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Confidentiality

Pass marks and marks distributions and the performance of centres and individual candidates are confidential and must not be discussed with or revealed to anyone not involved officially with the examination procedures in the Course concerned. In particular, details of marks and results must not be made available to unauthorised persons (eg including members of other examining teams).
Outline of Main Examination Procedures

1. Selection of Markers
2. Procedural Programme
3. Examination
4. Preparation for Markers’ Meeting/Photostat Selection
5. Markers’ Meeting
6. Marker Check/Standardisation
7. Cut-off Score/Pass Mark Determination
8. Finalisation
9. Issue of Results
10. Assessment Appeals
1 Overview of Examination Procedures

The following notes provide a general outline of the examination Procedures. Queries or requests for clarification about these should normally be raised in the first instance with Jack Greig, Head of Operations (ext 6841).

The full range of procedures does not require to be operated in the same way or to the same extent in every Course; in some Courses certain procedures may not be required. It is for the Principal Assessor to consider for example whether or not a meeting of all markers is required or if one for new markers only will suffice. The Principal Assessor should also consider the amount and nature of the preparation required for a meeting and whether or not this should necessarily involve the use of photostats.

These issues should be discussed and clarified at an early stage.

Selection of Markers

The selection of markers for the forthcoming examinations is normally carried out in September, on the basis of the entry estimates available at that time. Those who marked at the previous examination and whose performance was satisfactory will usually be selected for appointment at the forthcoming examinations. Those whose performance was less than satisfactory will not normally be re-appointed, but “doubtful” SCE Higher markers may be selected to mark at Standard Grade if they have previous satisfactory marking experience at that Grade.

Procedural Programme

Around the same time, the Principal Assessor also receives provisional details of the dates for the procedures based on the experience of the recent diet of examinations. Within the scheduling exercise the proposed date of the markers’ meeting is critical; this should be the earliest possible date after the examination day in order to ensure the earliest possible date for completion of the marking (two weeks later or, if less than two weeks, a period including two weekends). Delay has repercussions for the remaining procedures.

The procedural programme is compiled as a whole for each Course and level taking into account various factors including the delivery date of scripts to markers which is usually on the third working day following the examination date.

As a general rule there is little flexibility in determining the dates of the later procedures, but cases of difficulty should always be discussed with our staff in order to arrive at the best available solution.

Details are normally finalised by the end of the year and accommodation is then reserved for the procedures on the basis of the agreed dates.

A personalised programme is issued to each member of the examining team on the basis of the Principal Assessor’s selection of the members to be involved in the respective procedures.
The working day for Examiners is arranged in three-hour sessions, usually from approximately 9.30 am to 12.30 pm and from 1.30 pm to 4.30 pm. There is also the possibility of an evening session from 5.00 pm to 8.00 pm the normal closing time of the offices. The evening session can be extended beyond 8.00 pm, particularly when this would remove the need for attendance the following day. These exceptions should be raised with Ann Brand (ext 6858) in the first instance.

Preparation for Markers’ Meetings

This process is concerned with the refinement of the marking instructions and usually involves reference to examination scripts. It is not undertaken as a formal exercise by all teams and may as necessary take place outside of SQA in which case there may not be access to examination scripts.

Use of scripts requires the team to come to SQA’s offices at Dalkeith, usually on the second working day after the examination date. A sample of scripts is provided, either randomly selected on the day or on the basis of lists submitted in advance.

Photostats

In some Courses full scripts or parts of scripts are selected for photocopying for use at the markers’ meeting to illustrate, or provide the basis for discussion of, particular features of the marking requirements. The selection process is greatly assisted by the advance provision of a list of the centres which the examining team considers will be most likely to yield the categories and types of script being sought; this is especially important where the script copies are to be issued to the markers in advance of the meeting.

Markers’ Meeting

The main purpose of the meeting is the review and finalisation of the Detailed Marking Instructions in the light of queries arising from a preliminary reading of the scripts in the few days prior to the meeting.

The opportunity can also be taken as necessary to pass on or clarify any administrative details or requirements.

A note of the attendance is required and details of any changes to the printed Detailed Marking Instructions must be passed on to Clare Hickson of the Question Paper Unit at Dalkeith. Under no circumstances may a change be agreed in the allocation of marks as printed in the question paper without prior consultation with SQA.

To minimise travelling demands, the venue for the markers’ meeting will, where possible, take account of the home addresses of the markers, subject to the availability of accommodation, and facilities required etc.

Feedback from the Principal Assessor regarding the adequacy etc of the venue and any other aspects of the arrangements is very helpful.

Central Marking

As the name implies these procedures will take place at a central location rather than in the marker’s home. Marking takes place under the direct supervision of the Principal Assessor who will monitor the performance of each marker in terms of application of the national standard and work rate. Should the
Principal Assessor observe any deviation from the national standard, the marker concerned can be advised immediately and appropriate remedial action taken. Because of this, our procedures for the adjustment of marking after it has taken place are unnecessary, i.e., there is no marker check, standardisation or finalisation after the event. Scripts are not pre-allocated, markers simply draw on the pool of script packets.

Standard Grade, Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher Marker Check and SCE Higher Standardisation

These are procedures to confirm whether or not markers have applied the Detailed Marking Instructions accurately and consistently.

The Standard Grade, Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher marker check is carried out on the basis of a scrutiny of a few scripts to identify any marker whose work may require closer attention at the finalisation stage.

At SCE Higher the team scrutinises a small sample of each marker’s scripts and in the light of this makes recommendations as necessary to correct individual variations of leniency or severity of marking.

At the pass mark stage the Principal Assessor reviews the preliminary findings together with computer produced data before finalising the standardising factors.

In both cases it is expected that the vast majority of markers will produce acceptable marking. Only the occasional marker who deviates seriously from the marking scheme is noted for later attention at Finalisation.

The process should therefore normally involve simply a scrutiny of a sample of about three of each marker’s scripts. Re-marking of scripts is not normally required, but it is accepted that in some Courses there may be a preference for determining markers’ standards by completely re-marking randomly chosen scripts.

In the very exceptional event that completely unacceptable marking is discovered, approval may be given for the marker’s whole allocation to be m-marked but this always requires prior discussion with SQA at a senior level.

**Marker Script Referrals**

In the course of the routine clerical checking of the marked scripts to confirm the addition and recording of the marks, scripts containing queries from markers are set aside. These scripts should be cleared by the examining team during attendance for Marker Check/Standardisation.

**Cut-off Scores and Pass Marks**

The Qualifications Manager concerned will assist and guide the Principal Assessor with the formulation of recommendations to the Chief Examiner for the setting of the Cut-off Scores/Pass Marks. These recommendations will take account of the Principal Assessor’s overall views of candidate/marker performance which have emerged in the course of the earlier procedures and markers’ reports.
This stage also provides the opportunity for Principal Assessors to consider again data relating to individual SCE Higher markers to confirm the earlier standardisation findings and to identify any cases that might require further review at the finalisation stage.
**Finalisation and Review** Case Check (including Absentee and Special Assessment Arrangements Consideration)

Scripts are selected for final scrutiny on the basis of the information produced at Marker Check/Standardisation.

Standard Grade, Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher scripts are listed and supplied to the examining team in terms of “priorities” starting with cases where the review is more likely to produce a change in the award from the original marker.

**SCE Higher** scripts are selected from an agreed range of marks below the pass mark.

At this stage awards to absentee candidates are also considered and any required review or finalisation of the marking of Special Assessment Arrangements cases is carried out.

**Issue of Results**

When the last review cases have been finalised a series of computer operations are conducted. Changes to awards are processed followed by an automatic review on the basis of a comparison with the centre’s estimates. Any remaining entry queries are also resolved and the Course-based results tiles are then collated to produce candidate-based tiles in preparation for the production of the Certificates. When the various control procedures and checks have been satisfied Certificates are printed. While this is taking place the Statements of Candidates’ Results are produced for issue to centres and education authorities. In addition results tapes are made available to UCAS to assist the processing of university entrance applications.

These various operations and processes are co-ordinated around the target date - usually just over two weeks or so after the last examining team has completed finalisation - on which the Certificates are to be delivered to the candidates. This delivery exercise is itself conducted in close liaison with Royal Mail Letters.

When the results have been issued each centre receives some preliminary statistics of their entry and passes etc. In addition Appeal request forms are issued a few days later. These forms are designed to provide general information to departments in centres and also to simplify the identification and submission of appeals.

**Grading of Markers**

On completion of the examination process markers are graded in terms of their suitability for re-appointment by SQA. This process is essentially concerned with their performance as a marker but account should also be taken of other relevant factors such as inaccurate summation of marks, failure to complete the marking by the due date and/or the unexpected return of unmarked scripts around the end of the intended marking period; details in this connection are supplied by Operations Unit.

**Assessment Appeals Consideration**

Assessment appeals enable centres to provide SQA with alternative evidence in cases of lower than expected examination performance. They also act as the final mechanism for detecting and connecting any marking error in a candidate’s script.
The procedure is usually carried out at Dalkeith in September on dates arranged by Operations Unit. It should be completed in time for results to be issued by the end of the month. Centres with cases involving entry to university or college receive priority to ensure the results are intimated to the body concerned as soon as they are available but no later than 20 September.

Performance Reports

There may also be an occasional request from a centre for provision of additional information to explain unexpectedly poor performance in a Course/element. In approved cases any related correspondence is made available to enable the Principal Assessor to compile a report.

Principal Assessor’s Report

This should be prepared on completion of the examination procedures and is normally submitted in mid-August for the consideration of the Assessment Panel at a meeting held in the autumn.
Markers’ Meetings: Instructions to Conveners

Appreciation

Please convey our appreciation of the services provided by markers. We are conscious of the high quality of marking in general, of the high level of consistency in standards and of adherence to instructions on which, in the end, the reputation of the examination depends. Thank markers for the conscientiousness with which they have in the past carried out their duties and for the co-operation which they have shown and on which we will continue to rely.

General Arrangements

Smoking

Smoking is not permitted at markers’ meetings. Before the meeting ascertain whether or not a short break will be required outside the meeting room for this purpose and whether or not appropriate facilities can be provided. (In SQA’s offices, there is a designated smoking area.)

Distribution of Additional Scripts

A member of our administrative support staff will be in attendance at the start of the meeting and will arrange with you a suitable time for the distribution of additional scripts to markers.

Attendance

We will provide a list of markers at each meeting for use as an attendance register. The register, indicating clearly those present, should be handed at the end of the meeting to our administrative support staff in attendance. If there is no support staff present, the register should be left for collection. Attendance at the meeting is a condition of the appointment; a marker who fails to attend will not be permitted to mark.

Late Arrival

A marker who arrives after the meeting has started but who can be adequately briefed during a break or at the end of the meeting may continue to mark. A late arrival who cannot be adequately briefed may not be permitted to mark however valid the reason for arriving late. (Travel expenses will still be met if the validity of the reason for late arrival is accepted.)

Completion of Marking

It is essential that markers complete their allocation of marking by the specified date. Any marker who foresees difficulty in completing marking by the due date, for whatever reason, should be reminded to follow the instructions forwarded to them with their allocation.

Return of Marked Scripts

To enable arrangements to proceed according to the programme it is imperative that all markers adhere to the instructions for the return of scripts. In particular, examining team members must be told not to wait until they attend for Marker Check/Standardisation procedures to return their
first batch of marked scripts. Markers who encounter any difficulties in this connection should be asked to inform Sylvia Stevenson, Direct Line 0131461 6877 immediately.

Finalisation of Detailed Marking Instructions

The mark allocation of individual questions or of elements shown on question papers may not be changed without the prior approval of SQA. Impress upon markers that decisions taken at the meeting are final and supersede or augment any previously issued detailed marking instructions. We require for our records a copy of the detailed marking instructions as finalised at the meeting. Mark the record copy as such and pass it to our administrative support staff in attendance at the end of the meeting, or send it to Clare Hickson at Dalkeith soon thereafter.

Markers' Reports

Remind markers that they must complete a Report and at the same time draw to their attention the arrangements for its return in the envelope provided. The Report should not be included in a script envelope.

Approval of Additional Duties

Our prior approval must be sought before markers are asked on behalf of the Principal Assessor or examining team, to undertake any duties other than those normally required of them.

Enquiries

Give a note of any points which you are unable to deal with to our administrative support staff in attendance, who will then obtain the required information.

Recording of Marks

Photostats

Where complete candidate submissions such as projects, investigations, etc are used as photostats, instruct markers to award the final mark agreed at the meeting for such pieces if any feature in their allocation of scripts. These items will be identified as “Selected for Photostat” when they are forwarded to the marker.

Answer Books

Stress that marks must be recorded clearly in the appropriate column(s) provided; eg in the case of Standard Grade where more than one element is being marked, the marks awarded for the first element should be entered in the first column and the marks awarded for the second element should be entered in the second column. The grid on the outside back cover of the answer book should be completed to indicate the marks awarded for each question. The total mark for a paper should be entered in the Total box on the front cover of the answer book. (The total mark must be given as a whole number, where necessary by the process of rounding up.) Emphasise the need for markers to check carefully all additions, by summing marks from the first to the last page of the script and then from the last to the first page. The transcription of marks, within booklets and to the Mark Sheets, should also be checked.
Where supplementary items are enclosed inside answer books (e.g., square-ruled paper), instruct markers to indicate clearly on each item that it has been considered and to include any marks awarded on the answer book against the candidate’s answer to the same/related question.

