

NQ Verification 2015–16

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

Modern Studies — National 3 to Higher

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The most common assessment approach used by centres was the SQA-generated unit assessment support packages. Some centres did submit adapted and self-generated assessments which corresponded to the appropriate learning outcomes for the specific level being assessed.

The unit-by-unit approach appears to be the approach that is used most frequently by centres. Centres are reminded that they can also use alternative methods of evidence gathering such as the portfolio approach.

There was evidence from centres that the SQA documentation (assessment and judging evidence table) was being applied effectively. In some cases, centres were successfully adapting the judging evidence table to meet the specific demands of the assessment task. This personalisation should ensure that consistent assessment judgements between colleagues are being made in centres.

Most of the evidence submitted was 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 standard(s).

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 very effectively in articulating the assessment standard to markers and verifiers. The judging evidence table should be used by centres to ensure consistency of assessment judgements.

There was evidence of centres using best practice such as script annotation at the appropriate point of the candidate evidence where the candidate had achieved the relevant standard. 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 assessment judgement consistency across not just all candidates but also between marker and the centre's verifier of assessment judgements.

There was strong evidence of the candidate assessment record being used very effectively when recording candidate progress and achievements. The candidate assessment record was used very well when recording verbal follow-ups of candidates who just fell short of the assessment standard. Centres appear to be more familiar 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, assessed and the assessment judgement agreed by the centre's verifier.

03

Section 3: General comments

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

There was also evidence of thorough internal assessment and verification procedures. These procedures were robust with evidence of cross-marking and annotation of candidate scripts by both marker and internal verifier. Centres appear to be having detailed discussions regarding candidate performance and the consistent application of assessment standards. Centres are effectively recording candidate performance and progress.