## Internal Prior Verification of Assessment Record

| Course  |   |
|---|---|
| Level   |   |
| Unit name   |   |
| Unit code   |   |
| Outcomes covered by assessment  | 1, 2, 3, and 4  |
| Assessment standards covered  | All   |
| Adapted version of SQA assessment<br>or new centre-devised assessment | Adapted version of UASP Unit-by-<br>Unit Approach (package 1) |
| Assessor (who wrote assessment)                                       | J Smith   |
| Internal verifier   | N Murray (by arrangement with<br>ANother High School)         |

Approaches to assessment should be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair. Each of these principles is explained briefly below.

**Validity** — this is a measure of the accuracy of the approach to assessment; that it is appropriate for its purpose and does what it is intended to do in terms of measuring attainment against Outcomes and Assessment Standards.

**Reliability** — this is concerned with the extent to which the approach to assessment ensures judgements will be consistent from one candidate to the next; from one assessor to the next and from one occasion to the next (eg with a different assessor). Information for assessors on judging evidence supports reliability.

**Practicability** — the approach to assessment is designed so that it is relatively easy to set up and conduct without undue demand on centres, teachers and learners in terms of, for example, context and required resources.

**Equitability and fairness** — assessments must be accessible to all candidates who have the potential to succeed in them and offer candidates equal opportunities to succeed.

| Checklist questions  | Yes/No | Comments   |
|--|--------|--|
| Will the assessment allow<br>candidates to achieve the<br>Outcomes and meet the<br>Assessment Standards?                   | Yes    | Assessment is not<br>significantly different from<br>UASP and all Assessment<br>Standards are adequately<br>covered.   |
| Does the assessment ensure that candidates are not over-assessed?  | Yes    |  |
| Has a judging evidence table/<br>sample solutions/marking scheme<br>been provided?   | Yes    |  |
| Will the <u>assessment</u> allow<br>consistent assessment<br>judgements to be made?  | Yes    |  |
| Will the judging evidence<br>table/sample solutions/marking<br>scheme provide clear and<br>accurate guidance to assessors? | No     | Clearer information is<br>required in the judging<br>evidence table (JET) to<br>ensure assessors understand<br>that 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 must all<br>be met regardless of marks<br>obtained. |
| Will the assessment be practicable to implement with the available resources?  | Yes    |  |
| Are there any barriers to<br>assessment for any groups (eg<br>language used, cultural bias,<br>adaptable format)?          | No     |  |

## Outcome

| Assessment accepted (see note below)              |   |
|---|---|
| Assessment not accepted (see action points below) | х |

**NB** SQA strongly recommends that centre-devised assessments are also submitted to SQA for prior verification. This is not required if it is an adapted assessment which is not significantly different from a UASP or centre-devised assessment on the SQA secure site.

Send assessment to SQA for prior verification: No

## New National Qualifications — Internal Verification Toolkit

| Actions to be taken  | Action by | Action completed    |
|--|-----------|---------------------|
| Revise wording in JET<br>for ASs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3<br>and return to me. | J Smith   | N Murray 20/08/2014 |

Copied to assessor

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_N Murray \_\_\_\_\_ (Internal Verifier)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_20/08/2014\_\_\_\_\_