Remind markers that where there is more than one submission for a candidate these are placed one inside the other.

The “For Official Use” section on the front cover of the answer books is provided for the entry of an explanatory note from markers when referring cases to the Principal Assessor.

Mark Sheets

Go over the instructions on completion of these Mark Sheets. In particular, remind markers of the need to record marks legibly and that they must enter their “Marker Number” correctly and clearly on each form.

Mark Sheet Substitutes

Remind markers that as a safeguard against the loss or damage to scripts and mark sheets while in transit, it is important that the Mark Sheet Substitutes be completed with the basic information required.

Please point out the change to the procedure this year for the completion and return of the substitutes. As explained in the general instructions it is the Packet ID number (located underneath the grid on the mark sheet) that should be entered instead of the centre number in the appropriate box. Once completed the substitutes should be retained for two weeks after the script return date and then destroyed. There is no need for them to be returned to us.

Summary of Points to be Drawn to Markers’ Attention

a. Complete marking by the date specified or inform SQA immediately it is known that this is not possible, giving reason.

b. Record marks clearly on scripts (and any additional sheets) and in the case of Standard Grade Courses, in the appropriate columns/sections.

c. Check carefully to ensure that all totaling of marks is correct and that totals are transcribed accurately to the Mark Sheets.

d. Do not use fractions in totals for papers.

e. Decisions reached at the meeting are final and binding.

f. Submit a brief Report in the envelope provided and enclose it with the last batch of marked scripts.

g. Ensure Mark Sheet Substitutes are completed with the basic information required,
Central Moderation of Internal Assessment

Standard Grade

Introduction

The purpose of these notes of guidance is to provide Principal Assessors and Senior Moderators with information which will assist them in preparing for and supervising the conduct of central moderation procedures. The notes should be read in conjunction with the detailed “Notes of Guidance to Moderators”, the Moderator’s Worksheet and Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment).

Procedural Arrangements

a. Central moderation will be carried out in SQA’s offices at Dalkeith on the dates previously intimated to members of the moderating team.

b. Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should ensure that all members of the moderating team are aware of the purpose of the moderation procedure and of the way in which moderation will be conducted. A copy of “Notes of Guidance to Moderators” and any area specific instructions will be provided for each team member.

c. Members of the moderating team must apply the same standard in their assessment of the sample of work submitted by each centre. Consequently, before moderation begins, the moderation team itself should be standardised. To this end a selection of photostat candidate submissions will where required be provided for the use of the moderating team.

d. Moderators must not moderate work from their own centre or exception centres.

e. Before any amendments are made to a centre’s grades, the moderator will be required to indicate on the Worksheet the reason(s) why the centre’s assessments should not be accepted and to suggest the action required to bring assessments into line with the national standard. The moderator will then discuss the matter with you. Where you agree with the moderator’s decision you should give permission for the relevant grades to be amended by signing the Worksheet for the centre concerned. You should then complete a copy of Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment) for issue in due course to the centre. In completing Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment), you should give clear and specific instructions to the centre as to what action is required. Where it is deemed appropriate comments on particular aspects of an individual candidates’ performance may be included on Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment). Comments should be professional, constructive and unambiguous. A template of Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment) will be available on computer and Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should use this when preparing feedback to centres. (Instructions on use of the template will be provided by our staff.) Where paper copies of the form are used, instructions/comments should be written legibly in ink. Copies of Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment) should be completed during the course of the moderation exercise.
Where reassessment is deemed necessary, the grades for the candidates in the sample will be amended by the moderator and all remaining reassessments will be carried out by the centre concerned.

You will be required to monitor the performance of each moderator and to note his/her suitability for future employment. A form will be provided for this purpose.

When moderation has been carried out for all of the centres concerned, you should ensure that:

- all copies of the Moderator’s Worksheet have been properly completed;
- where necessary, grades shown on Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) have been amended;
- copies of Internal Assessments/Form Ex5 - Supplement (Re-assessment) have been completed for issue to those centres whose assessments have not been accepted;
- details of any matters requiring the attention of our staff have been noted.

Before leaving SQA's offices, you should inform the administrative support staff that the moderation exercise has been completed.

A report on the operation and outcome of moderation of internal assessment should be submitted to SQA's offices at Dalkeith within two weeks of the completion of the procedure.
Notes of Guidance to Moderators

Standard Grade

General

Moderation is concerned with confirming that a centre has carried out the grading procedure correctly according to the published “Arrangements” and the GRC for the element concerned. Moderation is not intended to be a regrading or double-grading exercise concerned with altering the centre’s grading of individual candidates’ work.

Moderation of Assessments

The following will be provided:

a. Samples of candidate’s work from a sample of centres. The samples of work should have been selected on the following basis:

Where thirteen or more candidates have been entered an asterisk (*) will appear against the name of one candidate listed on the Internal Assessment Form. From this point on the list, the centre should have selected the first two candidates in order of listing on the Internal Assessment Form for each of grades 1-6. Where the centre has submitted grades for 12 or fewer candidates, the work of all candidates should have been submitted, irrespective of the grades awarded. Where grades have been entered on the Internal Assessment Form for more than 12 candidates but with less than 2 on any grade, the sample of 12 should have been made up by the addition as appropriate of one candidate for each grade in order of listing on the Internal Assessment Form in the following sequence of grades - 3, 2, 4, 5, 1, 6, (3, 2, 4, 5, 1 for Biology, Chemistry and Physics) - with repetition as necessary

b. A Moderator’s Worksheet to record all working, comments and decisions in connection with the moderation of the centre’s sample.

Any notes on an individual candidate’s work should be written on the worksheet provided and not on the candidate’s Internal Assessment (Flyleaf).

c. A Moderator’s Report form.

Procedure

For each centre proceed as follows:

a. Clerical Check

i. Where appropriate, start by checking the sample of work for any “arithmetical” error on the centre’s part in arriving at the overall grades. An arithmetical error is one which occurs in the process of determining the assessment grade (wrong summation/application of a formula) as distinct from an “assessment” error (where a wrong grade is awarded prior to the process). Resultant correction(s) should be recorded on the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) in green ink and the words “Arithmetical Error”
entered alongside the amended grade(s) and also on the outside of the envelope containing the sample.

ii  Where an arithmetical error is found in the sample the centre will be contacted by us and advised to check its calculation of the grades for candidates not in the sample. Where such action is required, the "Arithmetic Error - Not Accepted" box on the Moderator’s Worksheet should be ticked.

It is emphasised that this is the only grade change which may be made on the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) at this stage.

b  Assessment Check

Initially you will scrutinise the work of 6 candidates, one at each of grades 1-6, Where there are “empty” grades, the sample should be made up to 6 by adding an appropriate candidate for each grade, following the sequence of selection outlined above.

i  You should number the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) in green ink to correspond with the number on the Worksheet against which the candidate’s grade particulars are to be entered.

As each candidate’s work is assessed, enter on the Worksheet the grade which you would award and also that awarded by the centre. The grades should be compared, noting 1 point for a one grade discrepancy, 2 points for a two grade discrepancy and so on, in the appropriate column on the Worksheet. These points should be added together and the total entered in Box 1. Where the points total for all 6 candidates is no more than 3, the centre’s internal assessments as a whole are deemed to be satisfactory and no further scrutiny is necessary. You should indicate on the Worksheet that the centre’s internal assessments have been accepted and sign the Worksheet.

ii  Where the points total entered in Box 1 is greater than 3, the work of the remaining 6 candidates in the sample should be assessed.

Compare the grades for all 12 candidates in the sample and calculate the discrepancy pointage as in (i). The total should be entered in Box 2.

Where the overall total is no more than 6, the centre’s internal assessments as a whole are deemed to be satisfactory and no further scrutiny is necessary. You should indicate on the Worksheet that the centre’s internal assessments have been accepted and sign the Worksheet.

iii  Where the discrepancy points total is greater than 6, the position at each grade should be considered. At this stage it may be helpful to consider any comments entered by the teacher on the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf). Where, after such consideration, the awards at any particular grade are considered to be satisfactory, all of the internal assessments at that grade can be accepted and confirmed. In such cases, the appropriate information should be entered in the “Moderator’s Comments” box in Section B of the Worksheet.
For each grade where there is concern, it will be necessary for reassessment to be carried out by the centre.

iv Where the sample comprises less than 6 candidates’ work, the following discrepancy points total should be applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Acceptable Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v Where you consider that the centre’s grades cannot be accepted, your reasons should be given in the “Comments”, box and the matter brought to the attention of the Principal Assessor or Senior Moderator. If your decision is confirmed, the PA or SM will sign the Worksheet and, where appropriate, you should amend, in green ink, the grades awarded on the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) to candidates in the sample.

vi When the moderation procedure has been completed for a centre, sign the Worksheet.

Liaison with Administrative Staff

a Provision of Samples

The work of candidates in the sample will be supplied automatically. If there are any enquiries in this connection contact Ray Cameron (ext 6861) for assistance.

b Matters of Policy

Moderators who require clarification of aspects of policy relating to these instructions should approach the Qualifications Manager concerned in the first instance. Where necessary the matter should thereafter be referred to Rhona Wright (ext 6853).

Confidentiality

The acceptability or otherwise of assessments from centres are confidential and must not be discussed with or revealed to anyone not involved officially with the moderation procedures.
(Instructions on use of the template will be provided by our staff.) Where paper copies of the form are used, instructions/comments should be written legibly in ink. Copies of the Internal Assessment Form/Form Ex5 - (Supplement) should be completed during the course of the moderation exercise.

Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should ensure that moderators are aware of the arrangements for provision of feedback and that instances of unsatisfactory assessment are properly documented on the Moderator’s Worksheet and, as necessary, discussed with the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator to facilitate completion of feedback forms.

You will be required to monitor the performance of each moderator and to note his/her suitability for future employment. A form will be provided for this purpose.

When moderation has been carried out for all of the centres concerned, you should ensure that:

- appropriate arrangements are made for any re-marking which may still be required. Proposed arrangements should be discussed and approved by our staff;

- all copies of the Moderator’s Worksheet have been properly completed;

- where necessary, marks shown on the Internal Assessment (Flyleafs) and the Internal Assessment Forms Ex5 have been amended;

- copies of the Internal Assessment Form Ex5 - (Supplement) have been completed for issue to those centres whose assessments have not been satisfactory;

- details of any matters requiring the attention of our staff have been noted.

Before leaving SQA’s offices, you should inform the administrative support staff that the moderation exercise has been completed.

A report on the operation and outcome of moderation of internal assessment should be submitted to SQA’s offices at Dalkeith within two weeks of the completion of the procedure.
Notes of Guidance to Moderators

SCE Higher

General

Moderation is concerned with confirming that each centre has carried out the assessment in accordance with the published “Arrangements” for the subject concerned. Moderation is not intended to be a remarking or double-marking exercise concerned with altering the centre’s assessment of individual candidates. Normally in moderation the centre’s rank order remains unaltered; it must not be changed without first scrutinising the work of all candidates and must be confirmed by the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator.

Moderation of Assessments

The following will be provided:

a envelopes containing either the entire package of candidate’s work submitted by a presenting centre or a representative sample of candidates’ work drawn from the submissions of the presentation group;

b a Moderator’s Worksheet to record all working, notes, comments and decisions in connection with the moderation of that centre;

c Internal Assessment/Form Ex5 detailing the centre’s internal assessments.

Procedure

For each centre proceed as follows:

a The sample of work available for each centre should be checked to see whether the internal assessment is generally in line with the national standard. This should normally involve simply a scrutiny of the work. Centres whose internal assessment is within ± marks of the national standard should be awarded a zero factor. Where a centre’s assessment is outwith the tolerance range, a plus or minus factor as appropriate will be required - the factor applied should be the smallest number of marks which will bring the centre’s standard within the tolerance range around the national standard. The factor must be entered on the Moderator’s Worksheet in the box headed SF.

b If, in the course of scrutinising the sample, one or more submissions are identified as having been assessed widely out-of-line with the remainder of the sample, the matter should be drawn to the attention of the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator.

Where inconsistency is confirmed by the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator, the work of the whole presentation group should be scrutinised to determine the appropriate action.

One of the two following courses of action should be taken:

i Determine a standardising factor for the majority of candidates, in some cases it may be possible to apply a standardising factor to the majority of candidates
while altering by varying amounts those exceptions to which this factor cannot be applied. In such cases the approach outlined in paragraph a (Procedure) should be followed, except for those submissions to which a different adjustment is applied. For such centres the standardising factor being applied to the majority of candidates should be entered on the Moderator’s Worksheet. For the exceptional submissions, the original mark should be cancelled and the final mark entered in green ink on both the submission and the Internal Assessment/Form Ex5. The final marks should take account of the tolerance range.

ii Where the original marking is so variable in standard that the use of a standardising factor is entirely inappropriate, and this is confirmed by the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator, the marks for all submissions should be finalised individually in green ink, on both the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) and the Internal Assessment/Form Ex5. Because the centre's marks are being set aside, no account should be taken of the tolerance range; the work is in effect being externally marked. Where exceptional adjustments are made or m-marking is carried out, supporting explanatory comments should be entered on the Moderator’s Worksheet. (In the case of Modern Languages the reference to altering marks on the Internal Assessment (Flyleaf) does not apply.)

