



NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01 Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units verified:

H235 73	National 3	Analysis of Media Content
H238 73	National 3	Creation of Media Content
H235 74	National 4	Analysis of Media Content
H238 74	National 4	Creation of Media Content

02 Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres are using the unit assessment support pack (UASP) as the basis for assessment at all levels. Most centres are adapting it slightly by reformatting it into a candidate booklet. This is good practice and enables the candidates to see clearly what is required of them and where they are achieving each assessment standard.

Some centres adapted assessment approaches while still using unit assessment support packs as a benchmark. These amendments were made to fit with specific media content or to be more supportive to candidates with specific support needs. This approach can often allow candidates some degree of personalisation and choice as well as depth, breadth and challenge. However, it is important to ensure that any adaptation does not limit candidates' ability to meet the assessment standards. For centres wishing to develop their own approach to assessment, the judging evidence table in the UASP provides the information required to enable the creation of appropriate assessment instruments that allow sufficient scope to generate evidence which meets the assessment standards.

SQA offers a free [prior verification service](#) to centres that [devise their own summative unit assessments](#), or that significantly change SQA's assessments to

suit their particular local needs. The service gives centres additional confidence that their proposed assessment is fit for purpose and meets national standards.

Assessment judgements

The majority of centres made valid and reliable assessment judgements with reference to the unit specifications and judging evidence tables in the UASPs. However, in a small number of cases, assessment judgements were inconsistent. Specifically, there was some inconsistency with the level of description that is acceptable to meet assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2 in the National 3 Analysis of Media Content unit. Whilst the description can be brief, it must be more than simple identification. It is recommended that centres refer to the Understanding Standards materials and commentaries, available on the [National 3 Media web page](#).

Some centres demonstrated good practice by adapting the candidate assessment records for their candidates to show more clearly how assessment judgements were made. A number of centres included copies of judging evidence tables for each candidate, clearly showing how assessment decisions were made. This is good practice and is extremely useful for the candidate, the internal verifier and the external verification process.

Generally, it would be useful to provide a separate internal verification statement and individual candidate records. Centres are reminded that they should submit a copy of the brief as part of their evidence for the Creating Media Content unit. Centre assessors should indicate which assessment standard they are crediting. Centres are also reminded that by offering SQA qualifications, they must have an effective internal quality assurance system which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards.

03

Section 3: General comments

There continues to be some confusion over the definition of content-based key aspects, particularly with regards to Language. Some centres are incorrectly teaching Language as dialogue/text, rather than as technical/cultural codes.

It is generally considered good practice for all candidates to create original images as a production skill in the Creating Media Content unit. Where they are not creating original images themselves their creative choices are limited.

There was considerable good practice demonstrated in the evidence provided by centres, with extensive use of the UASP reformatted into a candidate assessment booklet.

Many centres had good quality assurance procedures in place, with evidence of internal verification through cross-marking with colour-coded comments. Assessment decisions made by assessors were clearly recorded on candidate materials, along with confirmation/amendments by the internal verifier.