



# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

|                                         |           |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|
| Verification group name:                | Science   |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event     |
| Date published:                         | June 2015 |

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H26A 74      National 4      Science Assignment (Added Value Unit)

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Most candidate evidence submitted for verification took the form of written reports. Some excellent candidate material consisted of both a log/day book and a presentation or report. Although not necessary, it was seen to be a good strategy for overtaking all of the Assessment Standards.

Posters seemed to be an effective means of engaging candidates and many good examples of posters produced by candidates were submitted for verification.

#### Assessment judgements

Centres should ensure that candidate scripts are annotated by the assessor to show where a particular Assessment Standard has been achieved. This is helpful for candidates and for verifiers. Centres should also record reasons for judgements in a clear manner for verification purposes.

Candidates are allowed to redraft their report to ensure that all Assessment Standards have been met, but this would count as a re-assessment opportunity. Good practice would be for the internal verifier to also annotate scripts.

The following specific points relate to individual Assessment Standards.

*Assessment Standard 1.1 — Choosing, with justification, a relevant issue in science*

This Assessment Standard was completed well. The relevance to society was largely well described; however this relevance must be referred to again to enforce the findings.

Some centres submitted evidence for this Assessment Standard in the form of a candidate's log/day book. Although this is not necessary, this was seen as good practice.

*Assessment Standard 1.2 — Researching the issue*

This Assessment Standard was completed well. Centres are reminded of the advice provided previously that full URLs should be supplied when candidates are citing their source of reference. A generic reference, such as [www.bbc.co.uk](http://www.bbc.co.uk), does not give enough direction for the source to be retrieved by a third party. If one of the sources is an experiment/practical activity, then the title and aim should be recorded.

Some centres submitted evidence for this Assessment Standard in the form of a candidate's log/day book. Although this is not necessary, this was seen as good practice.

*Assessment Standard 1.3 — Presenting appropriate information/data*

This Assessment Standard was generally completed well; however, candidates must be encouraged to present some of their information/data in their own way. Hand-drawn graphs and tables are often of a much higher standard than computer-generated tables and graphs produced by candidates. The correct use of title, plotting of graphs, labels and units where appropriate is essential; however candidates should not be penalised if there are only minor omissions/errors to the presentation and there is sufficient detail to convey the information/data. The candidate must present their information/data by using at least **one** method.

*Assessment Standard 1.4 — Explaining the impact, in terms of the science involved*

Candidates must explain at least one impact of the issue on the environment/society. They should use relevant knowledge of science and refer to their processed data/information.

In their report, candidates should be encouraged to relate back to the topical issue.

*Assessment Standard 1.5 — Communicating the findings of the investigation*

A summary paragraph, or conclusion, at the end of the report was often seen to be an effective means of ensuring that the candidate sums up the ideas, issues, findings or conclusions in response to the topical issue and its impact on the environment/society.

## Section 3: General comments

Centre staff are reminded that all centres offering SQA qualifications must have an effective internal quality assurance system that ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards. Centres selected for external verification are expected to provide details of their quality assurance policies and processes.

Centres are advised that it would be effective during their internal verification process to record decisions through discussion with appropriate statements on the candidates' work or an attached pro forma.

Centres are advised that it would be appropriate during re-assessment to have a discussion with the candidate and to record any relevant verbal responses as evidence to overtake the Assessment Standards.