

Qualification Verification Summary Report NQ Verification 2019–20

Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units verified:

Unit code	Level	Unit title
H24P 73	National 3	Living Environment
H24R 73	National 3	Earth's Resources
H24S 73	National 3	Sustainability
H24P 74	National 4	Living Environment

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Only Round 1 of verification took place this year. All centres had chosen to use the published SQA unit assessment support packs (UASPs). Some centres made minor adjustments to the marking instructions, which is to be encouraged.

Some centres had marked their submission as complete but had not included an outcome 1 report. Please remember that when you are sending just the results for outcome 2 from the UASPs, this is interim evidence. Evidence for outcome 1 is necessary for submissions to be complete.

If you send in photocopied work, the photocopy must be legible and include all of a candidate's work.

You are reminded to use the most up-to-date versions of assessments, which were published on the SQA Secure site in 2018.

Assessment judgements

Rigorous, accurate, and consistent application of the marking instructions is essential. Some centres were not consistent in their application of the marking instructions, which is not acceptable. The marking guidance is not meant to be exhaustive, and centres are encouraged to annotate any minor changes they make to the marking instructions. If a candidate uses correct alternative answers, these should be marked as correct. Remember, however, that any changes made to the mark scheme must be scientifically correct, and at an appropriate level.

Generally, centres had applied the mark scheme accurately and consistently. However, some centres were judged to have been severe in their judgements, particularly at National 3. Centres are reminded to make sure they are marking at the correct level.

Some centres did not show where marks were awarded, just showing how many marks had been awarded but not for which questions they were awarded. You must show where marks are awarded, for both internal and external verification to take place.

Where a marker and an internal verifier differ in their decisions, the final decision made must be clearly shown.

Several centres had sent outcome 1 assessments for verification. Generally, these had been assessed poorly with many incorrect decisions. Centres must apply the evidence requirements correctly and rigorously.

Internal verification was generally good. There was a high level of annotation showing that internal verification was rigorous. Where the internal verifier and the marker do not agree, it is essential that the final decision is shown.

Section 3: General comments

Centres should confirm at the start of the year they are using the most up-to-date assessments, if they are using the unit assessment support packs.

There is no need to internally verify all evidence. An appropriate sample can be verified.

Internal verification was generally good. Many centres showed a high level of annotation showing internal verification was rigorous. Where the internal verifier and the initial assessor do not agree, it is essential that it is made clear what the final decision is.

It is essential that both the initial assessor and the internal verifier are aware of the level of answer expected for each level of qualification, and that both are aware that the marking guidance is not meant to be exhaustive and can be amended by the centre, so long as the marking instructions are annotated to show any amendments.