NQ Verification 2015–16
Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Media
Levels	N3 – Higher
Date published:	October 2016

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

NQ Verification 2015–6
Key Messages Round 1

01 ▶ Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Media
Verification event/visiting information	Event 1 and Visiting Verification
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H235 73	National 3	Media: Analysing Media Content
H235 74	National 4	Media: Analysing Media Content
H238 75	National 5	Media: Creating Media Content
H235 76	Higher	Media: Analysing Media Content

02 ▶ Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Overall, centres had submitted approaches to assessment making good use of the Unit assessment support packs (UASPs). Some centres applied and implemented Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) principles by adapting assessment approaches that took account of the Assessment Standards and guidelines in the UASPs. These amendments to the UASPs were made to fit with specific media content or to be more supportive to candidates with specific learning needs. This can often allow candidates some degree of personalisation and choice as well as depth, breadth and challenge.

A minority of centres had developed their own assessment instruments and these did not fully allow candidates to meet all Assessment Standards.

At Higher level a wide range of texts were being taught and, in a number of cases, centres had chosen to use a thematic approach, which may allow candidates to have a greater degree of personalisation and choice.

Guidance for centres on approaches to assessment

The UASPs for Media set out one possible assessment approach. These can also be adapted for individual contexts or used to help develop new assessments. Centres are encouraged to adapt the assessments and to use alternative approaches to facilitate personalisation and choice. Candidates can also produce evidence during learning and teaching.

For centre-produced assessments or adapted UASPs, which are significantly different, the free prior verification service can be used to ensure they are valid.

If a UASP approach is being used, it should be the most up-to-date version published on the SQA Secure site. Information about updates to NQ Media UASPs can be found in the documents 'Expressive Arts National 3 to National 5 Notification of Changes' and 'Expressive Arts Higher Notification of Changes' on the National Qualifications — Notification of Changes web page.

Assessment judgements

For the majority of centres the judgements being made at levels N3, N4 and N5 are reliable and consistent, showing a good understanding of all Assessment Standards.

At Higher, most centres are now consistently applying assessment judgements which meet the national standard. Candidates are developing more detailed and complex responses which lead to clear analysis and responses which are justified through informed textual referencing.

There is still some confusion over how to overtake Assessment Standard 1.5 in the Higher Analysing Media Content Unit. There is no discrete assessment task for this Assessment Standard; evidence is generated during the tasks for Assessment Standards 1.1–1.4. It is important to remember that candidates must apply knowledge of three key aspects during their analysis of content and contexts or role of media in order to achieve 1.5. For example, it is not sufficient to cover three content-based key aspects only and no context-based key aspects.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

Internal verification

The majority of centres had submitted evidence of internal verification and, in most cases, this had been effective in both supporting the assessor and in ensuring approaches to assessment were valid and assessment judgements were reliable and in line with national standards.

Documentation was generally very well done, especially where centres recorded assessment judgements using the material in the published UASPs. Some centres are developing their own recording profiles based on individual candidate records. This is good practice as it can be used as scaffolding for the candidates and is a clear indicator of how internal verification has been carried out.

As well as ensuring national standards are maintained, internal verification should ensure that assessors are fully supported through the process of internal assessment. Internal verifiers and assessors may find the suggested approach in the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit useful to ensure national standards are maintained, assessors are supported and paperwork is not excessive.

Some examples of 'rich' briefs have been developed in Creating Media Content. These allow the candidate to personalise their response both as to how and what they should research and the level of finish required.

A number of centres showed good practice in the delivery of the approaches and in the manner in which the assessment judgements were generated. These will be exemplified on the Understanding Standards section of the secure website.

A Media Common Questions document is available.

Prior verification

Centres are strongly advised to submit centre-produced assessments for prior verification if these differ significantly from the Unit assessment support packs. This should be requested before assessments are used with candidates.

If a centre has used a prior verified assessment, the verification certificate should be included with material submitted for external verification. Further information can be found on the Delivery Processes and Information for Centres web page.

Verification Sample Form

It is important that this is completed correctly with reference to pass/fail. This does not reflect candidates' final Unit results, just the evidence submitted for verification at that point in time. This is explained at the bottom of the form and in the following examples:

♦ If you have submitted evidence for three Outcomes and the candidate has passed two but failed one, you should insert 'Fail' on the Verification Sample Form. This does not reflect the completed Unit result but only the evidence supplied for verification.

♦ If you have submitted evidence for one Outcome and the candidate has passed that Outcome, you should insert 'Pass' for that candidate even though they have not yet completed the Unit.

NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Media
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

National 4	National 5	Higher
H239 74 Media Assignment Added Value Unit	H238 75 Creating Media Content Unit	H238 76 Creating Media Content Unit

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Round 2 verification focused on the Added Value Unit at National 4 as well as a small sample of Creating Media Content Units from National 5 and Higher.

N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Units

Most centres are using the Unit Assessment Support Packs effectively at all levels. Some centres are customising the Unit Assessment Packs to take into account local conditions in the manner of delivery, eg using a themed approach, allowing the candidates the opportunity for personalisation and choice, whilst maintaining the integrity of the assessment. In most cases the modification of the UASP is minor and does not affect the integrity of the Assessment Standards, but where there are major changes to the assessment tasks, it is recommended that

centres submit these to the prior verification service. This will check validity of the amended or centre-developed assessment instrument to ensure that it allows candidates the opportunity to generate appropriate evidence to meet the Outcome and Assessment Standards. This service is free and available to all centres.

