



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2018–19

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

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

#### National Units verified:

H239 74      National 4      Media — added value unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Overall, many centres submitted approaches to assessment which made good use of the unit assessment support pack (UASP). Many centres used the UASP as a template to assess all candidates appropriately, which supported candidates well and offered clear guidance.

Some centres applied and implemented Curriculum for Excellence principles by adapting assessment approaches that took account of the assessment standards and guidelines in the UASP. These amendments to the UASP were made to fit with specific media content or to be more supportive to candidates with specific learning needs. This approach can often allow candidates some degree of personalisation and choice as well as depth, breadth and challenge. However, it is important to ensure that any adaptation does not limit candidates' ability to meet the assessment standards.

Most centres made use of the judging the evidence table when devising their approach to assessment, developing briefs that were appropriate to the teaching and learning in that centre. These centre-devised instruments of assessment allowed candidates to generate a range of suitable evidence to meet each of to the assessment standards.

In some cases, the content of the centre-devised instruments of assessment did not enable candidates to produce evidence which would adequately meet the assessment standards. It is recommended that when centre-devised assessments are made, the UASP is adhered to closely. For centres wishing to develop their own approach to assessment, use of the judging the evidence table in the UASP provides a guide on how to create appropriate assessment instruments that allow sufficient scope to generate evidence which meets the assessment standards.

Some centres submitted National 5 assignments for candidates who had changed level; however, unless the evidence is mapped to, and assessed against, the National 4 assessment standards, this is not suitable for submission as an added value unit.

For assessment standard 1.2: Researching and analysing media content, the research undertaken by candidates must be professionally produced/to a professional standard content. Also, some candidates continue to focus on the design of a product, rather than the media content itself.

## **Assessment judgements**

The majority of centres applied the JET accurately to the candidate evidence to ensure valid and reliable assessment judgements. However, in a small number of cases, assessment judgements were inconsistent. This was mainly caused by inappropriate adaptations of the UASP resulting in inappropriate or insufficient evidence, or where the evidence from candidates moving from the National 5 assignment to the National 4 added value unit failed to meet all of the requirements for the added value unit, particularly in overtaking assessment standard 1.1: Generating ideas in response to a brief, and 1.4: Reflecting on the process and the product. For both of these assessment standards, the requirements of the National 4 added value unit are different to those of the National 5 assignment. Evidence gathered from the National 5 assignment can be used to fulfil the requirements of the National 4 added value unit, but care must be taken to ensure that assessment standards 1.1 and 1.4 have been addressed. Submission of the National 5 assignment alone does not meet all of the assessment standards at National 4.

Some centres demonstrated good practice by adapting the Candidate Assessment Records for their candidates to show more clearly how assessment judgements were made.

A number of centres included copies of JETs for each candidate, clearly showing how assessment decisions were made. This is good practice and is extremely useful for the candidate, the internal verifier and the external verification process.

Generally, it would be useful to provide a separate internal verification statement and individual candidate records. Centres are reminded that they should submit a copy of the brief as part of their evidence. Centre assessors should indicate which assessment standard they are crediting.

Centres are also reminded that by offering SQA qualifications, they must have an effective internal quality assurance system which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

### **Prior verification**

Centres are strongly advised to submit centre-produced assessments for prior verification if these differ significantly from the UASPs. This should be requested before assessments are used with candidates. If a centre has used a prior verified assessment, the verification certificate should be included with material submitted for external verification.

### **Good practice**

Many centres showed good practice by providing a brief that could be widely interpreted, thus allowing candidates opportunities for personalisation and choice. Many centres showed evidence of effective internal verification. Comments made by internal verifiers often clearly confirmed the assessor's judgement and were supportive of their candidates.

Many centres had good quality assurance procedures in place, with evidence of internal verification through cross-marking with colour-coded comments. Assessment decisions made by the assessor were clearly recorded on candidate materials, along with confirmation/amendments by the internal verifier.