



# **National Qualifications**

## **Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25**

### **Religion, Belief and Values Award**

**Verification group number: 119**

## Skills for Work Courses

- ◆ H190 Level 4 Investigating Religion and Belief
- ◆ H196 Level 4 Values in Action
- ◆ H190 Level 5 Investigating Religion and Belief
- ◆ H196 Level 5 Values in Action
- ◆ H190 Level 6 Investigating Religion and Belief
- ◆ H196 Level 6 Values in Action

## General comments

There is a continuing increase in uptake across the country with some centres using the units as part of core provision (S2–S4) and other centres are using them with senior classes. In general, whole-year groups were put forward for the NQ Award at all levels. Overall, the work presented was of a good standard and centres had used a variety of approaches to delivery and assessment.

Some centres are combining the work that candidates complete for the Values in Action unit with their work for the Youth and Philanthropy Initiative (YPI) or Charitas Award, which is acceptable practice and demonstrates the principles of Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) allowing for personalisation and choice. This was displayed in the wide variety of opportunities chosen for ‘faith or values’ being put into action through engagement within the community.

## Course arrangements, unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Most centres had devised their own instruments of assessment in line with the Award and unit specifications. (<https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/57042.html>)

These were generally of a good standard and enabled candidates some degree of flexibility. Some centres had produced booklets that guided candidates through the units, and this continues to be particularly effective at SCQF levels 3 and 4.

A range of support and prompts were provided to candidates ranging from PowerPoints, checklists and exemplar answers, allowing candidates to gauge the depth of responses required at different levels of assessment. Good practice was observed when unambiguous instructions were given to candidates, demonstrating the precise nature of what was required to achieve different levels. For example: ‘Analyse relevant sources to provide an explanation of a religious belief/viewpoint about the topic’ and ‘Explain how studying the topic has had an effect on your own beliefs’.

Some centres provided copies of their own Internal Verification and Malpractice Policy based on SQA documentation found at:

<https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/96858.html>

## **Evidence requirements**

Evidence from 12 candidates of the centre's choice is required at any level for verification. If the cohort is less than 12, all the candidates' evidence is required.

Centres do not need to produce evidence for every candidate presented for the Award. The evidence selected should show where the chosen candidates have achieved the learning outcomes. This means that candidates' work should clearly show where the assessment standards have been achieved on the evidence submitted for verification.

In some cases, detailed checklists and assessment records were made available for the units being verified. Marking schemes and assessment records were, overall, valid and reliable. Most centres supplied their internal verification policy and complete verification documentation including the sample plan and verification feedback to candidates.

It was helpful to the verifiers to see minutes of meetings and discussions over particular outcomes and assessment standards to ensure that these were in line with the national standards.

## **Administration of assessments**

Many centres selected for verification provided paperwork to support their assessment process. There was some evidence of cross-marking within centres and across centres shown with the use of different colour pens and initials of the internal verifiers.

Centres are reminded that assessments are open-book and that the amount of support that a candidate receives can determine the level they are presented at. Centres should refer to the unit specifications for each level as these specify the minimum outcomes and assessment standards required to achieve the award.

Centres should refer to SQA's secure site for further guidance.

([https://secure.sqa.org.uk/login.html?tg=/secure/Awards/Wider Achievement/Religion Belief and Values](https://secure.sqa.org.uk/login.html?tg=/secure/Awards/Wider_Achievement/Religion_Belief_and_Values))

## **Learning and teaching**

All centres clearly demonstrated that they had fully applied and implemented the CfE principles in their approach to learning and teaching, leading to robust assessment judgements.

Centres selected for verification devised appropriate prompts and resources for candidates to allow for different abilities, while also allowing for personalisation and choice, evidenced in the variety of topics chosen for study and engagement with the Values in Action unit.

## **Overall assessment**

Overall, the assessments verified were in line with the national standards based on the Award and unit specifications. (<https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/57042.html>).

In some cases, a detailed paper trail with records of the discussions was submitted, highlighting that an effective internal verification process had been followed.

It is helpful for the verification process that a consistent approach is adhered to in centres where different staff are involved in the assessment judgements, and that there are detailed records and checklists to ensure that judgements are reliable and can be accepted.

## **Verification**

In many centres, there was evidence of cross-marking and professional dialogue between assessors, promoting a consistency of standards in the Assessor Checklist.

Where feedback to candidates was provided, it was positive, highlighting areas of strength and identifying areas for development. This feedback was supportive and constructive, allowing candidates to review and augment their evidence leading to achievement of specific outcomes.

## **Areas of good practice reported during session 2024–25**

- ◆ In most centres, the candidate evidence sheets were well presented and clearly showed the assessment standards. This made the verification process straightforward by providing the correct amount of detail required at the levels submitted for verification.
- ◆ Clear noting of assessment standards on the candidates' evidence is deemed to be good practice, as is the use of different colours of pen for assessors and internal verifiers. These things make the verification process straightforward.
- ◆ Some centres submitted a robust Verification Policy which ensured that standards are being met.
- ◆ Some centres provided detailed records of conversations with candidates as evidence of their meeting specific Outcomes to elicit more information where clarification was needed.

## **Specific areas for improvement reported during session 2024–25**

- ◆ Centres are reminded that the assessment of the outcomes for the Religion, Belief and Values Award should be undertaken using a holistic approach to marking. This may mean that outcomes could be met within candidate evidence at any point.
- ◆ The language used for assessments should always be in line with the relevant level, and centres should remember that the same assessment is not always appropriate for different levels. Centres must be clear about what candidates need to produce to be successful at level 3 and level 4, and the difference between these levels.
- ◆ Centres should continue to ensure that the skills of Analysis and Evaluation have been demonstrated in meeting the assessment standards at different levels, and that all outcome standards are clearly marked on the evidence provided.
- ◆ This award needs time if the unit is to be successfully completed. Units within this award carry the same credit weighting as NQ units, so candidates should have a suitable and reasonable amount of time to engage fully with the aims of the unit, developing their knowledge and understanding and reflecting on the work that they have done.
- ◆ Centres are reminded that assessments are open-book and that the amount of support that a candidate receives can determine the level they are presented at. Centres should refer to the unit specifications for each level as these specify the minimum outcomes and assessment standards required to achieve the award.