



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies</b>
<b>Verification activity:</b>	<b>Event</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>July 2024</b>

### National Units verified

<b>Unit code</b>	<b>Unit level</b>	<b>Unit title</b>
H263 73	National 3	World Religion
H264 73	National 3	Morality and Belief
H265 73	National 3	Religious and Philosophical Questions
H263 74	National 4	World Religion
H264 74	National 4	Morality and Belief
H265 74	National 4	Religious and Philosophical Questions

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

During verification, the following observations were made:

- ◆ Most of the evidence submitted, in terms of approaches to assessment, were valid and in line with the national standards.
- ◆ The most common assessment approach centres used was based on SQA-generated unit assessment support packs adapted to suit the centre.
- ◆ Some centres submitted centre-generated assessments that corresponded to the appropriate assessment standards for the specific level being assessed. The prompts used by these centres helped candidates understand what they had to do to achieve the assessment standards.
- ◆ Most of the evidence submitted was based on written responses to an end-of-unit activity. Centres can also use alternative methods of evidence gathering, such as naturally occurring evidence.

## Action points

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

- ◆ Centres should ensure that the instrument of assessment they use clearly reflects the assessment standards and offers all candidates an opportunity to achieve these in their responses.
- ◆ If devising their own approaches to assessment, centres can use SQA's free [prior verification service](#) to validate their assessment instruments. This is especially helpful for centres that have never been verified by SQA.
- ◆ Centres are encouraged to use success criteria on instruments of assessment prompts more often, as many candidates would benefit from this practice. All the unit support packs contain 'Appendix 1: assessment information for candidates'. This section can further support candidates as they seek to understand and meet the required assessment standards.

## Assessment judgements

During verification, the following observations were made:

- ◆ Most centres continue to make appropriate and valid assessment judgements of candidates' evidence for each of the specific assessment standards, in line with national standards.
- ◆ The majority of centres provided clear judging evidence tables and marking schemes. It is good practice to refer to the current version of the unit assessment support pack when devising evidence tables. Centres should amend column 4 in the judging evidence table to suit the individual context.
- ◆ Some centres effectively annotated evidence where candidate submissions had been deemed to have achieved the relevant assessment standard. This is good practice, as it can facilitate consistent judgements between colleagues and assists the verification process.
- ◆ Some centres used the candidate assessment record effectively when recording candidate progress and achievements. There was also evidence of a few centres providing detailed candidate feedback.
- ◆ A few centres' final decisions about candidate achievement were not clear, as the verification sample form was not completed appropriately.

## Action points

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

- ◆ Some centres used wording in their assessments that over-complicated what was expected from candidates and therefore could have disadvantaged them. The instructions centres give to candidates should support candidates' understanding of the specific assessment standards and what they are required to produce to meet those standards. This also applies to the specific layout of any assessment, as this should not disadvantage any candidate in their response. Centres should refer to 'Appendix 1: assessment information for candidates' in the unit assessment support packs for guidance in this area.

- ◆ A few centres over-inflated the assessment standards when making assessment judgements. This can result in centres applying their own standards and incorrectly judging candidates to have not achieved an assessment standard when they actually achieved the national standard.
- ◆ Some centres submitted more candidate evidence than was needed. This can slow down the verification process, as the verification team reviews all submitted evidence. Centres should carefully consider how much evidence to send to SQA for verification and should only submit evidence for one level per candidate. Centres choose the unit that is to be verified and only need to send evidence from one unit, not every unit that candidates sit. SQA has checklist documents to support submissions for all levels so that the correct amount of evidence is submitted to SQA.

### **Section 3: general comments**

Centres are reminded that RMPS has a holistic approach to the assessment standards. 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 [SQA's prior verification service](#) when they are creating new approaches to assessment, and to refer to [Evidence required for external verification of units](#) if looking for alternative ways to assess and submit candidate evidence.

It is best practice to annotate at the point of achievement within the body of candidate evidence, providing a clear indication of the assessment standard it meets.

Most centres completed the verification sample form appropriately.

Centres should include individual candidate record forms to clarify all assessment standards that have been achieved. This should match up with the decisions noted on the verification sample form.

Centres are encouraged to refer to the feedback and support provided in the qualification verification summary reports on the [RMPS subject page](#) of SQA's website.

If selected for verification, centres should ensure that they submit copies of the following so that the verification process can run smoothly:

- ◆ the assessment task
- ◆ the judging evidence table, adjusted to suit their own needs
- ◆ specific quality assurance processes for internal verification documentation
- ◆ candidates' evidence of meeting the assessment standards, including clearly marked assessor decisions
- ◆ evidence (and comments, where applicable) of the work done by the internal verifier

Centres seeking guidance on internal verification should refer to SQA's [NQ internal verification toolkit](#).