For all centres, Moderators should enter on the Moderator’s Worksheet brief notes on the centre's internal assessment. In particular, explanatory comment should be provided for the award of any non-zero standardising factor. These notes and comments will assist in the provision of feedback to centres and in responding to enquiries from centres on the outcome of the moderation procedure. Consequently, all such notes/comments should be professional, constructive and unambiguous and be set out legibly.

Liaison with Administrative Staff

a Provision of Work

Candidates’ work will be supplied automatically. If there are any enquiries in this connection contact Ray Cameron (ext 6861) for assistance.

b Matters of Policy

Moderators who require clarification of aspects of policy relating to these instructions should approach the Qualifications Manager concerned in the first instance. Where necessary the matter should thereafter be referred to Rhona Wright (ext 6853).

Confidentiality

The acceptability or otherwise of assessments from centres are confidential and must not be discussed with or revealed to anyone not involved officially with the moderation procedures.
SCE Higher

Introduction

The purpose of these notes of guidance is to provide Principal Assessors and Senior Moderators with information which will assist them in preparing for and supervising the conduct of central moderation procedures. The notes should be read in conjunction with the detailed “Notes of Guidance to Moderators”, the Moderator’s Worksheet and Internal Assessment/Form Ex5- (Supplement).

Procedural Arrangements

a Central moderation will be carried out in SQA’s offices at Dalkeith on the dates previously intimated to members of the moderating team.

b Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should ensure that all members of the moderating team are aware of the purpose of the moderation procedure and of the way in which moderation will be conducted. A copy of “Notes of Guidance to Moderators” and any other specific instructions will be provided for each team member.

c Members of the moderating team must apply the same standard in their assessment of the work submitted by each centre. Consequently, before moderation begins, the moderation team itself should be standardised. To this end, a selection of photostat candidate submissions (as applicable) will be provided for the use of the moderating team.

(Candidates’ work to be used for this purpose should normally be selected by the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator in advance of the procedures, but could be provided by our staff on the basis of a specification submitted by the Principal Assessor/Senior Moderator.

Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should contact Ray Cameron (ext 6861) on this matter as soon as possible in order that the necessary arrangements can be made.

Where moderators are to scrutinise photostat submissions prior to the start of the moderation procedures, our staff should be advised accordingly in order that arrangements can be made for the photostats to be posted in good time to members of the moderating team.)

d Moderators must not moderate work from their own centres or exception centres

e Centres whose internal assessments are judged by the Moderators to be unsatisfactory will be provided with feedback. To this end, Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators are required to complete a copy of the Internal Assessment/Form Ex5- (Supplement) for all centres concerned, to indicate the extent to which internal assessments varied from national standards and to advise of any particular concerns relating to the work submitted to us. Where it is deemed appropriate comments on particular aspects of an individual candidates’ performance may be included on the Internal Assessment/Form Ex5- (Supplement). Where any additional comments are included, these should provide relevant information to assist future internal assessment, be professional, constructive and unambiguous. A template of the Internal Assessment/Form Ex5- (Supplement) will be available on computer and Principal Assessors/Senior Moderators should use this when preparing feedback to centres.
Assessment Moderation

Instructions to External Moderators (Visiting)

General

Moderation is the process by which we ensure that the national standards are applied in assessments carried out by centres. It is a quality assurance measure used to confirm that each centre offering internally assessed qualifications has carried out the assessment in line with the national standard and in accordance with the relevant published unit specifications/Arrangements/Standards.

It is important that both centres and external moderators make assessment decisions in a consistent manner. External moderators should always begin from the premise that the centre has made assessment decisions correctly and that the purpose of the external moderation exercise is to confirm the centre’s decisions. It will be assumed that all candidates entered for the same qualification in a centre are assessed to a common standard.

External moderation should take place on completed candidate evidence and will focus on the validity of the assessment instruments, how they are applied and the reliability of the centre’s assessment decisions.

For each unit selected for external moderation, we will have selected and notified centres of the candidates whose work will comprise the sample. Where a centre has more than 12 candidates entered for a unit, with the same completion date, 12 will be selected at random, Where there are fewer than 12, all candidates will be selected.

Prior Moderation of Assessment Scheme

Any centre which chooses not to use National Assessment Bank (NAB) materials, an assessment scheme previously successfully moderated/verified or other SQA approved assessment schemes ie Assessment Exemplar Packs (AEPs), is advised to seek prior moderation of the assessment scheme it intends to apply, before embarking on the unit. External moderators will be expected to carry out this procedure as necessary. Prior moderation will be carried out postally.

Arranging your Moderation Visit

We will provide you with:

- an itinerary indicating the centres to be visited (including details of the centre contact ie the SQA co-ordinator), the units to be externally moderated and the timescales within which you must carry out your visits

- for each unit, a copy of the Internal Assessment Form – Moderation Sample showing the names and entry details of the (12) candidates in the sample to be moderated

- a supply of:
  visiting moderation arrangements letters
  Moderator’s Worksheets
  Moderator Report Forms
  contact letters
Assessment Review forms
- envelopes and labels with your address details
- appointee release form
- expenses claim form.

As soon as possible after receipt of your itinerary you should contact the SQA co-ordinator in each centre by telephone to agree a suitable date and time for your visit. The visit should take place when the centre’s staff responsible for the units will be available and must be within the timescales indicated by SQA. When these details have been mutually agreed you should complete a visiting moderation arrangements letter and send it to the centre’s SQA co-ordinator, to confirm your visit. If you have any difficulties in contacting the centre’s SQA co-ordinator you should send the centre an appropriately completed contact letter.

When arrangements are in place for all visits, your itinerary must be completed and returned to us as soon as possible (within 10 working days of receipt). You should retain a copy for your own use.

If you experience any difficulties in arranging a visit, telephone your Assessment Moderation contact as soon as possible. Any subsequent alteration to your itinerary must be notified to the Assessment Moderation Unit in Glasgow.

All train / air travel arrangements and hotel accommodation should be booked directly by SQA. If you require these services please telephone SQA’s travel booking service on 0141 242 2233 with details of your visits. Tickets and/or hotel reservation confirmation will be forwarded to your home address.

When contacting SQA or a centre by telephone you must keep a note of all calls; these should be detailed on your expenses claim form (see Fees and Expenses section below).

The Visit

All visits should be undertaken in accordance with SQA’s Code of Conduct for Moderators.

If for any reason you are unable to carry out a scheduled visit you should firstly contact the centre to try to reschedule the visit (within the given timescales). Where this is not possible, you should inform the Assessment Moderation Unit in Glasgow who will attempt to rearrange the visit using another external visiting moderator.

On arrival at the centre you should make contact with the SQA co-ordinator. You should be directed to suitable accommodation where the evidence for the sample candidates is available in each of the units you are scheduled to moderate. Each sample should be accompanied by the centre’s completed copy of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample which will indicate the centre’s result for each of the candidates in the sample.

Centres must record one of the following results against each candidate in column A of the centre’s result section:

- **P** - Pass
- **F** - Fail ie this result should be recorded where the candidate has completed the unit but has failed to adequately demonstrate achievement at the point of assessment.
Note - this result can be changed to a ‘Pass’ at any point in the session until 30 June (or 30 September on request)

**M** - Merit (Higher National Qualifications only)

**D** - Deferred ie the candidate is not in a position to complete the unit until a later date

**W** - Withdrawn ie the candidate has withdrawn from the unit.

For levelled National Units, centres will where appropriate enter in column B the resulting class code (level) if different from that shown in the class column.

The following are the full range of levels/class codes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Class Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access 1</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access 2</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access 3</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Higher</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Centres which have not used NAB or AEP materials have been asked to supply you with a copy of the assessment scheme used. Where used, the NAB or AEP’s details must be recorded on the *Internal Assessment Form - Moderation* Sample. Centres using their own assessment schemes should indicate on the *Internal Assessment Form - Moderation* Sample whether the assessment scheme has been used in a previously successful moderation exercise.

**Candidate Sample**

You should first check to ensure that the evidence provided for scrutiny is that of the candidates listed. Each candidate’s work should be presented along with a flyleaf which will show the candidate’s name and entry details. To check that sufficient evidence is available for moderation, follow the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full sample of 12 or more candidates entered for unit.</th>
<th>Action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the evidence for 1 or 2 candidates is missing.</td>
<td>The centre must provide an adequate explanation and where possible provide substitute evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the evidence for between 3 and 6 candidates is missing.</td>
<td>The centre must provide an adequate explanation and where possible provide substitute evidence. Note the number of omissions/substitutions on the Moderator Report Form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of the above cases, you should continue to moderate the unit using the candidate evidence available.
If the evidence for more than 6 candidates in the sample is unavailable.

Due to the lack of suitable candidate evidence for this unit, moderation should not proceed and the Moderator Report Form completed to this effect. The centre’s result for this unit must be ‘not accepted’ (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 12 candidates (i.e. fewer than 12 candidates entered by centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the evidence for a significant number of candidates (notionally, more than half of the total) listed on the Internal Assessment Form – Moderation Sample is missing. The moderation exercise for this unit should not proceed and the Moderator Report Form completed to this effect. The centre’s result for this unit must be ‘not accepted’ (see below).

External Moderation Exercise

Where a suitable sample of evidence is available, you should proceed to moderate the sample. Follow the moderation decision-making flow chart (see Item I) and take notes on the Moderator’s Worksheet.

During the external moderation exercise you should be aware that in certain units/outcomes assessment can be made on an holistic basis. Where this is the case you should check to ensure that both the approach and any cut-off score is appropriate. Conversely, where holistic assessment is appropriate and the centre has not used this approach, it is worth bringing this to the centre’s attention by noting this on the Moderator Report Form. Where this has occurred, centres should not be penalised for making their assessments on the basis of Performance Criteria (i.e. using a PC by PC approach).

If at an early stage, you identify an issue with the Instrument of Assessment or the Marking Guidance which (as per the flow chart) warrants a ‘not accepted’ result, where possible, in order to maximise your time at the centre, you should continue to scrutinise the candidate evidence. This may identify additional issues which you can usefully include in your report to the centre.

Result of Moderation

The moderation result for each unit externally moderated will be either ACCEPTED or NOT ACCEPTED. These terms will not apply when retrospective moderation is employed (see Appendix A).

The result must be indicated on a Moderator Report Form. This is also the means of providing formal written feedback to the centre, which should be professional, constructive and unambiguous.

Accepted

Where you have decided that the centre is ‘accepted’ and no issues have been identified with either the validity or the reliability of its assessments, you must complete:

- the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form – Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘accepted’ box
A Moderator Report Form, giving positive feedback and drawing attention to good practice, where this is appropriate.

Where you have identified minor issues, with either the validity or the reliability of the centre’s assessments but these do not warrant a 'not accepted' result, you must judge the centre to be 'accepted' and complete:

- the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘accepted’ box
- a Moderator Report Form, indicating the issues and providing appropriate guidance.

Not Accepted

Where you have decided that the centre is ‘not accepted’ as issues are identified, with either the validity and/or the reliability of the centre’s unit assessments, you must:

- complete the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘not accepted’ box
- provide information and reasons for your decision on a Moderator Report Form (Not Accepted) — including specific advice on how the centre can resolve the identified issues and what action you expect the centre to take, eg Assessment Review
- where you disagree with the centre’s assessment decisions for specific candidates, enter on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample, under the Mod result column heading, your moderated candidate result(s) in column A and, where appropriate, the revised class (ie level for levelled National Units) in column B.

Advising the centre/SQA of the results of moderation

When you have completed the moderation exercise for all units, you should contact the centre’s SQA co-ordinator or nominated member of staff, to inform him/her of the result of external moderation and provide verbal feedback on the visit.

If all externally moderated units were accepted you must:

leave the following with the centre’s SQA co-ordinator.

- a copy of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample
- a copy of the Moderator Report Form

retain

- a copy of the Moderator Report Form
- your worksheet

send the following to SQA

- the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample
a copy of the Moderator Report Form - please ensure that your National Insurance number is shown on this copy

da completed expenses claim form.

If the moderation result for any unit is not accepted you must discuss the specific issues and any action the centre will be required to undertake. If any issues can be resolved during the visit, e.g. with the provision of additional candidate evidence (for the sample candidates), this may enable you to overturn a ‘not accepted’ result on the day.

Where externally moderated units were not accepted you must:

leave the following with the centre.

- a copy of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample
- a copy of the Moderator Report Form(s)
- an Assessment Review form for each not accepted unit
- an envelope and label showing your address details (both supplied by SQA)

retain

- a copy of the Moderator Report Form(s)
- your worksheet(s)

send the following to SQA

- the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample
- a copy of the Moderator Report Form • please ensure that your National Insurance number is shown on this copy
- a copy of your worksheet
- a completed expenses claim form

Assessment Review

The centre will be required to undertake an Assessment Review for each ‘not accepted’ unit. The form of review and your subsequent involvement will depend upon the issues encountered and the centre’s subsequent action.

