# NQ Verification 2018–19

# Key Messages Round 2

## 01 ▸ Section 1: Verification group information

| Verification group name: | Philosophy |
|---|---|
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | June 2019 |

### National Courses/Units verified:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H24J 75 | SCQF level 5 | Arguments in Action |
| H24K 75 | SCQF level 5 | Knowledge and Doubt |
| H24M 75 | SCQF level 5 | Moral Philosophy |
| H24J 76 | SCQF level 6 | Arguments in Action |
| H24K 76 | SCQF level 6 | Knowledge and Doubt |
| H24M 76 | SCQF level 6 | Moral Philosophy |

## 02 ▸ Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

Most centres' approaches were accepted as the majority of centres had used the appropriate and up-to-date unit assessment support packs, August 2016 (version 2.0), downloaded from the SQA secure site.

Two centres had adapted and used the August 2016 (version 2.0) unit assessment support packs. It was evident that such adaptation had not improved accessibility for candidates and they were not more effective in enabling candidates to generate the required assessment evidence.

Some centres had used and adapted previous unit assessment support packs, for example 2014 (version 1.1), making it very difficult for candidates to generate the required evidence as the August 2016 (version 2.0) version has revised outcomes.

## Assessment judgements

For most centres, the judgements made were generally accurate and consistent. However, the following observations are notable.

### Arguments in Action — SCQF level 5

#### Outcome 2.1

While any fallacy can be used in unit assessment, it was apparent that some centres were using examples from older unit assessment support packs and including fallacies from the older course specification. Best practice would be to use the unit assessment support pack dated August 2016 (version 2.0) to generate examples of fallacies and evidence for candidates.

#### Outcome 2.2

The definition of validity and invalidity continued to be problematic for some centres. Best practice would be again to refer to the most recent SQA exemplification of this distinction in the unit assessment support pack dated August 2016 (version 2.0) and in the corresponding judging evidence table where the appropriate accepted definition is given. (Assessment information for candidates (Appendix 1): commentary on assessment judgements.)

### Arguments in Action — SCQF level 6

#### Outcome 1.2

The distinction between inductive and deductive reasoning continued to be problematic for some centres. Best practice would be to refer to the SQA exemplification of this distinction in the unit assessment support pack dated August 2016 (version 2.0) and in the corresponding judging evidence table where the most recent distinction is given.

#### Outcome 2.3

Explanations for this outcome are best given in terms of acceptability, relevance or sufficiency. This was problematic for most centres. Best practice would be to refer to the SQA exemplification of this in the unit assessment support pack dated August 2016 (version 2.0) and in the corresponding judging evidence table where the appropriate terms are specified for inclusion in candidate evidence. (Assessment information for candidates (Appendix 1): commentary on assessment judgements.)

To achieve the required standard for the outcome, candidates now need to directly refer to the terms — acceptability, relevance and sufficiency — to meet the standard required as specified in the judging evidence table.

These observations are made in the light of clarification of these definitions and distinctions as specified in the most recent course specification.

### Knowledge and Doubt — SCQF level 5 and 6

For the majority of centres, the judgements made were generally accurate and consistent.

**Moral Philosophy — SCQF level 5 and 6**

For the majority of centres, the judgements made were generally accurate and consistent.

It was evident that positive and productive learning conversations had taken place between assessors and candidates and that good quality feedback was being generated by many centres and recorded appropriately on the candidate assessment record. It is hoped that this process will continue to develop to the benefit of candidates. Good practice would be for a more detailed record of feedback to be kept by centres and made available to candidates.

It would be best practice for centres to clearly indicate on the candidate assessment where assessment standards have or have not been met as well as recording this information on the candidate assessment record.

It is apparent that most centres continue to use the unit assessment summatively rather than as part of an integrated approach to learning and teaching. Good practice would be for centres to use the unit assessment support packs to assist in identifying and gathering the evidence that assessment standards have been met as part of the learning experience.

## 03 Section 3: General comments

Internal verification continues to be an important and mandatory part of the verification process. Most centres have developed and are using their own departmental procedures. More centres are using SQA guidance on internal verification by using the Internal Verification Toolkit (www.sqa.org.uk/ivtoolkit). Some centres showed evidence of detailed and accurate cross-marking having taken place with careful and informative annotation of candidate evidence and feedback. Centres should be aware that the internal verifier's and assessor's contribution to the process of making the assessment judgments must be clear.

Generally, centres appear to be more confident with respect to successfully managing the internal verification process. There were some good examples of effective internal verification with assessors and internal verifiers working collaboratively to make the appropriate assessment judgments. However, centres should be aware that candidate evidence for a particular standard may not appear where it is expected but may be present in another part of the assessment response.

It is important to note that although units and their relationship with the course have now changed at SCQF level 5 and level 6, they continue to be a valuable support to centres in managing assessment and also in providing an effective pathway for the development of the subject by enabling a gradual introduction of Philosophy courses.