



NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Media
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	July 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H235 73	National 3	Analysing Media Content
H238 73	National 3	Creating Media Content
H235 74	National 4	Analysing Media Content
H238 74	National 4	Creating Media Content

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Many centres chose to assess candidates with centre-devised assessments. While this is entirely valid, we recommend centres make use of SQA's free [prior verification service](#). This gives the centre confidence that their assessment is fit for purpose and meets national standards.

If using centre-devised assessments, it is important to ensure that candidates have opportunities to achieve all the assessment standards. If centres use adapted instruments of assessment, they must provide a modified version of the judging evidence table that exemplifies possible responses to the centre-devised assessment.

A number of centres provided opportunities for naturally occurring evidence, enabling candidates to demonstrate their learning and meet assessment standards over an extended period. There was some highly effective use of the combined assessment unit assessment support pack to evidence candidates' work for the Analysing Media Content units.

Assessment judgements

Centre judgements were broadly in line with national standards, and generally reliable and consistent. However, in the Analysing Media Content (National 3) unit, some evidence lacked sufficient detail. Many candidates gained marks for only identification of examples of individual key aspects, however, the judging evidence table specifies 'Describe in some detail'.

Centres may benefit from reviewing Understanding Standards materials, which exemplify the appropriate level of detail. These materials are available on the Understanding Standards section of SQA's secure website.

Section 3: general comments

Candidates generally demonstrated confident understanding of terminology in terms of the key aspects of media and their components. There was some evidence of confusion over terms, for example using language to refer to persuasive techniques rather than technical or cultural codes or muddling narrative and genre conventions. While candidates wrote confidently about target audiences, they continue to find it challenging to describe institutional factors in sufficient detail.

Producing content based on a pre-existing text is generally not appropriate for the Creating Media Content units, as candidates will struggle to demonstrate fully their skills, knowledge and understanding. In addition, coding is not a media production skill, as media conventions are not being considered by the candidate and it is not an appropriate product for assessing the Creating Media Content units.

Many centres had good quality assurance procedures in place. There was evidence of internal verification, as well as cross-marking with media teachers and lecturers in other centres, leading to regular cycles of quality assurance and greater consistency.



NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Media
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	July 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H239 74	National 4	Media Assignment Added Value Unit
H235 74	National 4	Analysing Media Content
H238 74	National 4	Creating Media Content
J297 75	SCQF level 5	Analysing Media Content
J299 75	SCQF level 5	Creating Media Content

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Many centres chose to assess candidates with centre-devised assessments, often using modified versions of the unit assessment support packs. While this is entirely valid, we recommend centres make use of SQA's free [prior verification service](#). This gives the centre confidence that their assessment is fit for purpose and meets national standards.

Many centres submitted National 5 assignments for candidates that were moving level to National 4. While this is valid, it is important to ensure that candidate evidence is assessed against the National 4 assessment standards and that this is indicated on the evidence submitted for verification. This is particularly important to ensure achievement of the level of evaluation required for assessment standard 1.4, which must cover a description of one strength and one area for improvement for both the product and process.

Some centres submitted evidence for National 4 Analysis of Media Content and Creation of Media Content. We remind centres that, if these are being used to assess candidates for the

added value unit, they must give candidates guidance to achieve assessment standard 1.2, relating to purpose.

If using centre-devised assessments, it is important to ensure that candidates have opportunities to achieve all of the assessment standards. If centres use adapted instruments of assessment, they must provide a modified version of the judging evidence table that exemplifies possible responses to the centre-devised assessment.

Assessment judgements

Centre judgements were broadly in line with national standards, and generally reliable and consistent. However, in the added value unit, there is still some confusion over assessment standard 1.1 with reference to 'three ideas'. This is clarified in the unit assessment support pack, in the 'commentary on assessment judgements' column of the judging evidence table.

Section 3: general comments

Candidates generally demonstrated confident understanding of terminology in terms of the key aspects of media and their components. There was some evidence of confusion over narrative structures and theory, particularly in relation to print media.

A wide range of assessment tools were in use to support candidates. Some centres made highly effective use of templates to guide candidate responses while allowing for personalisation and choice and enabling candidates to demonstrate their learning and meet assessment standards.

Many centres had effective quality assurance procedures in place, with evidence of internal verification, as well as colour-coded annotations on candidate evidence. Both assessors and internal verifiers provided constructive, meaningful feedback that supported candidates to achieve the assessment standards.

A number of centres included additional individual candidate record sheets, which further facilitated the verification process. However, a number of centres showed no evidence of internal verification. While this is understandable to an extent, where National 5 candidates are changing level, it is important that centres show quality assurance has still taken place.