NQ Verification 2016–17 Key Messages Round 2

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	**Environmental Science**
Verification event/visiting information	**Event**
Date published:	**June 2017**

National Courses/Units verified:

H24T 74   National 4   Environmental Science: Assignment (Added Value Unit)

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The verification sample was small, so there are limited comments for this round of verification.

All centres used the Environmental Science: Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit assessment.

Some centres had not used the current mark scheme with threshold but had used the old judging evidence table to assess each assessment standard. Centres are reminded to make sure they use the most up to date version. This is available in National 4 Environmental Science: Understanding the next steps for session 2016–17 and will be incorporated into the unit assessment support pack for session 2017–18.

Assessment judgements

Regardless of the version used, most of the assessment judgements made by centres were in line with the national standard. Those who had used the new marking scheme had, in general, applied this correctly.

Some centres had misunderstood the marking instructions for assessment standard 1.2 (researching the issue). For assessment standard 1.2, candidates can gain 2 marks for including relevant information/data selected from two or more sources and 1 mark for including where both of these sources could be

found. The mark for referencing is awarded if both sources are detailed (although these do not have to be referenced following a formal referencing system).

In order to be awarded the marks available for assessment standard 1.3 (processing and presenting appropriate information/data), candidates need only process one of the sources in an appropriate format.

Some candidates attempted to draw graphs on lined or squared paper, which can make it difficult to achieve the required accuracy. Centres are reminded that when graphs are hand-drawn, candidates should be provided with graph paper. When graphing software is used, candidates must produce graphs that have both major and minor gridlines so accuracy can be verified, and appropriate scales.

Rigorous, accurate and consistent application of the marking scheme is essential. The marking guidance is not meant to be exhaustive and it is encouraged that centres annotate any minor changes they make to the mark scheme.

Internal verification was generally good. There was a high level of annotation showing internal verification was rigorous. Where the internal verifier and the marker do not agree, it is essential that it is obvious what the final decision is.

03 ▸ Section 3: General comments

Where candidates have used software to generate graphs, then both minor and major gridlines must be visible so accuracy can be verified. Also, when using software to generate graphs, the scales must be appropriate.

Centres are reminded that there is no need to internally verify all evidence; an appropriate sample can be verified. When the internal verifier and assessor disagree, the centre needs to make sure that the final decision can be identified easily.