External Visiting Moderator’s Action

If issues are identified with the validity of the Instrument of Assessment (IA) and/or the Marking Guidance you must advise the centre to:

- make the appropriate changes to the IA/Marking Guidance as per the Moderator Report Form
- reassess all candidates where these IAs/Marking Guidance have been used and indicate any revised results on the Internal Assessment Form, - Moderation Sample (Centre’s instructions will advise that revised results are shown in red ink against the appropriate candidates)
- complete part 1 of the Assessment Review form
Where there are issues with the reliability of the centre's judgements you must advise the centre to:

- review the assessments of all candidates (or those specifically identified eg if an issue is identified which affects Intermediate 2 candidates only) in line with your comments/recommendations
- complete part 1 of the Assessment Review form
- where appropriate, send on to you in the envelope provided, the above material along with the reassessed evidence for the sample candidates.

Centre's Action

Once the centre has undertaken action in response to your recommendations, a member of the centre's senior management will be required to sign the declaration in part 1 of the Assessment Review form to confirm that the assessment review has been carried out and to indicate whether:

Option A the reassessment/review has been undertaken and the candidate evidence and supporting documentation will be sent to the external moderator for further scrutiny

or

Option B the review required a change to candidate results and revised results, in line with the external visiting moderator's changes to the sample candidates, will be produced for submission to SQA.

Your involvement will continue only where the centre has elected to use Option A.

Option A • External Visiting Moderator’s Action

The Assessment Review form will be returned to you along with the Assessment scheme, the Internal Assessment Form – Moderation Sample (which will have been annotated with the centre's revised result(s) in red ink) and the candidate evidence. You should proceed to evaluate this material.

If the assessments are now ‘accepted’:

- tick the “accepted after Assessment Review” box on part 2 of Assessment Review form, providing comments where appropriate
- return a copy of the Assessment Review form along with the candidate evidence to the centre
- send a copy of the Assessment Review form to SQA
- retain a copy of the Assessment Review form.

If issues with the assessments remain, which you can not readily resolve with the centre, all documentation and evidence should be sent immediately to the Assessment Moderation Unit in Glasgow with a short note of explanation.
Malpractice

If in the course of your duties you suspect any form of malpractice you must send written details of your concerns to the Assessment Moderation Unit in Glasgow. The Internal Assessment Form. Sample and candidate evidence must also be sent with your Moderator Report Form. Moderation should be completed as normal. In this situation the centre concerned must not be contacted/informed.

Fees and Expenses

On receipt of your Moderator Report Form and expenses claim form, you will receive payment. You must ensure that your National Insurance number is shown on the copy of the Moderator Report Form submitted to SQA.

Claims for reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred in the course of moderation duties (eg postages, telephone calls, travelling) should be made on your expenses form.

Release compensation must be claimed by your main employer by completing and returning an appointee release form.
Retrospective Moderation

Retrospective moderation will take place in September and will be used to review centres’ assessment decisions in units which have been resulted or certificated. It will be employed as an additional quality assurance measure to inform centres’ assessments in any subsequent offering of selected units. Retrospective moderation will not affect individual candidates’ results.

The processes of retrospective moderation will follow those of mainstream visiting external moderation. The result will indicate either that ‘no issues were identified’ or that ‘issues were identified’. This result must be intimated to centres on the Moderator Report Form (Retrospective Moderation).

Where ‘issues were identified’ with a centre’s assessment of a unit, these must be detailed on the Moderator Report Form (Retrospective Moderation) and the centre will be automatically selected for moderation on the next occurrence of the unit. Where the assessment instrument (non-NAB/AEP materials) is identified as the problem area, centres must be instructed to seek prior moderation of the assessment scheme before the next offering of the unit.

On completion of the retrospective exercise you should:

- leave a copy of the Moderator Report Form (Retrospective Moderation) with the centre
- send a copy of the Moderator Report Form (Retrospective Moderation) to the Assessment Moderation Unit in Glasgow
- submit an expenses claim form.

There will be no further action required by you.
Instructions to Central Moderators

General

Moderation is the process by which we ensure that the national standards are applied in assessments carried out by centres. It is a quality assurance measure used to confirm that each centre offering internally assessed qualifications has carried out the assessment in line with the national standard and in accordance with the relevant published unit specifications/Arrangements/Standards.

It is important that both centres and moderators make assessment decisions in a consistent manner. Moderators should always begin from the premise that the centre has made assessment decisions correctly and that the purpose of the external moderation exercise is to confirm the centre's decisions. It will be assumed that all candidates entered for the same qualification in a centre are assessed to a common standard.

Moderation will take place on completed candidate evidence and will focus on the validity of the assessment instruments, how they are applied and the reliability of the centre's assessment decisions.

For each unit selected for moderation we will have selected and notified centres of the candidates whose work will comprise the sample. Where a centre has more than 12 candidates entered for a unit, with the same completion date, 12 will be selected at random. Where there are fewer than 12, all candidates will be selected.

Prior Moderation of Assessment Scheme

Any centre which chooses not to use National Assessment Bank (NAB) materials, an assessment scheme previously successfully moderated/verified or other SQA approved assessment schemes ie Assessment Exemplar Packs (AEPs), is advised to seek prior moderation of the assessment scheme it intends to apply, before embarking on the unit. Prior moderation will be carried out postally and you will be expected to carry out this procedure as necessary.

SQA Booking/Travel Service

All train/air travel arrangements and hotel accommodation should be booked directly by SQA. If you require these services to attend central moderation events please telephone 0141 242 2233 with the appropriate details. Tickets and/or hotel reservation confirmation will be forwarded to your home address.

Moderation of Assessments

Central moderation procedures will take place in our offices in Dalkeith in December and April on dates prescribed by SQA. You will also be expected to undertake postal moderation duties during other months of the year.

At the moderation event the following will be provided:

- envelopes containing candidate evidence, copies of the assessment scheme used (where non-NAB/AEP materials) and the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample which shows the names and entry details of the candidates in the sample to be moderated
- moderator's worksheets to record all working notes, comments and decisions in connection with the moderation of each centre/unit

Moderator Report Forms (paper and electronic versions will be available)

Moderation process

You should first check to ensure that the evidence provided for scrutiny is that of the candidates listed on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample and that the form has been completed to indicate the centre's result for each of the listed candidates.

Centres must record, against each candidate, one of the following results in column A of the centre's result section:

- **P** - Pass
- **F** - Fail (this result should be recorded where the candidate has completed the unit but has failed to demonstrate competence at the point of assessment)
  - Note: this result can be changed to a 'Pass' at any point in the session up until 30 June (or 30 September on request)
- **M** - Merit (Higher National Qualifications only)
- **D** - Deferred (the candidate is not in a position to complete the unit until a later date)
- **W** - Withdrawn (the candidate has withdrawn from the unit)

For levelled National Units, centres will where appropriate enter in column B the class code (level) if different from that shown in the class column.

The following are the full range of levels/class codes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Class Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access 1</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access 2</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access 3</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Higher</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each candidate's work should be presented inside a clear face bag along with a flyleaf which will show the candidate's name and entry details.

Where used, details of the NAB pack or AEP must be recorded on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample. Centres making alterations to NAB materials have been instructed to send annotated copies along with their candidate evidence.

If non-NAB/AEP materials have been used, centres have been instructed to provide a copy of the assessment scheme and to indicate on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample whether the assessment scheme has been used in a previously successful moderation exercise.
The Sample

To check that sufficient evidence is available for moderation, follow the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full sample of 12 (ie 12 or more candidates entered for units)</th>
<th>Action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the evidence for between ‘1 and 6 candidates in the sample is missing.</td>
<td>The centre must where possible provide substitute evidence. You must note the number of omissions/substitutions on the Moderator Report Form. You should continue to moderate the unit using the available candidate evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the evidence for more than 6 candidates in the sample is missing.</td>
<td>Due to the lack of suitable candidate evidence the moderation exercise should not proceed and the moderator’s worksheet and Report Form completed to this effect. The centre’s result for this unit must be ‘not accepted’ (see Result of Moderation Exercise section below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fewer than 12 candidates (ie fewer than 12 candidates entered for unit)</th>
<th>Action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the evidence for a significant number of candidates (notionally, more than half of the total) listed on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample is missing.</td>
<td>The moderation exercise for this unit should not proceed and the moderator’s worksheet and the Moderator Report Form completed to this effect. The centre’s result for this unit must be ‘not accepted’ (see below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the total number of candidates entered for the unit/completion date is shown in a box at the top right hand corner of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample. This will indicate whether or not the centre is in a position to provide substitutes and should be used to inform your decision.

Moderation Exercise

Where a suitable sample of evidence is available, you should proceed to moderate the sample, following the moderation decision-making flowchart (Item I), taking notes on the Moderator’s Worksheet as you work through the sample.

If at an early stage, you identify an issue with the Instrument of Assessment or the Marking Guidance which (as per the flowchart) warrants a ‘not accepted’ result you should draw this to the attention of the senior moderator. Where possible, scrutiny of the candidate evidence should continue as this may show up additional issues which can usefully be included in the report to the centre.

During the moderation exercise you should be aware that in certain Units/Outcomes assessment can take place on an holistic basis. Where this is the case you should check to ensure that both the approach and any cut-off score is appropriate. Conversely, where holistic assessment is appropriate and the centre has not used this approach, it is worth bringing this to the centre’s attention by noting
this on the Moderator Report Form. Where this has occurred, centres should not be penalised for making their assessments on the basis of Performance Criteria (ie a PC by PC approach).

Result of Moderation Exercise

The moderation result for each Unit externally moderated will be either ACCEPTED or NOT ACCEPTED. These terms will not apply when retrospective moderation is employed (see Appendix A - Retrospective Moderation).

This result must be indicated on the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample and on the Moderator Report Form. The latter is also the means of providing feedback to the centre and it is important that any comments made or guidance given are professional, constructive and unambiguous.

Accepted

Where you have decided that the centre is ‘accepted and no issues have been identified with either the validity or the reliability of its assessments, you must complete:

- the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘accepted’ box
- the Moderator Report Form, giving positive feedback and drawing attention to good practice, where this is appropriate.

Where you have identified minor issues, with either the validity or the reliability of the centre's assessments but these do not warrant a 'not accepted' result, you must complete:

- the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘accepted’ box
- the Moderator Report Form, detailing the issues and providing appropriate guidance - this must be countersigned by the senior moderator.

In each of these cases, the above documentation intimating the ‘accepted result will be sent back to the centre along with the candidate evidence.

Not Accepted

Where, having scrutinised the sample, you identify issues with either the validity and/or the reliability of the centre's unit assessments, you must complete your worksheet accordingly and bring this to the attention of the senior moderator. If the senior moderator agrees with your judgement he/she will

- complete the Moderation Result section of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample by ticking the ‘not accepted’ box
- provide information and reasons for the decision on the Moderator Report Form (Not Accepted) - including specific advice on how the centre can resolve the identified issues and what action the centre will be expected to take, eg Assessment Review where there is disagreement with the centre's assessment decisions for specific candidates, these must be annotated on the Internal
Assessment Form - Moderation Sample. The moderated candidate result(s) should be shown under the Mod result section heading, (eg P/F/D etc) in column A and, where appropriate, the revised class (ie level for National Units which have been levelled) in column B.

A copy of the Internal Assessment Form - Moderation Sample and the Moderator Report Form will be sent back to the centre along with the candidate evidence and an Assessment Review form.

Assessment Review

Where there is a large number of ‘not accepted’ results in your moderation area, you may be required to carry out moderation on reviewed materials. Where this is the case, the materials listed below will be sent to you for scrutiny and evaluation.

You will receive:

- reviewed evidence (in line with feedback) for the candidates in the sample
- where required, the revised Instrument of Assessment/Marking Guidance (in line with feedback)
- the Assessment Review form with part I completed
- the Internal Assessment Form – Moderation Sample indicating the centre's reviewed result (in red ink).

If the assessments are now ‘accepted’ you must:

- tick the “accepted after Assessment Review” box on part 2 of the Assessment Review form and provide comments where appropriate
- return a copy of the Assessment Review form along with the candidate evidence to the centre
- send a copy of the Moderator Report Form (Review) to the Assessment Moderation Unit in Dalkeith
- retain a copy of the Moderator Report Form (Review).

If issues with the assessment are not resolved with the centre, all documentation and evidence should be sent immediately to the Assessment Moderation unit in Dalkeith with a short note of explanation.

Malpractice

If in the course of your duties you suspect any form of malpractice you must inform the Senior Moderator of your concerns. The Senior Moderator should produce a report detailing concerns which should be passed on to the Assessment Moderation staff at Dalkeith. Moderation should be completed as normal and the centre concerned must not be contacted in this connection.

Fees and Expenses

Fees will be paid on completion of the moderation event.

Claims for reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred in the course of moderation duties (eg postages, telephone calls, travel) should be made on your expenses claim form.

Release compensation must be claimed by your main employer by completing and returning the appointee release form.
Appendix A

Retrospective Moderation

Retrospective moderation will take place in September either within our offices in Dalkeith (i.e., a central event) or postally, and will be used to review centres’ assessment decisions in units which have been resulted or certificated. It will be employed as an additional quality assurance measure to inform centres’ assessments in any subsequent offering of selected units. Retrospective moderation will not affect individual candidates’ results.

