



# **NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports**

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Modern Studies</b>
<b>Levels</b>	<b>N4 – Higher</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>October 2016</b>

**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:	Modern Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2016

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H23F 74, 75, 76	Social Issues in the UK
H23G 75, 76	International Issues
H23C 74, 75, 76	Democracy in Scotland and in the UK
H7X4 77	Contemporary Issues

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

A variety of assessment approaches were used by the centres chosen for Round 1 verification. The most common assessment approach used by centres was the SQA-generated Unit assessment support package. Other centres successfully modified or adapted existing questions to suit their specific assessment needs. Centres that took this approach used appropriate question prompts and scaffolding to fully inform the candidates of the assessment requirements to achieve the specific assessment and learning outcomes.

The Unit-by-Unit approach appears to be the approach that is used most frequently by centres.

#### Assessment judgements

Centres are continuing to make appropriate and valid assessment judgements of candidates' evidence. These judgements are also being correctly verified as part of centres' internal verification procedures.

Centres used the judging evidence table very effectively in articulating the Assessment Standard to assessors and verifiers. The judging evidence table, or similar, should be used by centres to ensure consistency of assessment judgements. Centres should consider amending column 4 of the judging evidence table in order to provide exemplars specific to the question being asked or task being set. Again, this ensures assessment judgement consistency across not just all candidates but also from the marker and the centre's verifier of assessment judgements.

There was strong evidence of the Candidate Assessment Record being used very effectively when recording candidate progress and achievements. The Candidate Assessment Record was used very well when recording verbal follow-ups of candidates who just fell short of the Assessment Standard.

03

### **Section 3: General comments**

Overall, the standard and quality of centre submissions was high. Centres seem confident in adapting or modifying existing questions to suit their assessment needs. Centres clearly understand the specific Assessment Standards and there was clear evidence of consistent application of these standards.

There was also evidence of thorough internal assessment and verification procedures. These procedures were robust with evidence of cross-marking and annotation of candidate scripts by both marker and internal verifier. Centres appear to be having detailed discussions regarding candidate performance and the consistent application of Assessment Standards. Centres are effectively recording candidate performance and progress.



# NQ Verification 2015– 16 Key Messages Round 2

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Studies
Verification event/visiting information	Verification Event Round 2 - AVU
Date published:	May/June 2016

**National Courses/Units verified: Modern Studies National 4 - AVU**

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

The most common assessment approach used by centres was the SQA-generated Unit Assessment Support Packages (UASP).

The unit-by-unit approach appears to be the one that is used most frequently by centres.

Centres who adapt existing questions are encouraged to use appropriate question scaffolding that corresponds to the outcome(s) being assessed. This ensures that the candidate is fully aware of the assessment criteria that need to be met to achieve the appropriate outcome or standard.

There was evidence from centres that the SQA documentation (Assessment and Judging the Evidence Table) was being applied effectively.

There was a variety of evidence submitted which included very effective and appropriate naturally-occurring evidence such as poster work and PowerPoint presentations. Centres are reminded that naturally-occurring evidence is a valid

way of assessing candidate performance and progress, provided that the candidate evidence corresponds with and meets the appropriate Assessment Standard(s).

## **Assessment judgements**

Centres are continuing to make appropriate and valid assessment judgements of candidates' evidence for each of the specific Assessment Standards and Outcomes. These judgements are also being correctly verified as part of the centre's internal verification procedures.

Centres used Judging Evidence Tables (JET) very effectively in articulating the Assessment Standard to markers and verifiers.

There was evidence of centres using best practice, such as script annotation at the point in the candidate evidence where the candidate had achieved the relevant standard. There was also strong evidence of cross marking and random sampling of candidate evidence tied to robust and consistent internal verification policies and procedures. These measures ensure the consistency of assessment judgements across not just all candidates but also between marker and the centre's verifier of assessment judgements.

There was strong evidence of the Candidate Assessment Record (CAR) being used very effectively when recording candidate progress and achievements. The CAR was used very well when recording verbal follow-ups of candidates who just fell short of the assessment standard.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Overall, the standard and quality of centre submissions was high. Centres clearly understand the specific assessment standards, and there was clear evidence of consistent application of these standards.

There was also evidence of thorough internal assessment and verification procedures. These procedures were robust, with evidence of cross marking and annotation of candidate scripts by both marker and internal verifier. Centres appear to be having detailed discussions regarding candidate performance and the consistent application of assessment standards. Centres are effectively recording candidate performance and progress.