



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2018–19

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Mathematics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2019

#### National Courses/Units verified:

All units from National 3, 4 and SCQF level 5 Applications of Mathematics

All units from National 4 and SCQF level 5 Mathematics

All units from SCQF level 6 Mathematics

All units from Advanced Higher Mathematics course

Units from Advanced Higher Mathematics of Mechanics course

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

The vast majority of centres used SQA assessment support packs. At National 3, National 4 and SCQF level 5 in Mathematics and Applications of Mathematics, a unit-by-unit approach was favoured. Centres should use the most up to date versions of SQA assessments.

Where centres make amendments to either the assessment or marking guidance and judging evidence table, then these should be submitted along with the candidate evidence.

Some centres, particularly at SCQF level 6 and at Advanced Higher, used a combined approach. Where centres use a combined approach, the submission must include information on how evidence is consistently judged.

In **Mathematics** and **Applications of Mathematics**, using a threshold remains the favoured approach rather than judging by assessment standard.

Thresholds are set as follows:

### **Mathematics**

- ◆ Numeracy unit at National 4 — 60% for outcome 1 and 60% for outcome 2
- ◆ For Mathematics at National 4, SCQF levels 5 and 6 — 60% for outcomes 1 and 2 combined
- ◆ For added value at National 4 — 60% of the total marks or 50% of the operational marks and 50% of the reasoning marks

### **Applications of Mathematics and Numeracy**

- ◆ 60% for outcome 1 and 60% for outcome 2

However, if a candidate does not reach the threshold for a unit or an outcome, then perhaps they could still achieve the outcome/unit by assessing the individual assessment standards.

In all cases, centres should use the approach that gives the most favourable outcome for the candidate.

## **Assessment judgements**

Most centres made reliable decisions across the assessments submitted.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Care should be taken when transferring marks from candidates' scripts to judging evidence tables. In some cases, candidates did not achieve a unit they were entitled to. These tables should be updated after internal verification to ensure final judgements are accurate.

Most centres had effective systems of internal verification. In some cases, where the assessor and internal verifier disagreed, the final decision was not clear. A final decision should be made clear on the judging evidence table or candidate script.

In a few cases the internal verification merely confirmed the initial marking and was not effective in improving reliability of judgement.

Centres are reminded to read previous verification key message reports from [2014](#), [March 2016](#), [October 2016](#), [March 2017](#), [June 2017](#), [March 2018](#) and the [Mathematics Marking Guidance](#) to help support the assessment process.

When submitting evidence for external verification, centres are reminded that evidence should be complete for at least a full assessment standard. If a centre does not have the evidence required, they should contact NQ Verification to discuss how to proceed.