



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2019–20

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Mathematics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2020

#### National Courses/Units verified:

All units from National 3 and National 4 (not including Added Value Unit for National 4), for Mathematics and Applications of Mathematics

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Most centres used SQA assessment support packs. At National 3 and National 4 the unit-by-unit approach was favoured. Centres should use the most up-to-date versions of SQA assessments.

Where centres make amendments to either the assessment or marking guidance and judging evidence table, then these should be submitted along with the candidate evidence.

Some centres used a combined approach. When using a combined approach, the submission must include information on how evidence is consistently judged.

In **Mathematics** and **Application 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

- ◆ For Added Value at National 4 — 60% of the total marks **or** 50% of the operational marks and 50% of the reasoning marks

### **Applications of Mathematics and Numeracy**

- ◆ 60% for outcome 1 and 60% for outcome 2

However, if a candidate does not reach the threshold for a unit or an outcome, then they could achieve the outcome/unit by assessing the individual assessment standards.

In all cases, centres should use the approach that gives the most favourable outcome for the candidate.

Where centres have broken down assessments, the validity and reliability of the assessment must be maintained. Further guidance can be found in the document entitled [Developing Unit Assessments for National Units](#).

### **Assessment judgements**

Most centres made reliable decisions across the assessments submitted.

Centres are reminded to use the additional notes in the marking instructions to ensure they are consistent with national standards.

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

Take care when transferring marks from candidates' scripts to judging evidence tables. In some cases, candidates did not achieve a unit they were entitled to. These tables should be updated after internal verification to ensure final judgements are accurate.

Most centres had effective systems of internal verification. In some cases, where the assessor and internal verifier disagreed, the final decision was not clear. A final decision should be made clear on the judging evidence table or candidate script.

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

Centres are reminded to read the guidelines for sending in evidence and to send at least a full assessment standard to verify. It is not necessary to send in all evidence from a candidate.

Centres are reminded to read previous key message reports from [March 2017](#), [June 2017](#), [March 2018](#), [QVSR 2019](#), and the [Mathematics Marking Guidance](#), to help support the assessment process.

When submitting evidence for external verification, centres are reminded that evidence should be complete for at least a full assessment standard. If a centre does not have the evidence required, contact NQ Verification to discuss how to proceed.