The processes of retrospective moderation will follow those of mainstream central moderation. The result will indicate either that ‘no issues were identified’ or that ‘issues were identified’. This result will be intimated to centres on the Moderator Report Form (Retrospective Moderation).

Where ‘issues were identified’ with a centre's assessment of a unit, these will be detailed and the centre will be automatically selected for moderation on the next occurrence of the unit. Where the assessment instrument (non-NAB/AEP materials) is identified as the problem area, centres will be instructed to seek prior moderation of the assessment scheme before the next offering of the unit.
Central Marking

General

Introduction

For certain Courses all marking will be carried out centrally, usually within our offices at Dalkeith, under the immediate direction and management of the Principal Assessor, who will be responsible for ensuring that all marking is completed to the required standard and within the time available. Administrative support will be provided as appropriate.

The marking team, will not receive an individual allocation of scripts, but will contribute generally to the task, although it is expected that each member will in total undertake a fair share of the marking. (To assist Principal Assessors in monitoring the progress of the team and of individual members in carrying forward the work, an indication of the expected number of scripts to be marked per hour will be provided.)

Markers should not mark work from their own centre.

Payment is made on the basis of sessional fees.

Monitoring Progress

It is important that all scripts are marked in the time available. Principal Assessors therefore will require to monitor the work rate of both the team as a whole and of individual members. Where the work is in danger of falling behind schedule, this will need to be drawn to the attention of all concerned and when there are indications that marking will not be completed by the due date; the matter should be raised with Operations Unit (Ann Brand - ext 6858).

Procedure

Finalisation of Detailed Marking Instructions

Marking instructions for the paper(s) concerned will be prepared in the normal way. Where possible, copies of the question paper(s) and the marking instructions will be posted to all members of the marking team on the day of the examination so that they can familiarise themselves with these prior to the start of the marking procedure; however, depending on the time available between the examination and the start of the marking procedure, it may be easier to distribute copies of the instructions only when the markers meet together.

The first stage of the marking procedure will be the finalisation of the marking instructions based on a review of a small sample of scripts by each marker. It is envisaged that this should not require more than the first hour since, given that all marking is to be carried out centrally, the opportunity will be there for any particular issues which arise in the course of marking to be raised with the Principal Assessor and discussed as necessary within the marking team.

For record purposes a copy of the finalised detailed marking instructions should be passed to Clare Hickson at Dalkeith.
Marking Scripts and Recording Marks

Principal Assessors should ensure that all members of the marking team are aware of the procedures to be followed for marking of scripts and completion of the Mark Sheets.

Monitoring the Standard of Marking

As Principal Assessor you should ensure that all marking is carried out to the national standard. You should sample the work periodically of each member of the team. For Standard Grade the sample reviewed should cover each level of paper involved; for Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2, Higher and SCE Higher, scripts awarded high, middle and low marks should be included. If you identify a discrepancy, you should discuss it immediately with the marker concerned and take whatever remedial action is necessary, including reassessment of scripts dealt with previously.

If the deviation is more serious, you should handle the matter sensitively and raise it with the Qualifications Manager for the subject concerned. Where necessary, the discussion with the marker can be made away from the rest of the team.

Grading of Markers

Principal Assessors are required to indicate under the heading “Grading” on the Markers’ Grading Form each marker’s fitness for future appointment using the following codes:

- **A:** to be invited to mark in 2001
- **B:** to be invited to mark in 2001 unless the requirement is for fewer markers, in which case priority will be given to “A’ markers
- **C:** not to be m-appointed.

Markers’ Reports

All members of the marking team must complete a Report and submit this to our offices at Dalkeith within one week of the end of the procedure.

Completion of Marking

The Principal Assessor must check each page of the Markers’ Grading Form to ensure that all markers have been “graded” according to their fitness to mark in future. The Principal Assessor should then telephone Margaret Russell (ext 6922) to arrange for the collection of scripts and the Grading Forms.

Assistance

For assistance in interpreting or carrying out these instructions, contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
Marker Check/Standardisation Procedure

Standard Grade Marker Check

General

Examiners are expected to check marking standards, including the accuracy of recording and addition of marks, on a small sample of each marker’s work. It is anticipated that the vast majority of markers will produce acceptable marking. Only those markers who are discovered to be deviating seriously from the marking instructions should be noted for later attention.

Examiners must apply the same standards and criteria to both the scrutiny of the work of markers and the marking of their own allocation of scripts. Examiners who feel that their own marking may require review should discuss the matter with the Principal Assessor and Qualifications Manager before the start of this procedure.

The object of this exercise is to check a sample of each marker’s work and to ascertain the direction and extent of errors made by the marker. On-the-basis of this check scripts will be prioritised for review at a later stage before awards are finalised. The main factors which are taken into account are proximity to a grade boundary and whether the script has been marked by a marker who has been, to some degree, lenient, strict or erratic. The priority rating is increased if the Course estimate would support a change of grade, and all things being equal, a suspected severely-marked script is given higher priority than a suspected leniently-marked one. Information on markers supplied by the examining team at this stage contributes to prioritisation of scripts to be considered by the examining team at the finalisation stage.

Material Provided

We will provide Examiners with:

a. Markers’ Grading Forms which lists marking teams by element and Level

b. A sample of scripts from each marker

c. Request Forms for additional scripts

d. Green script replacement cards

e. Marker script referrals as necessary

f. A supply of green pens.

Procedure

Marked scripts

For each marker, scrutinise three scripts (at each Level where appropriate), selected from around the middle rather than the extremes of the mark range. If the marking on each script is confirmed within a reasonable tolerance, enter a tick (√) under the heading “Acceptable” on
the Markers’ Grading Form and initial the section headed “SO”. You need not scrutinise any further scripts from that marker.

In discussion, the examining team should define for each Level the limits within which acceptable marking should fall around the national standard. Where you discover a serious deviation, you should note differences (+ or -) from the true mark on the Markers’ Grading Form and examine a further three scripts from the appropriate Level. Where scrutiny of the additional scripts removes the previous doubts, record the marker as “Acceptable”. If the fault persists, scrutinise a further six scripts at the Level concerned and advise the Principal Assessor.

If serious deviation is confirmed after scrutiny of twelve scripts, initial the “SO” section of the Markers’ Grading Form for that marker and refer the matter to the Principal Assessor.

Using the information recorded on the Markers’ Grading Form about marker deviation, the Principal Assessor will define, for each unacceptable marker, a range of marks within which the computer will identify individual cases for further attention. This will be indicated by the entry of a number (of marks) under the appropriate heading Inconsistent, Severe or Lenient on the Markers’ Grading Form.

The range of marks prescribed for later attention should cover the bulk rather than all of the scripts scrutinised. The related entry on the Markers’ Grading Form should therefore reflect neither the smallest nor the greatest discrepancy found.

The Principal Assessor must then initial the “PA” section of the Markers’ Grading Form for that marker.

If any additional packets of scripts are required, Examiners should complete the request form with the-relevant details.

Directly Graded Scripts

For each marker, scrutinise three scripts (the scripts in the sample should cover the top, middle and bottom of the grade range) and for each script scrutinised enter in the appropriate boxes on the Markers’ Grading Form:

a marker’s grade
b your grade
c points discrepancy* between a and b

Avoid the use of + or – symbols in recording points discrepancy. What is most important is that you are clear about whether the marker is

“severe” having awarded poorer grades than are merited, or
“lenient” having awarded better grades than are merited, or
“inconsistent”.

* Discrepancy is the difference between a marker’s grade and the examiner’s grade.
* for the purposes of the calculation, grades 7 from Credit and General scripts should be “counted” as notional grades 3 and 5 respectively.

Where the points discrepancy is “zero”, accept the marker’s work and tick (J) “Acceptable” on the Markers’ Grading Form. You should not scrutinise any further scripts from that marker.

Where the marking is not “Acceptable”, scrutinise a further three scripts. If across the six scripts there is a total discrepancy of 2 points or fewer, accept the marker’s work. However, if the total of discrepancies is more than 2 points then scrutinise a further six scripts. If across the twelve scripts the total of discrepancies is 5 points or fewer, accept the marker’s work.

However, in the case of Modern Languages, the maximum acceptable deviation should be 3.

Where the total of discrepancies is more than 5 points or 3 points for Modern Languages note this on the Markers’ Grading Form and refer the matter to the Principal Assessor.

If the Principal Assessor agrees with your judgement the marker concerned should be classified as unacceptable and a tick (✓) entered in one of the boxes headed - Inconsistent or Severe or Lenient. Normally, all scripts from unacceptable markers will be referred for review at finalisation. However, it may be that in an individual case the deviation is confined to one or two grades. In these circumstances a note should be made on the Markers’ Grading Form and only scripts at the grades concerned will be referred at finalisation.

Amendment to Marks/Grades on Scripts

Normally, you should not make any amendments to total marks/grades on scripts during the Marker Check. An exception to this rule is permitted, however, on discovery of an error unrelated to deviation from the marking scheme, e.g., omission of marks for a question or an arithmetical error in the summation of the marks. In these cases delete the total mark on the script, enter the corrected total mark, initial the change and enter “Error” alongside. In addition, complete the grid at the top of the script and one of the green script cards provided. Put the card into the envelope and return the script separately to the administrative support staff. Replace unaltered scripts in their envelopes. Care should be taken to ensure that the scripts are replaced in the correct envelope.

If you find that a marker has made a significant number of arithmetical errors in the scripts scrutinised, draw this to the attention of Vivien Harrower (ext 6860) who will arrange a check of all the scripts from that marker.

Grading of Markers

During the Marker Check/Standardisation procedures the Principal Assessor is required to indicate under the heading “Grading” on the Markers’ Grading Form each marker’s fitness for future appointment using the following codes:

A: to be invited to mark in 2001

B: to be invited to mark in 2001 unless the requirement is for fewer markers in which case priority will be given to “A” markers
C: not to be re-appointed.

In the event of a marker’s “Grading” being amended at later procedures, Administrative Services must be informed (please contact Brian Cowe at Dalkeith, ext 6934).

Completion of Marker Check

The Principal Assessor must check each page of the Markers’ Grading Form to ensure that all markers have been placed into one of the four categories and have been “graded” according to their fitness to mark in future. The Principal Assessor should then telephone Margaret Russell (ext 6922) to arrange for the collection of the scripts and the Markers’ Grading Forms.

Marker Script Referrals

In the course of the routine clerical checking of the marked scripts to confirm the addition and recording of the marks, scripts containing queries from markers are referred to the Principal Assessor. These scripts should be considered by the examining team during attendance for marker check. Confirmation of the mark/grade should be indicated as either "Set" or “Error” as appropriate beside the Total mark/grade box on the front of the script.

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out these instructions contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).

Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am and after 4.30 pm.
Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher Marker Check

General

Examiners are expected to check marking standards, including the accuracy of recording and addition of marks, on a small sample of each marker’s work. It is anticipated that the vast majority of markers will produce acceptable marking. Only those markers who are discovered to be deviating seriously from the marking instructions should be noted for later attention.

Examiners must apply the same standards and criteria to both the scrutiny of the work of markers and the marking of their own allocation of scripts. Examiners who feel that their own marking may require review should discuss the matter with the Principal Assessor and Qualifications Manager before the start of this procedure.

The object of this exercise is to check a sample of each marker’s work and to ascertain the direction and extent of errors made by the marker. On the basis of this check scripts will be prioritised for review at a later stage before awards are finalised. The main factors which are taken into account are proximity to a grade boundary and whether any components of the script have been marked by a marker who has been, to some degree, lenient, strict or erratic. Candidates whose total marks fail near the A/B, B/C and C/fail boundaries will be prioritised for review, with the C/fail boundary receiving higher priority. The priority rating is increased if the Course estimate would support a change of grade, and all things being equal, a suspected severely-marked script is given higher priority than a suspected leniently-marked one. Information on markers supplied by the examining team at this stage contributes to prioritisation of scripts to be considered by the examining team at the finalisation stage.

Material Provided

We will provide Examiners with:

a. Markers’ Grading Forms which lists marking teams by component
b. A sample of scripts from each marker
c. Request Forms for additional scripts
d. Green script replacement cards
e. Marker script referrals as necessary
f. A supply of green pens.

Procedure

Courses and Components to be included

For some components such as internally assessed components, objective tests, components subject to visiting assessment, and centrally marked components, we have other methods of quality control. The procedure described below will apply to all Courses at Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher from 2000 and Advanced Higher from 2001 which are not covered by these other methods. (This
includes Mathematics components which are currently excluded from marker standardisation procedures at SCE Higher.

Review range for a marker/component

In discussion, the examining team should define for each component the limits within which acceptable marking should fall around the national standard. Two marks adrift on an extended mark scale may still constitute acceptable marking, whereas the same error on a 12 point mark scale might not be. Where it is felt the deviation is sufficiently serious to warrant remedial action, Examiners will record the nature and the extent of the problem. In conjunction with the estimate, this will provide the information necessary for the computer to select the scripts where marker error, if uncorrected, is most likely to lead to the award of the wrong grade.

