



NQ Verification 2016–17

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Economics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	May 2017

National Courses/Units verified:

H236 75 National 5 Economics: UK Economic Activity
H236 76 Higher Economics: UK Economic Activity
H7XY 77 Advanced Higher Economics: National and Global Economic Issues

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The assessment approaches used by all centres at National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher were valid. All centres used the published SQA unit assessment support packs or SQA unit assessment support packs that had been slightly adapted, which meant that no issues arose concerning the approach to assessment.

The unit by unit approach was the option most seen by verifiers.

Assessment judgements

Verifiers found that most of the evidence submitted was of a very high standard with nearly all centres having a very clear understanding of the national standard. Most centres had marked according to the guidance provided in the unit assessment support packs, however this is not intended to be exhaustive of all possibilities and can be modified. Centres are reminded that any modifications must be noted and are subject to the same level of internal quality assurance processes as other assessment judgements.

Having considered the evidence submitted in this round, it was evident that:

- ◆ Most centres were fully aware of the requirements of each level and made full use of the judging evidence tables to decide whether a candidate had achieved/not achieved the accepted standard. This was reflected in the quality of candidate responses that were accepted and centres must be commended for their rigour in marking these responses.
- ◆ Candidate evidence submitted for each outcome clearly indicated whether candidates passed or failed, however some candidate evidence was slightly leniently marked and centres are reminded that they should look at the judging evidence tables and marking instructions when marking candidate evidence to ensure that they are marking to the national standard.
- ◆ Although most of the evidence submitted achieved the required standard, it was evident that a few centres were not fully aware of the responses required to meet the national standard. This was reflected by some of the responses that were accepted by centre assessors. For example, in Higher Economics UK Economic Activity outcome 1.1, some candidates accurately described monetary policies that could be used by the UK Government, however they did not explain how they could be used to achieve the Government's main aims.

03

Section 3: General comments

All centres that submitted evidence completed candidate assessment records effectively and submitted the instrument of assessment, however not all centres submitted the judging evidence tables and marking instructions with candidate evidence. Centres are reminded that they should enclose the instrument of assessment, judging evidence tables and marking instructions.

In the vast majority of cases, centres provided very good evidence of internal verification with evidence that was double-marked, using different colours of ink, and signed and dated by the internal verifier. However, centres are reminded that internal verification documentation should show commentaries regarding any differences between the original marker and the verifier, as well as the decision reached.

It was noted that internal verification was undertaken by all centres that submitted evidence and centres are to be commended for this.

Centres are reminded that they must have an effective internal quality assurance system in place and that SQA has produced an Internal Verification Toolkit which provides advice and support on designing and implementing the best model and approach to internal verification depending on your subject, centre and candidate needs. It can be found at www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit.