



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Verification group name: | Economics |
| Levels | N5 – Advanced Higher |
| Date published: | October 2016 |

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|---|------------|
| Verification group name: | Economics |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | March 2016 |

National Courses/Units verified:

H234 76 Higher Economics: Economics of the Market
H7XX 77 Advanced Higher Economic Markets: Structures and Intervention

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The assessment approaches used by all centres at Higher and Advanced Higher were deemed valid. All centres used SQA Unit assessment support packs or SQA Unit assessment support packs that had been slightly adapted. The Unit by Unit approach was the preferred option.

Assessment judgements

Verifiers found that most of the evidence submitted was of a high standard, with centres having a clear understanding of the national standard. Having considered the evidence submitted in this round, it was evident that:

At Advanced Higher, centres were fully aware of the requirements of the level and made full use of the judging evidence tables to decide whether a candidate had achieved/not achieved the accepted standard. This was reflected in the quality of candidate responses that were accepted and centres should be commended for their rigour in marking these responses.

At Higher, although most of the evidence submitted achieved the required standard, it was evident that some centres were not fully aware of the complexity of responses required to meet the national standard. This was reflected by some of the responses that were accepted by centre assessors. For example, in Higher

Economics of the Market, Outcome 1, Assessment Standard 1.1 — candidates would be required to give an indication of relative scarcity to fully achieve the Assessment Standard. It is insufficient just to mention limited resources and unlimited wants and centres should be aware that if candidates make no reference to relative scarcity they will not have met the national standard for this Assessment Standard.

Similarly, expectations should be raised regarding candidate responses for Higher Economics of the Market Outcome 1, Assessment Standard 1.2. A clear explanation should be given of opportunity cost, making reference to a production possibility diagram. In some instances candidate explanations were unclear and candidate responses did not match the diagrams that had been drawn.

Candidate evidence submitted for each Assessment Standard clearly indicated whether candidates passed or failed. However, some candidate evidence was very leniently marked and centres are reminded to look at the judging evidence tables and marking instructions when marking candidate evidence to ensure that they are marking to the national standard.

03

Section 3: General comments

All centres that submitted evidence completed candidate assessment records effectively. In addition, all centres submitted the instrument of assessment, judging evidence tables and marking instructions with candidate evidence. For this they are to be commended.

It was noted that, although rigorous internal verification was undertaken by most centres that submitted evidence, this was not the case with all centres. A few centres presented candidate evidence that had been cross-marked in a different colour but with no evidence of internal verification. Centres are reminded that they must have an effective internal verification policy in place.

SQA has produced an Internal Verification Toolkit which provides advice and support on designing and implementing the best model and approach to internal verification depending on your subject, centre and candidate needs. It can be found at www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit.

Candidate evidence submitted for each Outcome clearly indicated whether candidates passed or failed. However, some candidate evidence was very leniently marked and centres are reminded to use the judging evidence tables and marking instructions when marking candidate evidence.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Verification group name: | Economics |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | June 2016 |

National Courses/Units verified:

| | | |
|---------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| H237 75 | National 5 | Economics: Global Economic Activity |
| H237 76 | Higher | Economics: Global Economic Activity |

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The assessment approaches used by all centres at National 5 and Higher were valid. All centres used the published SQA unit assessment support packs or SQA unit assessment support packs that had been slightly adapted, which meant that there were no problems concerning the approach to assessment.

The unit-by-unit approach was the preferred option.

In the majority of cases, centres provided very good evidence of internal verification with the evidence double-marked, using different colours of ink, and signed and dated by the internal verifier. Centres are reminded that the internal verifier should mark on the same script as the original marker. In addition, internal verification documentation should show commentaries regarding any differences between the original marker and the verifier, as well as the decision reached.

Assessment judgements

Verifiers found that most of the evidence submitted was of a very high standard with centres having a clear understanding of the national standards. Most centres had marked according to the guidance provided in the unit assessment support packs, however this is not intended to be exhaustive of all possibilities and can be modified. Centres are reminded that any modifications must be noted and must be subject to the same level of internal quality assurance as other assessment judgements. Good practice from some centres included annotating marking guidance with details of acceptable alternative answers.

Having considered the evidence submitted in this round, it was evident that:

- ◆ Many centres were fully aware of the requirements of each level and made full use of the judging evidence tables to decide whether a candidate had achieved/not achieved the accepted standard. This was reflected in the quality of candidate responses that were accepted and centres must be commended for their rigour in marking these responses.
- ◆ Evidence submitted clearly indicated whether candidates had achieved or not achieved each outcome/assessment standard. However, some candidate evidence was slightly leniently marked and centres are reminded that they should look at the judging evidence tables and marking instructions when marking candidate evidence to ensure that they are marking to the national standards.
- ◆ Although most of the evidence submitted met the required standard, it was evident that a few centres were not fully aware of the national standard. This was reflected by some of the responses that were accepted by centre assessors, for example:
 - In the Economics: Global Economic Activity (Higher) unit, for assessment standard 1.3, some candidates did not accurately describe trends in the value of UK imports and the value of UK exports spanning the last five years. Candidates are required to give a description of the trend in the total value of UK exports and the trend in the total value of UK imports and should include figures in this description.
 - In the Economics: Global Economic Activity (National 5) unit, for assessment standard 1.1, candidates should briefly describe what has happened to the level of UK imports and the level of UK exports over the past few years. Candidates are required to give a brief description of whether exports and imports have increased/decreased and the years, for example the level of UK imports decreased between 2011 and 2014 then increased in 2014 and 2016 would be sufficient.

Section 3: General comments

Many centres that submitted evidence completed candidate assessment records effectively and submitted the instrument of assessment, judging evidence tables and marking instructions with candidate evidence. Centres are reminded that they should enclose the instrument of assessment, judging evidence tables and marking instructions along with candidate evidence.

Although most centres that submitted evidence carried out rigorous internal verification, this was not the case with all centres. A few centres submitted candidate evidence which had not been internally verified. Centres are reminded that they must have an effective internal quality assurance system in place.

SQA has produced an Internal Verification Toolkit which provides advice and support on designing and implementing the best model and approach to internal verification depending on your subject, centre and candidate needs. It can be found here: www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit.