NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01 Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	**Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies (RMPS)**
Verification event / visiting information	**Event**
Date published:	**June 2022**

National Courses/Units verified:

H263 73	National 3	World Religion
H264 73	National 3	Morality and Belief
H263 74	National 4	World Religion
H264 74	National 4	Morality and Belief
H265 74	National 4	Religious and Philosophical Questions

02 Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

During verification the following examples of good practice were observed:

The majority of centres verified at the event were deemed to be either ‘accepted’ or ‘accepted*’. This was encouraging to the verification team as it shows that the majority of centres are consistent in their application of assessment approaches.

Many centres had made positive use of the unit assessment support packs (ASPs) as the basis for their own assessments and had produced assessment materials of a high standard for candidates.

A few centres had developed a system of supportive comments which helped candidates to see exactly what was expected from them in their responses to the assessment prompts. This was often based on materials found in the unit ASPs.

Some centres had used the sample questions that are included in the unit ASP materials as the basis of their assessment materials, and this made the verification process of these assessment approaches straightforward.

A few centres demonstrated a good use of appropriate prompts and resources for candidates to allow for the differing abilities in any group, and this also allowed for personalisation and choice.

Action points

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

When centres devise their own assessment approaches, they should include the actual instrument of assessment in the evidence submitted, as this greatly helps the verification process to take place. This applies to end of unit assessments as well as naturally occurring evidence.

A few centres created assessment approaches which either did not assess the correct assessment standards that they claimed the candidates had attempted, or where the questions used in the instrument of assessment did not actually allow the candidates to pass specific assessment standards.

A few centres used assessment approaches that placed demands on candidates that went beyond the requirements of the assessment standards. This was particularly the case where centres sought to produce assessments that combine different assessment standards and levels. Centres are reminded that assessment prompts should be appropriate to the level being assessed. Using one assessment task to gather assessment evidence for National 3 and 4 candidates may lead to language being either too complex or too simplistic, and therefore candidates may not be given the opportunity to produce work which meets the assessment standard at the level they are working at.

When centres devise their own assessment approaches they should include some exemplar responses in column four of their judging the evidence table for verification, as this can assist the verification team.

Assessment judgements

During the verification event, the following examples of good practice were observed:

The majority of centres verified at the event were deemed to be either ‘accepted’ or ‘accepted*’. This was encouraging to the verification team as it shows that the majority of centres are consistent in their assessment judgements.

The majority of centres submitted candidate evidence that was clearly marked to show where each assessment standard was or wasn’t being met

The majority of centres displayed good practice in clearly annotating and marking to show how they had decided whether assessment standards had or had not been achieved. These annotations were done through:

- highlighting
- underlining
- ticking
- writing of assessment standards numbers
- bracketing
- numbering etc

This was very helpful for verifiers in understanding the process that centres had followed.

There was good evidence of centres having clear internal verification policies, which were applied. This was demonstrated in several examples of very good cross-marking systems and record completion.

A few centres had used ‘discussion with candidates’ as a means of eliciting further information to qualify any achievement of an assessment standard. A record of these discussions supported the centre’s assessment judgements and helped the verification team in their activities. Centres are reminded that it is good practice to submit at least some indication of what the candidates actually said in any discussion, as this helps the verification team to verify the centre’s assessment judgements.

Helpful feedback to candidates on how to achieve a particular assessment standard was used by a few centres to support candidates in their preparation for any re-assessment. This is to be commended.

Action points
The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

Some centres either did not indicate, or did not indicate clearly, exactly where each assessment standard had been met on candidate responses, and this meant that the verification team could not verify the submitted assessment judgements.

The Verification Sample Form was not always completed correctly. A few centres judged their candidates to have ‘failed’ as they had not completed all the assessment standards. However, the evidence that was submitted was interim evidence and the candidate had actually ‘passed’ the assessment standards that had been submitted.

A few centres had judged candidates using the wrong assessment standard, and some centres were not applying the assessment standards accurately. This should be addressed through internal verification in the first instance.

A few centres had overestimated the evidence required to meet the assessment standard and were expecting to see more evidence than was necessary. Centres must ensure that they are familiar with the requirements of each assessment standard.

03 Section 3: General comments

Centres should note that the first step of any internal verification exercise should be to ensure that the centre is using the most up-to-date assessment standards to assess their candidates’ work.

Centres should also check any submitted SQA paperwork to ensure that it is completed correctly. This paperwork (including the SQA checklist) should reflect any evidence that is being submitted.

Centres are reminded that RMPS has a holistic approach to assessment standards and this means that ‘if a candidate broadly meets the requirements of the assessment standards then there is no need for re-assessment’.

Centres are encouraged to take advantage of the SQA prior verification facility when they are creating new approaches to assessment and to refer to Evidence required for external verification of units (including added value units) at verification events if looking for alternative ways to assess and submit candidate evidence.

Centres may want to refer to the NQ Internal Verification Toolkit for further information on internal verification within a centre.