Marker Check

For each component subject to this procedure, three packets of scripts from each marker's allocation will be selected at random by the computer program and will be provided by Operations staff. Examiners will scrutinise the marking of one script from each packet, The scripts sampled should lie in between 40% and 80% of the mark range. If the marking instructions have been correctly applied, then the marker's work will be accepted. Enter a tick (√) under the heading “Acceptable” on the Markers' Grading Form and initial the section headed “SO”. You need not scrutinise any further scripts from that marker.

If doubts arise from the scrutiny of the three scripts, you should note differences (+ or -) from the true mark on the Markers' Grading Form and examine a further three scripts. Where scrutiny of the additional scripts removes the previous doubts, record the marker as “Acceptable”. If doubts persist then scrutinise a further six scripts and advise the Principal Assessor.

If serious deviation is confirmed after scrutiny of twelve scripts, initial the “SO” section of the Markers' Grading Form for that marker and refer the matter to the Principal Assessor.

Using the information recorded on the Markers' Grading Form about marker deviation, the Principal Assessor will define, for each unacceptable marker, a range of marks within which the computer will identify individual cases for further attention. This will be indicated by the entry of a number (of marks) under the appropriate heading Inconsistent, Severe or Lenient on the Markers' Grading Form. The range of marks prescribed for later attention should cover the bulk rather than all of the scripts scrutinised. The related entry on the Markers' Grading Form should therefore reflect neither the smallest nor the greatest discrepancy found.

The Principal Assessor must then initial the “PA” section of the Markers' Grading Form for that marker.

If any additional packets of scripts are required, Examiners should complete the request form with the relevant details.

Amendment to Marks on Scripts

Normally, you should not make any amendments to total marks on scripts during the Marker Check. An exception to this rule is permitted, however, on discovery of an error unrelated to deviation from
the marking scheme, e.g., omission of marks for a question or an arithmetical error in the summation of the marks. In these cases delete the total mark on the script, enter the corrected total mark, initial the change and enter “Error” alongside. In addition, complete the grid at the top of the script and one of the green script cards provided. Put the card into the envelope and return the script separately to the administrative support staff. Replace unaltered scripts in their envelopes. Care should be taken to ensure that the scripts are replaced in the correct envelope.

If you find that a marker has made a significant number of arithmetical errors in the scripts scrutinised, draw this to the attention of Vivien Harrower (ext 6860) who will arrange a check of all the scripts from that marker.

Grading of Markers

During the Marker Check/Standardisation procedures the Principal Assessor is required to indicate under the heading “Grading” on the Markers’ Grading Form each marker’s, fitness for future appointment using the following codes:

- A: to be invited to mark in 2001
- B: to be invited to mark in 2001 unless the requirement is for fewer markers in which case priority will be given to ‘A’ markers
- C: not to be m-appointed

In the event of a marker’s “Grading” being amended at later procedures, Administrative Services must be informed (please contact Brian Cowe at Dalkeith, ext 6934).

Completion of Marker Check

The Principal Assessor must check each page of the Markers’ Grading Form to ensure that all markers have been placed into one of the four categories and have been “graded” according to their fitness to mark in future. The Principal Assessor should then telephone Margaret Russell (ext 6922) to arrange for the collection of the scripts and the Markers’ Grading Forms.

Marker Script Referrals

In the course of the routine clerical checking of the marked scripts to confirm the addition and recording of the marks, scripts containing queries from markers are referred to the Principal Assessor. These scripts should be considered by the examining team during attendance for marker check. Confirmation of the mark should be indicated as either "Stet" or “Error” as appropriate beside the Total mark box on the front of the script.

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out these instructions contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).

Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am and after 4.30 pm.
SCE Higher Standardisation

General

The purpose of Standardisation is to confirm whether or not markers are applying the marking instructions and to determine where appropriate the extent of any adjustment required to correct individual variations of leniency or severity of marking. This is a two stage process, the first stage being undertaken by Examiners in conjunction with the Principal Assessor and the second by the Principal Assessor alone.

It is expected that the vast majority of markers will produce acceptable marking. Therefore the procedure will normally involve a scrutiny of a small sample of each marker’s scripts. Re-marking of scripts will not necessarily be required, but it is accepted that in some Courses there may be a preference for determining markers’ standards by completely re-marking randomly chosen scripts.

Examiners must apply the same standards and criteria to both the scrutiny of the work of markers and the marking of their own allocation of scripts. Examiners who feel that their own marking may require review should discuss the matter with the Principal Assessor and Qualifications Manager before the start of this procedure.

First Stage

Material Provided

We will provide Examiners with:

a. Forms Ex58 - Markers’ Factors/Grading Forms
b. A sample of scripts from each marker
c. Request Forms for additional scripts
d. Green script replacement cards
e. Marker script referrals as necessary
f. A supply of green pens.

Procedure

You are expected to read or re-mark one or more scripts from each packet. As you go through each script, you should note any adjustments to the marker’s marks and on completion of your scrutiny consider whether or not you agree with the total mark awarded by the marker; do not alter the total mark on the script. Record agreement/disagreement with the total mark as "0", "+1", "-1" etc in the “Adjustment” boxes on the Markers’ Grading Form to indicate the correction required to bring the marker’s total into line with the national standard.

If in the course of scrutiny of a script you discover an error unrelated to deviation from the marking scheme, eg, omission of marks for a question or an arithmetical error in the summation of the marks, delete the mark on the script, enter the revised total, initial the change and enter “Error” alongside.
a script requires a substantial amount of re-marking or requires to be completely remarked, enter “Final” alongside the amended total. Where you discover that a marker has made a number of arithmetical errors in the scripts seen, indicate this in the “Comments” box on the Markers’ Grading Form and inform Vivien Harrower (ext 6860) who will organise a check of all the scripts from that marker.

Where you amend the total mark for a script, keep the script out of its envelope, complete the grid at the top of the script and enter the candidate’s particulars on one of the green cards provided. Put the card into the envelope and return the script separately to the administrative support staff.

If you do not alter the total mark return the script to its envelope. Care should be taken to ensure that the scripts are returned to the correct envelope.

As soon as you have identified a pattern (of consistency, severity or leniency) in a marker’s work, consider the adjustments that you have recorded and from these recommend any adjustment required to bring the marker into line with the agreed standard. Enter your recommendation in the box headed “SO Factor” on the Markers’ Grading Form. The Principal Assessor will review these and indicate confirmation or otherwise in the “PA Factor” box.

Point to note

“Error” scripts will have the marker’s standardising factor applied to the amended total.

Completion

The Principal Assessor will be expected to check each page of the Markers’ Grading Form to ensure that factors have been entered against each marker in the “SO” and “PA” columns and then contact Margaret Russell (ext 6922) to arrange for the collection of the scripts and the Markers’ Grading Forms.

Marker Script Referrals

In the course of the routine clerical checking of the marked scripts to confirm the addition and recording of the marks, scripts containing queries from markers are referred to the Principal Assessor. These scripts should be considered by the examining team during attendance for standardisation. Confirmation of the mark should be indicated as either "Stet", "Error" or "Final" as appropriate beside the Total mark box on the front of the script.

* “Error” scripts will have any appropriate marker’s factor applied to the raw mark. The entry of “Final” on the script will be accepted as the final mark for that candidate in that paper.

Second Stage (carried out by the Principal Assessor at the Pass Mark stage)

Material Provided

You will receive data based on raw marks about the marking in each Course/Grade/Paper. This will include the average mark and the standard deviation for each marker and for the paper as a whole. For each marker, there will be a computer factor which is based on a comparison of marker’s mark/standard deviation with the equivalent values for all the markers of the paper. The entry “0” will be shown where any difference is not statistically significant. Where the difference is statistically
significant, the computer factor is the smallest whole number which, when added to the marker’s average, would make the difference no longer significant. Where the number of scripts marked by a marker is less than 100, a computer factor will not be given. In addition, you will receive the Markers’ Grading Forms which were used at the first stage and these will have been updated to include the computer factors.

Procedure

You will be expected to scrutinise the information produced and to decide upon a final standardising factor for each marker and to enter that in terms of a marks adjustment in the “Final Factor” column of the Markers’ Grading Form; you will normally give Examiners involved in the first stage of standardisation a factor of “0” but if the information supplied suggests otherwise you should discuss the matter with the Qualifications Manager in your subject. It should be borne in mind also that the total of all of the final factors to be applied should be close to zero, ie, without significant bias towards a negative or positive figure which would distort the already agreed “pass” percentage.

In exceptional cases only, and after discussion with the Qualifications Manager, you should indicate the area of review in respect of individual markers for whom you have had serious difficulty in finalising an appropriate standardising factor. In such cases, you should enter in the appropriate column the number of marks below the Pass Mark from which range scripts marked by that marker will be reviewed. All such markers should normally be graded “C” ie, not to be invited to mark in 2001.

The basic principles are that markers whose scripts require to be reviewed should not normally be re-appointed: markers who are to be re-appointed should not normally feature in the review process.

Grading of Markers

During the Marker Check/Standardisation procedures the Principal Assessor is required to indicate under the heading “Grading” on the Markers’ Grading Form each marker’s fitness for future appointment using the following codes:

A: to be invited to mark in 2001

B: to be invited to mark in 2001 unless the requirement is for fewer markers in which case priority will be given to “A” markers

c: not to be re-appointed.

In the event of a marker’s “Grading” being amended at later procedures Administrative Services must be informed (please contact Brian Cowe at Dalkeith, ext 6934).

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out these instructions contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).

Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am or after 4.30 pm.
Awarding Procedures

Standard Grade: Setting Cut-Off Scores

Introduction

The following notes relate to the setting of cut-off scores for externally assessed elements which have extended mark scales. Making decisions on cut-offs is as much an art as it is a science and the professional judgement of the Principal Assessor is an integral component of the process. These decisions are also informed by statistical evidence and there are points to be observed when interpreting the statistics and combining them with the judgemental evidence which is the preserve of the Principal Assessor.

Statistical evidence comes from two sources

a  The current year’s examination:

   number of entries;

   distribution of candidates’ scores on the external paper;

   Course estimates for those candidates;

   a priori cut-off scores;

   the cut-off scores which most closely replicate the average of the previous three year’s distribution of awards;

   distribution of candidates’ grades on the internal element(s) and on the directly graded external elements where appropriate.

b  The previous years for which the examination has been offered, up to a maximum of three years:

   number of entries;

   Course estimates:

   cut-offs applied;

   resulting distributions of grades in the element;

   distribution of candidates’ grades on the internal element(s) and on the directly graded external elements if any.

Taken together these data provide firstly, an indication of the evidence on which previous cut-off decisions were made, the decisions themselves, and the outcome of those decisions; and secondly, the corresponding evidence for the present year, and the cut-offs which should be applied unless there has been a change in candidate performance.
The aims of cut-off score setting

One aim in determining awarding standards is to maintain comparability from one year to another within a Course. The candidates and users of the Certificate have the right to expect that a grade 2 in a Course represents the same standard of attainment as in the previous year or in the following year.

Another important aim concerns Course comparability. Users of the Certificate expect that a grade 2 in one Course will be as easy or as hard to obtain as a grade 2 in another. This type of comparability is easier to justify for some Course groups than for others. It would be argued that Mathematics should apply the same standard as Physics, or French the same standard as German. But could it be argued that Office and Information Studies should apply the same standard as Music? These Courses address quite different skills; however there is a “weight” of demand that should apply to all Standard Grades irrespective of the Course matter. Cross-course comparability therefore is a more indirect concept but, despite this, it has an important role to play in monitoring standards.

The section on SCE Higher (page 57 - the principles of pass mark setting) contains further explanation which is also relevant to Standard Grade.

The practice

For each element for which cut-off scores have to be decided, a statistical summary sheet is provided giving various key statistics for the previous three years and the current year. The first three lines will already be completed, and provisional cut-offs entered for the current year. This line can only be finalised when all the cut-off decisions for the element have been agreed.

It is normal practice to start with the cut-off decisions for grades 1 and 2 which will be made in the light of the following data:

a) Any changes in the number of candidates entered for the Credit Level paper.

b) Any changes in the maximum marks allocated to the element. (Variations in this figure from one year to another should, however, be avoided as they add an unnecessary complication to the maintenance of standards. Setters should, wherever possible, work to a constant allocation each year.)

c) The mark on the paper which corresponds to the Course estimates at each grade. This is expressed both as a raw mark and as a percentage of the maximum, a distinction which will become unnecessary if mark allocations are kept constant as advised.

d) The percentages of the group taking the Credit paper which the centre felt were worth grade 1 and grade 2. Grade 2 in this context means grade 2 or better and thus includes the grade 1 percentage.

e) For previous years, the percentages of the Credit group which attained grade 1 and grade 2.
The \textit{a priori} score is 70\% for grade 1 and 50\% for grade 2. These are notional and normally the upper cut-off falls in the range of 60-70\% and the lower in the range 40-50\%.

The provisional cut-off scores which most closely replicate the previous years' distribution of awards.

The National Ratings, indicating the relative difficulty of Course and elements

From this it can be seen what relationship the previous year's cut-offs and the current year's provisional cut-offs have to the Course estimates and to the maximum marks available for the paper. If this relationship has been consistent and it is wished to retain it, then the provisional cut-offs should be accepted. Where the relationship has not been consistent or satisfactory or where there are other complicating factors such as large changes in the size and composition of the entry group, the decision will not be so direct but preliminary guidance can be given by the Qualifications Manager.

