



NQ Verification 2016–17 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Verification group name: | Geography |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | |

National Courses/Units verified:

Unit code H27K

Level National 4

Unit Title 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 that was suitable for them. This included posters, leaflets, PowerPoint presentations and written reports.
- ◆ Success criteria have been written in child-friendly language.
- ◆ There was evidence of personalisation and choice in choosing topics.

Area of concern

- ◆ When N5 Assignments are used to cover this unit, centres must ensure that all assessment standards are covered.

Assessment judgements

Good practice

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

- ◆ Most assessment judgements in the centres verified were in line with national standards.
- ◆ 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 internal verification procedures, assessment judgements were more likely to be consistent and reliable.
- ◆ Verbal feedback/re-assessment annotated onto scripts by assessors was helpful.
- ◆ Concise and relevant submissions enabled candidates to meet assessment standards without having to produce a lengthy piece of work.

Good practice in relation to each assessment standard included:

- 1.1 Candidates giving their added value submission a full title or aim, eg: '*The impact of the tsunami on Japan*'; '*The difference between inner city and the CBD*'. Candidates who had a good choice of topic were able to undertake appropriate research and explain their findings. If topics were too narrow and/or limited, candidates struggled to give two descriptions and 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, eg: '*Radioactive water was recently discovered leaking from the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant (d)*' '*In Rosemount there was*

more vehicles going away from the CBD (d) because Japan is on a plate boundary the tsunami could happen again (e).’ ‘On the land transect all residential places are at the top of Rosemount because the land is cheaper (e).’

1.5 Candidates gave clear statements about what their graph, map/diagram/table showed, eg: *‘The map shows how far the shock waves spread. They travelled nearly as far as Tokyo which shows that the earthquake was really huge’;* *‘There are more offices along the transect than anything else’.*

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 *‘tsunami’, ‘seismic’, ‘shockwaves’, ‘nuclear meltdown’ – ‘inner city’, ‘CBD’ ‘accessible’, ‘high/middle/lower order’.*

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 overtaken.
- ◆ Each assessment standard needs to be assessed once only. There was some evidence of over-assessment
- ◆ 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 procedures to show how quality assurance ensures that national standards have been applied.
- ◆ Quality assurance templates were devised by some centres to give a clear and staged protocol for quality assurance.
- ◆ Centres used cross-marking as part of their internal verification processes.
- ◆ The Verification Sample Form was completed appropriately by most centres. Candidates can only be recorded as passing the unit if all assessment standards are complete and overtaken.
- ◆ Centres should be aware of candidate health and safety when carrying out fieldwork.
- ◆ While a wide range of topics could be deemed appropriate for this unit, they must be investigated in a geographical way.
- ◆ The N4 Added Value Unit Webinar is available on the SQA secure website.