Some centres have developed broad-ranging briefs that allow candidates more choice to demonstrate creative approaches and build on previous knowledge and skills.

At Higher there is a requirement that the level of finish is a completed media product. This would require for example, some edited footage of moving image texts or edited poster etc. For the purposes of verification this evidence should also be submitted as part of the candidate's work.

N4 Added Value Unit

There is no longer a mandatory requirement to use the SQA-produced UASP, but centres should be aware that this UASP has been amended for 2016–17. For centres wishing to develop their own approach to assessment, the use of the Judging Evidence Table in the UASP can provide a guide on how to create appropriate assessment instruments that provide sufficient scope to generate evidence which meets the Assessment Standards. Again, centres that wish to devise their own assessment instruments are reminded that there is a free prior verification service.

A large number of centres made appropriate use of the Judging Evidence Table in their approach to assessment and developed a brief that was appropriate to the teaching and learning in that centre. These generated a range of candidate evidence which was appropriate to achieving and overtaking the Assessment Standards.

In a very small number of cases the content of the centre-devised assessment instruments did not enable candidates to produce evidence which would meet the Assessment Standards.

It is recommended that when devising Assessment Instruments for use in individual centres the details of the Assessment Requirements, which are set out on pages 16 – 19 of the revised UASP, are used for guidance.

Assessment judgements

N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Units

The vast majority of centres have delivered judgements which are reliable.

At Higher, the majority of evidence sampled demonstrated complexity and detail. Many centres have included the feedback given to each candidate; this is useful in demonstrating the positive impact practitioner that feedback has had on the

quality of candidates' responses and in allowing candidates to maximise their potential.

The evidence from some centres, however, requires greater detail in linking the assessment judgements explicitly to the Assessment Standards. In some cases, more use of textual referencing and examples from the created product would improve responses, as would more detailed justification of choices made in terms of technical and cultural coding, content and audience pleasures and expectations.

N4 Added Value Unit

The majority of centres applied the JET accurately to the candidate evidence to produce accurate and reliable judgements.

A number of centres produced interim rather than complete candidate evidence. This is acceptable as candidates may still be completing this Unit. However, in a small number of cases the assessment judgements were inconsistent. This was caused in the main by either the inappropriate adaptation of the UASP resulting in inappropriate or insufficient evidence, or where the evidence from candidates moving from the N5 Assignment to the N4 AVU failed to meet all the requirements for the AVU, particularly in overtaking Assessment Standard 1.1 (Generating ideas in response to a brief) and 1.4 (Reflecting on the Process and the Product), where the demands of N4 are somewhat different to those of the N5 Assignment.

Evidence gathered from the N5 Assignment is acceptable to be used to fulfil the requirements of the N4 AVU, but care must be taken to ensure that Assessment Standards 1.1 and 1.4 have been addressed. Submission of the Assignment alone does not meet all of the Assessment Standards at National 4.

Some centres adapted the Candidate Assessment Records for their candidates to show more clearly how assessment judgements were made by the centre. This is good practice.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

N5 and Higher Creating Media Content Unit

There is significant evidence of internal verification in the vast majority of centres.

Documentation is generally very well done, especially where centres record assessment judgements using individual Candidate Records taken from or adapted from the support packages.

Centres are reminded that the IV toolkit, available here http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/74671.html, provides additional support in ensuring that an effective cycle of quality assurance is in place.

A number of centres showed good practice in the delivery of the approaches, eg a broad brief covering content, purpose and audience allowed candidates to generate evidence taking into account their personal choices and previous knowledge.

Other good practice was identified in the manner in which assessment judgements were generated. For example, some centres used a colour coding system to identify where candidate evidence had met the various Assessment Standards for the unit. This was an effective way to provide support for the candidate while at the same time collecting examples of naturally occurring evidence from across the body of the candidate's work (some examples of this will be published on the Secure site in due course).

N4 Added Value Unit

Many centres showed good practice by providing a brief that could be widely interpreted, thus allowing candidates opportunities for personalisation and choice.

Most centres showed clear evidence of effective internal verification. Comments made by internal verifiers clearly confirmed the assessor's judgement and were supportive of their candidates.

Centres are reminded that they should submit a copy of the brief as part of their evidence.

Centre assessors should indicate which assessment standard they are crediting.

Assessors are reminded that assessment judgements are either pass or fail.

When submitting evidence that had originally been gathered in response to the N5 Assignment, to support the award of N4 Added Value Unit, the evidence must be clearly identified with the N4 Assessment Standard that it is linked to, along with the assessor's judgement of pass or fail.

Centre assessors and verifiers should be aware that the judgement entered on the Verification Sample Form is not necessarily final. There may be time for candidates to be re-assessed.

In a small number of cases at all levels, some centres are potentially disadvantaging candidates through over-assessment. Most centres effectively use a holistic approach, which takes into account naturally-occurring evidence.