At General and Foundation Levels the pattern is similar except that there is no reference to the percentages of these groups attaining each grade. This is partly because of the policy not automatically to mark the lower Level paper for candidates who scored highly at the upper Level which would, in Courses where it is applied, make such figures meaningless but also because one cannot know at this stage how many candidates sitting the General paper will obtain a Credit award, or Foundation candidates a General award. The lack of group percentages in the tables for the General and Foundation papers means that there is no precise way of knowing prior to the awarding meeting what will be the effect of particular cut-offs at grades 3 to 6 on the distributions of awards at these grades.

The awarding meeting

Because of the need to equate performance on two or three Levels of papers at Standard Grade, which necessitates computer-supported decision-making, only tentative views on cut-off scores may be formed by the Principal Assessor prior to the awarding meeting. This meeting will be chaired by the Chief Executive or the Director of Awards, acting as Chief Examiner. Also normally present are the Statistician and the Qualifications Manager for the Course. Initially, at the awarding meeting cut-off scores for each grade are agreed provisionally taking account of the Principal Assessor's judgemental evidence and all available statistical evidence. In determining cut-offs for grades 3 to 6 on multi-level papers care has to be taken that grade 3 is not a more difficult target than grade 2 and grade 5 is not more difficult to achieve than grade 4. This can be achieved by looking at the computer printout of the distributions of candidates' scores. Distributions at the adjacent Levels are aligned so as to indicate equivalence of demand (in a statistical sense at least) on the basis of the scores of candidates who have attempted two adjacent Levels. Consequently, when the minimum mark for grade 2 has been determined, the mark representing equivalent demand on the General distribution can be read off. The minimum mark for grade 3 should then be set below this equivalent mark. By means of the computer it is then possible to view the implications for the distribution of awards of applying these cut-off scores and, if necessary, alternative cut-offs can be substituted until the outcome is agreed to the satisfaction of the Chief Examiner. The table at the bottom of the summary sheet can then be completed. This is, as it were, the "bottom line" which gives the outcome when the cut-off scores at all 6 grades have been applied and the final distribution of awards for that element has been.
When these decisions have been made, the appropriate form will be printed from the computer for signature by the Principal Assessor and counter-signature by the Chief Examiner.

As a final check, the provisional grade distribution for the Course is printed out for comparison with the provisional and final grade distributions in the previous three years. If the grade distribution for the Course is unsatisfactory, the decisions at element level can be revisited. This facility is particularly useful if the element structure or weights have changed.

The Principal Assessor’s unique contribution is his or her professional judgement of the performance of the candidates and of the difficulties of the question paper gained from his or her own marking, the comments of the examining team and Markers’ Reports; Qualifications Managers are able to contribute their considerable familiarity with the various sets of statistics and their experience of the awarding standards being applied across a range of Courses, both in previous years and in other Courses earlier in the diet of the same year. The pooling of these two areas of expertise allows cut-off scores to be determined which should maximise fairness to candidates from year to year. The key role of the Principal Assessor in this process is Warmly acknowledged and appreciated.
Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher: Setting Pass Marks

Introduction

Setting pass marks is as much an art as it is a science and the professional judgement of the Principal Assessor is an integral component of the process, particularly in the early years of a qualification. Decisions are also informed by statistical evidence which is combined with the Principal Assessor’s judgemental evidence.

Judgemental evidence includes:

- markers’ reports
- comments from setters and examiners
- personal experience of marking and scrutiny of scripts
- archived benchmarking scripts where available.

The statistical evidence consists of:

- the frequency distribution and summary statistics of candidates’ score
- Course estimates and the pass marks implied by them
- for Highers replacing an existing SCE Higher, the frequency distribution and summary statistics of candidates’ scores in the relevant SCE Higher.

Based on all of this evidence, a decision must be made as to the pass mark, the minimum mark for grade A, and the minimum mark for an upper grade A, which embody the desired awarding standards.

As far as possible, awarding meetings for SCE Higher and replacement Highers will be scheduled together, so that characteristics of the two candidate groups can be compared, and standards of the two qualifications aligned.

The aims of pass mark setting

One aim in determining awarding standards is to maintain comparability from one year to another within a Course. The candidates and users of the Certificate have the right to expect that a grade B in a Course represents the same standard of attainment as in the previous year or in the following year. In the first year of a qualification, the challenge is to set the standard at the appropriate level to establish a baseline for future years.

Another important aim concerns Course comparability. Users of the Certificate expect that a grade B in one Course will be as easy or as hard to obtain as a grade B in another. This type of comparability is easier to justify for some Course groups than others. It could be argued that Mathematics should apply the same standard as Physics, or French the same standard as German. But could it be argued that Philosophy should apply the same standard as Travel and Tourism?

These Courses address quite different skills; however there is a “weight” of demand that should be expected to apply to all Courses at the same level irrespective of the Course matter. Cross-course comparability therefore is a more indirect concept, but an important one for SQA, which requires Courses to be broadly equivalent in level of demand.

A third consideration is comparability across levels. Higher is benchmarked against SCE Higher, Intermediate 2 against Standard Grade at Credit, and Intermediate 1 against Standard Grade at General. Scrutiny of archived benchmarked scripts at the appropriate level in the same or a related
Course is the key to this consideration. For example, the Principal Assessor for Automotive Engineering could look at examples of Technological Studies.

Having looked at the aims of standard setting, we now turn to the question of how these aims may be achieved.

The principles of pass mark setting

Setting a standard for a new qualification is more challenging than maintaining the standard in an established one. Once a Course is established, much of the pass mark process consists of comparing the assessment instruments and performance of the candidates with recent years, and adjusting pass marks accordingly. Obviously in the first year of a qualification, no such historic information is available; therefore the judgement of the Principal Assessor is critical.

Considerable care and attention is given to the setting and vetting of all question papers prior to the examination. If in retrospect it transpires that the candidates scored better or worse than was expected, it is not always easy for the Principal Assessor to know whether this was because his or her expectation of the questions was inaccurate, or because the candidates really did do better or worse. Both of these would have the same statistical outcome, yet it is vital to distinguish between them. Awareness of difficulties experienced by candidates in relation to particular questions can often help in making this judgement.

The awarding meeting

Before the meeting, the Principal Assessor should collect all the judgemental evidence which will contribute to the pass mark decisions. This should include consideration of candidate scripts which fall near a possible grade boundary to compare them with the standards laid down in the grade descriptors. Where available, archived scripts in related Courses should also be examined, to align the level of demand across Courses. Please discuss any requirements for archive material in advance with the Qualifications Manager, who can advise on what is available and relevant and will arrange to have copies made.

At the awarding meeting it is necessary to determine a pass mark (the C/fail interface), the minimum mark for grade A (the A/B interface) and the minimum mark for band 1 (upper grade A). The A/B interface is initially set at the mark \( 5\sqrt{3/\sigma} \) above the pass mark, but this can be modified if that mark appears severe or lenient. Once the pass mark, A/B interface, and upper A are set, the remaining grade boundaries are calculated automatically by the computer. The resulting grade distribution is carefully considered before a final decision is made, and, if necessary, alternatives can be explored.

The awarding meetings are chaired by the Chief Executive or the Director of Awards, acting as Chief Examiner. Also normally present are the Statistician and the Qualifications Manager for the Course. It is important to remember that these officers have experience of the awarding standards applied across a range of Courses and qualifications, both in previous years and in other Courses earlier in the diet this year. The Principal Assessor is expected to contribute his or her unique knowledge in relation to the perceived difficulty of the examination and the performance of the candidates. The knowledge comprises part of the evidence to be considered in arriving at the award decisions. The other evidence which is considered may, however, act as a counterbalance or suggest a different pass mark. Different options will therefore be considered at the awarding meeting, and only those interface marks which best reflect all of the evidence will be accepted. When final decisions have
been made, the appropriate form is printed from the computer for signature by the Principal Assessor and Chief Examiner.

These interface decisions are the most crucial of the whole examination, since, not only do they ensure the continuing maintenance of the examination standards, but they also determine that candidates receive fair rewards for their work and responses to the examination. The key role of the Principal Assessor in this process is warmly acknowledged and appreciated.
SCE Higher: Setting Pass Marks

Introduction

Setting pass marks is as much an art as it is a science and the professional judgement of the Principal Assessor is an integral component of the process. Decisions are informed also by statistical evidence which is combined with the judgemental evidence which is the preserve of the Principal Assessor.

The main statistical evidence consists of:

a. the pass marks and the distributions of bands in the previous years for which the examination has been offered, up to a maximum of three years;

b. the frequency distribution of candidate’s scores for the current year’s examination, and suggested pass marks which replicate the previous years’ distribution of awards.

c. entry numbers and the frequency distribution of candidate scores for the replacement Higher, if applicable.

Based on these three types of evidence, a decision must be made as to the pass mark and band A/B interface for the present year which embody the desired awarding standards.

As far as possible, awarding meetings for SCE Higher and replacement Highers will be scheduled together, so that characteristics of the two candidate groups can be compared, and standards of the two qualifications aligned.

The aims of pass mark setting

One aim in determining awarding standards is to maintain comparability from one year to another within a Course. The candidates and users of the Certificate have the right to expect that a band B in a Course represents the same standard of attainment as in the previous year or in the following year.

Another important aim concerns Course comparability. Users of the Certificate expect that a band B in one Course will be as easy or as hard to obtain as a band B in another. This type of comparability is easier to justify for some Course groups than for others. It would be argued that Mathematics should apply the same standard as Physics, or French the same standard as German. But could it be argued that Secretarial Studies should apply the same standard as Music? These Courses address quite different skills; however there is “weight” of demand that should apply to all Highers irrespective of the Course matter. Cross-course comparability therefore is a more indirect concept but, despite this, it has an important role to play in monitoring standards.

Having looked at the aims of standard setting, we now turn to the question of how these aims may be achieved.

The principles of pass mark setting

There are occasions where the optimal conditions for pass mark setting occur. These are where the characteristics both of the assessment instrument (eg the question paper) and of the entry group are the same as in previous years. In such cases the mark distribution will also be the same and it will be a simple matter to confirm that the pass mark should be retained for the current year. Usually,
However, the mark distribution differs from one year to another and the question arises of how to interpret this. There are two reasons why the mark distribution can change between consecutive years; either the candidates performed better or worse, or the examination was easier or harder. These are not mutually exclusive and both may have occurred to some extent. It is however crucial to distinguish between them if awarding standards are to be maintained. If the quality of the candidates has shifted, this must be reflected in the pass rate since to do otherwise would be unfair either to the present year’s candidates or to those entered in previous years. In contrast, changes in the accessibility of the assessment instruments should not be reflected in the pass rate since candidates should not be rewarded (or penalised) because they happen to sit the examination in a year when the paper was easier (or harder) than usual. It is therefore necessary to know the reasons underlying any changes in the distribution of marks. The impressionistic evidence supplied by the Principal Assessor, based on the Principal Assessor’s own marking, reports from other members of the examining team and from the markers, is the main source of evidence for this.

Considerable care and attention is given to the setting and vetting of all question papers prior to the examination. If in retrospect it transpires that the candidates scored better or worse than was expected, it is not always easy for the Principal Assessor to know whether this was because his or her expectation of the questions was inaccurate, or because the candidates really did do better or worse. Both of these would have the same statistical outcome, yet it is vital to distinguish between them. Awareness of difficulties experienced by candidates in relation to particular questions can often help in making this judgement.

Turning to the frequency distribution produced by the computer, the pass mark can be set in a number of ways, of which the two extremes are as follows. The first is to assume that the shift in the mark distribution is entirely attributable to changes in the candidate group. In this case the pass mark will be set at the same figure as last year. The second is to assume that the shift in the mark distribution is entirely attributable to changes in the assessment instrument. In this case the pass mark will be set so as to maintain the average pre borderline pass rate of the previous three years. In practice, these two assumptions often define the limits of the range within which the pass mark should be set, though exactly where between the two depends on other evidence. These two extreme pass marks are calculated by the computer and printed on the pass mark form, as is the pass mark suggested by Course estimates.

Where the Course has a large, stable entry and there have been no changes to the syllabus, assessment arrangements or curricular support, it is likely that the characteristics of the entry group will have remained fairly constant and the pass rate would not be expected to vary significantly. For examinations where the Course is being phased out in favour of a revised examination, it is less likely that characteristics of the entry group will not have changed and pass rate may well vary.

Where there is an experienced examining team with a record of setting papers of a constant standard, it is unlikely that the difficulty of the examination has changed significantly and hence the pass mark would not be expected to change significantly. In some Courses however the nature of the Course matter makes it more difficult to achieve a constant standard in this way. In these cases, significant shifts in the pass marks from one year to another may be necessary in order to maintain the same standard.

Helpful information may be available from other sources. Some examinations have papers which are particularly suitable for use as “benchmarks”. An objective test paper is a good example of this mean scores on that paper can be compared with that of previous years and with the pre-test mean calculated from item facilities. Projects and other assessment instruments which do not change from
year to year are another source. Question paper analyses, where these are available, may also add to the overall picture. Finally between Course comparability indices (“National Ratings”) will often provide valuable feedback on the outcome of decisions made in previous years.

