being investigated. The candidate must give the title and aim of the experiment as a source for it to be considered valid.

It should also be noted that it is possible to get candidates to redraft their final reports where they have not passed a particular Assessment Standard.

Appropriate feedback should be made by the assessor to help this process. Prompting is an acceptable level of support but care needs to be taken that candidates are not given model answers or prompts that give an inappropriate amount of guidance. For example, identifying to a candidate that they haven't passed Assessment Standard 1.4 because the units in their table are incorrect and they need to correct these, would be an appropriate level of support for re-assessment. Saying to a candidate 'the units in your table should be m s^{-1} , you need to correct this' would not be appropriate.

Centres are reminded that, as part of SQA processes for a centre to be authorised to present candidates for a Course, an effective internal verification process is in place. This allows the centre to check that each candidate is given the same opportunities and that the standards being applied by one member of staff are the same as other staff in that centre. For external verification purposes, it is important that evidence is supplied to demonstrate this internal verification process, not only in the provision of a school/department policy but on the effective use of the policy on the candidates' work.