



NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01 Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Mathematics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2022

National Courses/Units verified:

All units from National 3 and 4 Applications of Mathematics
All units from National 4 Mathematics

There is no requirement for candidates to achieve the Added Value Unit at National 4 as part of the course award during session 2021–22.

02 Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres used SQA unit assessment support packs (UASPs). In both Mathematics and Applications of Mathematics, a unit-by-unit approach was favoured. Centres are advised to use the most up to date version of assessments.

Where a centre chooses to devise their own assessment or adapt an existing UASP, they should ensure that the assessment meets the standards described in the appropriate unit assessment support pack. Centres must also create an appropriate method for judging the evidence reliably. Further information can be found in the document entitled [Developing Unit Assessments for National Units](#).

Centres may wish to have assessments prior verified, particularly those that are entirely self-devised. More information can be found on the [NQ prior verification web page](#).

Centres are reminded that unit assessments in Mathematics and Applications of Mathematics should be carried out under supervised, closed-book conditions.

Assessment judgements

Most centres made reliable decisions across the assessments submitted for verification.

In Mathematics and Applications of Mathematics, using a threshold remains the favoured approach rather than judging by assessment standard.

Thresholds are set as follows:

Mathematics

- ◆ Numeracy unit at National 4: 60% for outcome 1 and 60% for outcome 2.
- ◆ For Mathematics at National 4, SCQF levels 5 and 6: 60% for outcomes 1 and 2 combined.

Applications of Mathematics and Numeracy

- ◆ 60% for outcome 1 and 60% for outcome 2. Each outcome requires a separate judgement.

If a candidate does not reach the threshold for a unit or an outcome, it is possible that they could achieve the outcome or unit by assessing the individual assessment standards.

Centres should use the approach that is more favourable for the candidate, even if this means using different approaches for candidates within the same cohort. This may help reduce re-assessment for candidates.

03

Section 3: General comments

Most centres have effective systems for internal verification. In some cases, where the assessor and internal verifier disagreed, the final decision was not clear. A final decision should be made on the candidate's script and record of achievement table.

Care should be taken when recording marks on candidates' record of achievement tables. In some cases, candidates were not awarded outcomes and units that they had achieved. These tables should be checked and updated during internal verification.

In a few cases the internal verification merely confirmed the initial marking and was not effective in improving reliability of judgement.

When considering a candidate's response where an answer has been rounded incorrectly, or truncated, assessors can ignore minor errors where this does not affect the demonstration of the mathematical skill being assessed. As an example, a candidate asked to calculate the area of a circle of radius 2 (12.566...) can be awarded full credit if they truncate their answer to 12.5, as the candidate has demonstrated their understanding of the mathematical skill.

As a further note on rounding, where a candidate has been penalised for incorrect rounding, they should not be further penalised within the same assessment. This does not apply where questions specifically request answers to be rounded.

Working subsequent to an error must be followed through, with possible marks for the subsequent working, provided that the level of difficulty involved is approximately similar.

Centres are reminded to use previous key messages reports ([March 2017](#), [June 2017](#), [March 2018](#)), qualification verification summary reports ([June 2019](#), [June 2020](#)) and the [Mathematics Marking Guidance](#) document to help support reliable judgements.