



NQ Verification 2017–18 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Philosophy
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2018

National Courses/Units verified:

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

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All assessment approaches were accepted as all centres had used appropriate and up-to-date unit assessment support pack materials downloaded from the SQA secure site.

Two centres had successfully adapted and used the 2016 unit assessment support packs.

Centres should be aware that they no longer need to achieve prior approval for adaptation to unit assessments but can do so after use.

Assessment judgements

Assessment judgements made were generally accurate and consistent for all eight centres.

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. 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 learning outcomes have or have not been met as well as recording this information onto the candidate record sheet.

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. Best 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

Centres used either the SQA IVToolkit for this purpose, or had developed their own departmental process consistent with the 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 contribution to the process of making the assessment judgements should be clear.

Generally, centres appeared 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 judgements. 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.

Outcome 1.2 in Argument in Action (SCQF level 5) seems to raise issues for candidates and therefore assessors also. Candidates have to give an example of an argument. There is no requirement at this level for candidates to generate their own example of an argument. A candidate selecting an appropriate example would be judged to have met the standard required.

Outcome 2.3 in Arguments in Action (Higher) still seems to raise issues for candidates and therefore for assessors also. To achieve the required standard for the outcome, candidates do not need to directly refer to the terms — acceptability, relevance and sufficiency — to meet the standard required.

It is important to note that, although the role of units and their relationship with the course award have now been changed, 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.