



NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01

Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units verified:

H256 73	Electricity and Energy
H25A 73	Waves and Radiation
H256 74	Electricity and Energy
H258 74	Dynamics and Waves
H25A 74	Waves and Radiation

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres in the verification sample this year adopted the use of the unit assessment support packs (UASPs) available on the SQA secure site. Most centres used the holistic assessment packs, Outcome 2: Assessment activity 2 — test 1 or 2 to make clear assessment judgements on the candidates' attainment.

A few centres used the original UASP approach of assessing knowledge and understanding, and each of the problem-solving skills individually. Using this approach, candidates have to achieve half or more of the knowledge and understanding questions to pass assessment standard (AS) 2.1, and achieve half or more of the questions assessing **each** problem-solving skill to pass AS 2.2.

A small number of centres used an invalid approach to assess outcome 2. Some of these centres had allocated one mark to every question in the original UASP (package 1) to give a total mark of, for example, 11 or 14, and then applied a 50% cut-off score for a pass in outcome 2. The others had allocated one mark to each question and three marks to any calculations in the original UASP to give a total mark and a 50% cut-off score. However, none of these centres had adapted

the original UASPs, as required, by adding additional 'standard three-mark calculation' type questions assessing processing. Neither approach is valid. To use the original UASPs with marks and a 50% cut-off score, they must be adapted by adding additional 'standard three-mark calculation' type questions assessing processing. It is essential where marks are being allocated to questions that the [Physics: General Marking Principles \(2017\)](#) are applied.

However, given that two holistic outcome 2 tests with marks and a cut-off score are available for every unit, centres should use these outcome 2 tests when they wish to assess outcome 2 by applying marks and a cut-off score, rather than attempting to adapt the original UASPs (package 1). This will also be less work for centres.

Centres should use original UASPs (package 1) when they are assessing the knowledge and understanding (AS 2.1) and each of the problem-solving skills (AS 2.2) individually.

Assessment judgements

For outcome 2, candidates can be assessed using the original approach requiring 50% **of** the statements made in support of AS 2.1 to be correct, and 50% of the responses to **each** of the problem-solving types to be correct in support of AS 2.2.

They can also be assessed holistically by using a single assessment, where the candidate is required to achieve 50% or more of the marks for the whole assessment instrument.

To follow the holistic approach centres should use one of the outcome 2 tests available from the SQA secure website, for each unit.

Most centres followed this holistic approach and made accurate and reliable assessment judgements.

Where centres followed the original assessment approach in the original UASPs (package 1), assessment judgements tended to be accurate and reliable.

In a small number of cases, leniency in marking affected assessment judgements. Sometimes this was caused by centres amending the published marking instructions incorrectly or adding additional 'acceptable' responses that were not, in fact, acceptable.

Where centres received a 'not accepted' decision for their assessment judgements, this was mostly because an invalid approach to assessment was used, which meant the judgements were neither accurate nor reliable.

It is important that centres record clear assessment decisions — both on the candidates' scripts and on an appropriate record sheet — that would allow verification of assessment decisions to be made. During the internal verification process, it is vital that the assessor's and internal verifier's judgements are clearly

indicated, and the final decision is made clear, especially where there is any difference of opinion between assessor and internal verifier.

A large number of the centres selected for verification made it clear where internal verification took place and what the final agreed decisions were. This year, evidence of professional dialogue was supplied by many centres.

03 Section 3: General comments

The type of evidence should be clearly marked on the evidence supplied by a centre for verification. When a complete assessment instrument is used, the evidence should be marked as complete, rather than interim, even if a resit is required. The centre assessment decision is made on the evidence supplied for verification, and the final decision made by the centre for each candidate may subsequently change after reassessment.

Where a centre makes adaptations to the marking guidance, it is important that these additions are both clear and correct. Centres should also expect to see units included with numerical answers unless the answer is dimensionless. A few centres had incorrectly annotated marking instructions to say 'unit not required'.

Where it is necessary to adapt an original UASP (package 1) to use holistically, perhaps because in exceptional circumstances a candidate requires a second resit, centres must adapt them by including further processing questions (standard 3 marker type calculations). Centres must apply the Physics General Marking Principles when marking assessments holistically.

It is not a valid or acceptable approach to take the original UASPs (package 1) and simply allocate one mark per question including the calculations, then apply a 50% cut-off score.

Centres should submit the original copies of the evidence produced by the candidates, as this will help with the quality of the evidence available for verification.