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	July 2024

### National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H266 74	National 4	Added Value Unit — Assignment
J2D5 75	SCQF level 5	World Religion
J2D7 75	SCQF level 5	Morality and Belief
J2D9 75	SCQF level 5	Religious and Philosophical Questions
J2D6 76	SCQF level 6	World Religion
J2D8 76	SCQF level 6	Morality and Belief
J2DA 76	SCQF level 6	Religious and Philosophical Questions
J2BC 77	SCQF level 7	Medical Ethics
J2BD 77	SCQF level 7	Religious Experience

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

During verification, the verification team observed the following examples of good practice:

- ◆ Most centres that were verified at the event were deemed to be either ‘accepted’ or ‘accepted\*’. This shows that most centres were consistent in their application of the national standards.
- ◆ While the majority of evidence submitted was based on written responses to an end-of-unit activity, the verification team were encouraged to see a few centres use alternative methods of evidence gathering by using naturally occurring evidence. This approach is encouraged, as it allows for candidates to achieve the assessment standards needed through existing course work.

- ◆ Many centres used SQA unit assessment support pack materials as the basis for their assessment approach. The verification team were pleased to see that no centres were using out-of-date assessment materials.
- ◆ Many centres used prompts that supported the candidates understanding of what they had to do to achieve the assessment standards.

### **Action points**

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice. Centres are reminded that the assessment standards cannot be changed.

- ◆ When submitting materials for verification, centres must include a copy of the instrument of assessment, as well as some exemplar responses in column 4 of their judging evidence table for verification, as this greatly helps the verification process.
- ◆ A few centres used wording in their assessments that over-complicated what they expected from candidates, and therefore could have disadvantaged them. Centres should give instructions to candidates to support understanding of the specific assessment standards, and what candidates are required to produce to meet those standards. Submitting proposed instruments of assessment to SQA for prior verification is one way of ensuring that all instruments of assessment are suitable for use.
- ◆ If centres are sending in naturally occurring evidence, the verification process should include an explanation of how the tasks, questions or prompts and answer relates to the assessment standards being assessed.

### **Assessment judgements**

During the verification event, the following was observed:

- ◆ Most centres made assessment judgements in line with national standards.
- ◆ Most centres implemented internal verification procedures that were clear and well-laid out, so verifying assessment judgements was a straightforward process. Centres are commended for this consistency of approach.
- ◆ The majority of centres submitted candidate evidence that was clearly marked to show where each assessment standard was met. This was done through highlighting, underlining, bracketing, and numbering. These annotations made the verification process straightforward, and is commended and encouraged.
- ◆ A few centres chose to submit their verification materials digitally. Centres may wish to consider this method of submission in the future, as it is a useful way to send in evidence, particularly posters and mind maps.

### **Action points**

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

- ◆ Some centres submitted excessive evidence in their submissions. This generates extra work for both the centre and the verification team. Centres should use the guidance on evidence required for external verification that can be found on SQA's website.

- ◆ Some centres submitted candidate materials with no indication of where assessment standards had been met, making the verification process impossible. Centres must annotate candidate materials to show where they have assessed the candidate as having attained a particular assessment standard.
- ◆ A few centres did not correctly complete the verification sample form. Centres must insert 'pass' or 'fail' for each candidate in the pass/fail column — 'interim' should not be used here. If the submitted materials are indeed interim materials, the centre must still state whether the candidate has passed or failed.
- ◆ For the added value unit, assessment standard 1.6 relates to the candidate 'presenting their findings,' and does not relate to a conclusion or require a personal opinion. Assessment standard 1.1 is the actual choosing of the topic or issue for study. Assessment standards for the added value unit can be met in both the research stage and the presentation of findings stage.

### **Section 3: general comments**

Centres are reminded that the purpose of verification is to review a centre's assessment and determine whether the approach to assessment and the assessment judgements are sound. The role of verifiers is not to re-assess candidates work, but to consider if the centre's assessment approach is valid and if it has made assessment judgements reliably. This process cannot be carried out if the candidate work is not clearly annotated, showing where each assessment standard has been met.

Centres are encouraged to take advantage of SQA's free prior verification facility when creating new approaches to assessment, and to refer to the document [Evidence required for external verification of units at verification events](#) if looking for alternative ways to assess and submit candidate evidence.

Centres should note that they cannot use another centre's prior verified material and claim it is prior-verified. An SQA prior verification certificate only applies to the original submitting centre.

A few centres submitted 'naturally occurring' evidence for their candidates rather than an end-of-unit assessment or test. This allowed them to send materials that the candidates had produced throughout the unit without the candidates having to sit an extra assessment. Materials including extracts from jotters and essays, posters or leaflets done as part of a class activity, and slide presentations done in class were collated as evidence. The centre then notated on these materials where the assessment standards had been met and submitted these materials to SQA. This approach is one that centres may wish to consider.

Unless units are being taught over two academic years, it is expected that, by round 2, more than one of the unit assessment standards should be available and submitted for verification.

Centres' SQA co-ordinators receive information about verification selection and the dates that are related to each round of verification through SQA Connect or by email. General information on external verification can be found on [SQA's website](#).

Centres may want to refer to SQA's [NQ internal verification toolkit](#) for further information on internal verification within a centre.