



NQ Verification 2016/17 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Verification Event Round 1 - May 2017
Date published:	June/July 2017

National Courses/Units verified

Modern Studies National 4 — Added Value Unit

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The most common assessment used by centres was the SQA Unit Assessment Support Package (UASP). Some centres did submit adapted and/or self-generated assessments which corresponded to the appropriate assessment standards for the specific level that was being assessed. Some of the centre-generated assessments had been prior verified by SQA.

There was evidence of candidates' personalisation and choice in terms of topics/issues chosen for the Added Value Unit (AVU), as well as varied methods of presentation — for example PowerPoint presentations, written reports, posters.

Evidence from centres indicated that the SQA documentation (Assessment and Judging the Evidence Table — JET) was being applied effectively. In some cases, centres were successfully adapting the JET to meet the specific demands of the centre's assessment tasks. This approach should ensure that there are consistent assessment judgements between colleagues and across candidates' evidence within the centre.

Most of the evidence submitted related to written responses to assessment questions. Centres are reminded that naturally-occurring evidence is also a valid

way of assessing candidate performance and progress, provided the candidate evidence corresponds with and meets the appropriate assessment standards.

Some centres are over-inflating the assessment standards for some of the outcomes. Centres are reminded that they should adhere to the specific assessment standards and that it is these assessment standards against which candidates should be judged in terms of achievement.

Assessment judgements

Centres are continuing to make appropriate and valid assessment judgements of candidates' evidence for each of the specific assessment standards and outcomes. These judgements are also being correctly verified as part of centres' internal verification procedures. This indicates that centres are applying and correctly interpreting the unit support documentation.

Centres used the Judging Evidence Table (JET) very effectively in articulating the assessment standard to markers and verifiers. The JET should be used by centres to ensure consistency of assessment judgements.

There was evidence of centres continuing to use annotation effectively on scripts where the candidate has achieved the relevant assessment standard. This is good, effective practice as it can facilitate consistent judgements between colleagues and across candidates' work.

There was also evidence of cross-marking and random sampling of candidate evidence, tied to robust and consistent internal verification policies and procedures. These measures ensure consistent assessment judgement across all candidates, and also between the marker and the verifier.

There was strong evidence of continuing professional dialogue taking place within centres in relation to the judging of assessment standards in line with a robust internal verification process and procedure.

Some centres produced and made good use of workbooks/logbooks in effectively supporting candidates to achieve the assessment standards.

There was strong evidence of the Candidate Assessment Record (CAR) being used effectively when recording candidate progress and achievements. The CAR was also used well when recording verbal follow-ups of candidates who just fell short of the assessment standard. Centres appear to be more familiar with, and confident in using, verbal remediation when re-assessing candidates. Centres should note that when this is the case, they should still follow their own internal verification processes and ensure that the candidate's verbal response is noted and assessed, and that the assessment judgement agreed by the centre's verifier.

Section 3: General comments

Overall, the standard and quality of submissions was high. Centres clearly understand the specific assessment standards, and there was clear evidence of consistent application of these standards between colleagues.

There was also evidence of thorough internal assessment and verification procedures, for example cross-marking and annotation of candidate scripts by both marker and internal verifier. Centre staff appear to be having detailed discussions about candidate performance and the consistent application of assessment standards. Centres are recording candidate performance and progress effectively through detailed and specific Candidate Assessment Records.

For Assessment Standards 1.2 and 1.3 of the N4 AVU, candidates need to show that they are carrying out research (collecting relevant evidence). This can be done in a number of ways, including keeping a log, carrying out and completing a survey and keeping a record of the data generated from the survey, a screenshot, etc. Centres are advised to see page 8 of the National 4 AVU UASP for further detail of expectations for 1.2 and 1.3. Centres should also ensure that there is a specific link between evidence collected and evidence presented in terms of the specific Assessment Standards.