To summarise, if the difficulty of the examination has not changed then neither should the pass mark, though the pass rate may change. If the performance of the candidates has not changed then the pass rate should stay the same even if the pass mark has to change. In practice the decision must take account of any change in the difficulty of the examination and the performance of the candidates.

The awarding meeting

At the awarding meeting it is necessary to determine a pass mark (the C/D interface) and an A/B interface. The A/B interface is initially set at the mark \( \frac{3}{10} \) of a standard deviation above the pass mark but this can be modified if that mark appears severe or lenient. Once the pass mark and the A/B interface are set, the B/C and D/No award interfaces are calculated automatically by the computer. The resulting distribution of bands is carefully considered before a final decision is made and, if necessary, alternatives can be explored. The awarding meeting will be chaired by the Chief Executive or the Director of Awards, acting as Chief Examiner. Also normally present are the Statistician and the Qualifications Manager for the Course. It is important to remember that these officers have experience of the awarding standards applied across a range of Courses, both in previous years and in other Courses earlier in the diet of the same year. The Principal Assessor will be expected to contribute his or her unique knowledge in relation to the perceived difficulty of the examination and the performance of the candidates. That knowledge will comprise part of the evidence to be considered in arriving at the award decisions. The other evidence which will be considered may, however, act as a counterbalance or suggest a different pass mark. Different options will therefore be considered at the awarding meeting, and only those interface marks which best reflect all of the evidence will be accepted. When final decisions have been made the appropriate form will be printed from the computer for signature by the Principal, Assessor and counter-signature by the Chief Examiner.

These interface decisions are the most crucial of the whole examination, since, not only do they ensure the continuing maintenance of the examination standards, but they also determine that the candidates receive fair rewards for their work and responses to the examination. The key role of the Principal Assessor in this process is warmly acknowledged and appreciated.
Finalisation

Standard Grade

General

At this stage scripts (or parts of scripts where more than one element is assessed in a single script) from those markers classified during the marker check as unacceptable will be provided for finalisation of marks.

Material provided

We will provide Examiners with:

- the completed Markers' Grading Forms from the marker check stage
- review lists
- scripts for re-marking
- details of grade boundaries.

Review Lists

These show candidates in the order of priority in which their scripts are to be dealt with, starting with cases where the review is most likely to lead to a change in the original award. Scripts, or elements, to be re-marked will be indicated alongside each candidate's name, by a mark entry under the heading for the element concerned, at the appropriate Level.

These will be supplied in priority order as shown on the review lists, Re-marking is to be undertaken in strict order of priority viz, priority 1 followed by-priority 2 and so on.

Queries regarding the scripts provided should be referred to Angela Russell (ext 6904). Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am or after 4.30 pm.

Procedure

Action on Scripts

Re-mark only those scripts (or parts of scripts relating to an individual element) at the level indicated on the review list worksheet by the entry of the marker's grade in the "OM" column or, where applicable, an * (see 'Note' overleaf). Indicate the revised mark on the scripts.

You should not re-mark scripts/elements not in the review simply because they are routinely available within the material provided along with review cases.

Action on Review Lists

Check each total mark change against the appropriate cut-off table (this step does not apply for directly graded scripts). If a mark requires to be changed, cross out the entry in the "OM"
(Original Mark) column and record the new mark in the "RM" (Revised Mark) column. Where a change does not affect the existing mark enter "Stet" in the "RM" column. Revised marks will be keyed into the computer system, which will re-calculate the candidates’ grades. Make sure that the change is recorded in the correct column. Entries should not be made in the “RM” column in respect of scripts/elements which are not designated in the “OM” column as being in the review. An entry which apparently relates to a script/element not in the review will not be actioned.

Note: An asterisk * in the “OM” column in place of a mark indicates that the candidate has attempted the examination at two Levels, and either the marks for both Levels are subject to review or the lower Level script did not originally require to be marked (because of the total mark/grade awarded in the upper Level). In these instances, where you reduce the mark for the upper Level script or it remains at 7 you must re-mark (or mark as appropriate) the lower Level script and then take the appropriate action on both the script and the review list, awarding the better mark achieved.

Completion of Action

The Principal Assessor should check each page of the review list to ensure that an entry (of either a mark or "Stet") has been recorded in the "RM" column against every candidate listed. The PA should then sign the last page of each list to indicate that this has been done and then contact Angela Russell (ext 6904) to inform her that the procedure has been completed.

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out the above instructions contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher

General

At this stage, components of scripts from those markers classified during the marker check as unacceptable, will be provided for finalisation of marks.

Material provided

We will provide Examiners with:

- the completed Markers’ Grading Forms from the marker check stage
- review lists
- scripts for remarking
- details of grade boundaries

Review Lists

These show candidates in the order of priority in which their scripts are to be dealt with, starting with cases in which the review is most likely to lead to a change in the original award. Components to be re-marked will be indicated along with centre, Scottish Candidate Number, and candidate name. As well as the mark for the component under review, the printout will show the total mark, so that the Examiner can see the effect of a review decision.

Scripts

These will be supplied in priority order as shown on the review lists. Re-marking is to be undertaken in strict order of priority viz, priority 1 followed by priority 2 and so on.

Queries regarding the scripts provided should be referred to Angela Russell (ext 6904). Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am or after 4.30 pm.

Procedure

Action on Scripts

Re-mark only those components indicated on the review list worksheet.

You should not re-mark components not in the review simply because they are routinely available within the material provided along with review cases. Indicate the revised mark on the script.

Action on Review Lists

After reviewing a script, the Examiner should either indicate that the mark for the paper is unchanged by entering "Stet" in the "RM" (Revised Mark) column, or cross out the entry in the “OM” (Original Mark) column and enter a revised mark in the “RM” column. Revised marks will be keyed in to the computer system, which will recalculate the candidates’ grades.
Completion of Action

The Principal Assessor should check each page of the review list to ensure that an entry (of either a mark or "Stet") has been recorded in the "RM" column against every candidate listed. The PA should then sign the last page of each list to indicate that this has been done and then contact Angela Russell (ext 6904) to inform her that the procedure has been completed.

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out the above instructions contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
SCE Higher

General

For each marker whose inconsistent marking made the finalisation of a standardising factor difficult the Principal Assessor will have determined a range of marks below the pass-mark from which scripts will be selected for review. Examiners will re-mark these scripts.

Material Provided

Mark Lists

These provide a complete list of candidates giving details of their standardised individual paper marks, standardised total marks and range marks. Scripts for review will be identified by the entry "R" against the paper mark and "REV" alongside the range mark.

Mark Lists will include manuscript entries relating to changes made to scripts by Examiners at the Standardisation Stage. Changes made in blue ink denote a correction of minor errors (in terms of a standardised mark) whereas changes in green ink indicate a finalised mark in respect of scripts which have been completely re-marked.

Range Tables

Tables show the conversion of total standardised marks to range marks.

Review Scripts

These will be provided in bundles in centre number order according to paper. If you have any queries regarding the scripts provided, contact Angela Russell (ext 6904). Examiners should note that administrative support staff may not be available before 8.30 am or after 4.30 pm.

Markers’ Grading Forms

These indicate standardising factors applied to each marker’s scripts and will be supplied for reference only.

Procedure

Action on Scripts

The marks on the scripts are not standardised; bearing this in mind, re-mark each script and determine the final mark to be awarded. Indicate the final mark on the scripts, enter “Final” alongside and initial the entry.

Action on Mark Lists

The marks on the Lists are standardised; bearing this in mind, where you have made a change to a script which necessitates a change to a paper mark shown on the Lists, stroke through that mark, enter the revised mark alongside and amend the candidate’s total mark and range mark as appropriate. Where the paper/range mark does not need to be changed, enter "Stet" alongside. As you complete
each case, tick through and initial the indicator “REV” or “PA”. The Principal Assessor should check each sheet of continuous stationery to confirm that all required “REV” and “PA” cases have been actioned and should sign the last page to indicate that this has been done.

Completion of Action

The Principal Assessor should inform Angela Russell (ext 6904) on completion of finalisation.

Assistance

For assistance in either interpreting or carrying out the above instructions, contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
Absentee and Other Special Cases

Standard Grade

Comparison of Internal Estimates and External Grades Print

To assist Principal Assessors in actioning Absentee and Principal Assessor Correspondence cases the above printout will be provided. This printout gives a cross-tabulation of internal and external grades indicating the median and mean external grade for all candidates on each estimated grade.

Absentees

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing
   a. the absentee cases
   b. the centre’s estimate grade by element

2. evidence to support each case

3. any examination work completed.

The coursework evidence should be assessed to determine the level of attainment demonstrated in terms of the GRC.

An award of at least grade 7 should be made, except in Modern Languages (Additional) and Gaelic (Learners) (Additional) where failure to achieve at least grade 4 should be indicated by the entry 444.

Where a candidate has a learning or hearing difficulty and approval has been given for their scripts to be referred to the PA (see SAA Referrals) the letter R will appear against the centre’s estimate. The candidate’s difficulty should be taken into account when scrutinising the evidence and, if available, any examination work.

The grade awarded should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

Principal Assessor Correspondence. PA (Corr)

The following will be provided:

1. a list detailing the cases

2. correspondence explaining the circumstances

3. examination work, if appropriate
Principal Assessor Correspondence cases should be reviewed in the light of the circumstances explained in the correspondence.

The revised mark should be entered on the list opposite the candidate’s name.

If no change is justified "Stet" should be entered.

Candidates with a Learning or Hearing Difficulty - SAA Referrals

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing the cases
2. the candidates’ scripts.

The scripts should be scanned by the Principal Assessor to ensure that no undue penalty has been imposed by the marker who has no knowledge of the difficulty.

If there is evidence of a penalty the scripts should be remarked. The revised mark should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

If there is no evidence of a penalty being imposed "Stet" should be entered.

General

Ellen Aitken may be contacted on extension 689016862 for assistance,

The Principal Assessor should phone Ellen Aitken when all the above cases have been actioned.
Absentee and Other Special Cases

Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher

Comparison of Internal Estimates and External Bands Print

To assist Principal Assessors in actioning Absentee and Principal Assessor Correspondence cases the above printout will be provided. This printout gives a cross-tabulation of internal and external bands indicating the median and mean external band for all candidates on each estimated band.

Absentees

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing
   a. the absentee cases
   b. the centre’s estimate band
2. evidence to support each case
3. any examination work completed

The coursework evidence should be assessed to determine the level of attainment demonstrated and a band commensurate with the evidence awarded.

Where a candidate has a learning or hearing difficulty and approval has been given for their scripts to be referred to the PA (see SAA Referrals) the letter R will appear against the centre's estimate. The candidate’s difficulty should be taken into account when scrutinising the evidence and, if available, any examination work.

The band awarded should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

Principal Assessor ‘Correspondence - PA (Corr)

The following will be provided:

1. a list detailing the cases
2. correspondence explaining the circumstances
3. examination work, if appropriate
Principal Assessor Correspondence cases should be reviewed in the light of the circumstances explained in the correspondence.

The revised mark should be entered on the list opposite the candidate’s name.

If no change is justified "Stet" should be entered.

Candidates with a Learning or Hearing Difficulty • SAA Referrals

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing the cases
2. the candidates’ scripts.

The scripts should be scanned by the Principal Assessor to ensure that no undue penalty has been imposed by the marker who has no knowledge of the difficulty.

If there is evidence of a penalty the scripts should be remarked. The revised mark should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

If there is no evidence of a penalty being imposed "Stet" should be entered.

General

Ellen Aitken may be contacted on extension 6890/6862 for assistance.

The Principal Assessor should phone Ellen Aitken when all the above cases have been actioned.
Absentee and Other Special Cases

SCE Higher

Comparison of Internal Estimates and External Ranges Print

To assist Principal Assessors in actioning Absentee and Principal Assessor Correspondence cases the above printout will be provided. This printout gives a cross-tabulation of internal and external ranges indicating the median and mean external range for all candidates on each estimated range.

Absentees

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing
   a. the absentee cases
   b. the centre's estimate. range

2. evidence to support each case

3. any examination work completed.

The coursework evidence should be assessed to determine the level of attainment demonstrated and a range commensurate with the evidence awarded.

Where a candidate has a learning or hearing difficulty and approval has been given for their scripts to be referred to the PA (see SAA Referrals) the letter R will appear against the centre's estimate. The candidate’s difficulty should be taken into account when scrutinising the evidence and, if available, any examination work.

The range awarded should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

Principal Assessor Correspondence-PA (Corr)

The following will be provided:

1. a list detailing the cases

2. correspondence explaining the circumstances

3. examination work, if appropriate.
Principal Assessor Correspondence cases should be reviewed in the light of the circumstances explained in the correspondence.

The revised awards should be entered on the list opposite the candidate’s name.

If no change is justified "Stet" should be entered.

Candidates with a Learning or Hearing Difficulty - SAA Referrals

The following will be provided:

1. a computer printout detailing the cases
2. the candidates’ scripts.

The scripts should be scanned by the Principal Assessor to ensure that no undue penalty has been imposed by the marker who has no knowledge of the difficulty.

If there is evidence of a penalty the scripts should be re-marked. The revised grade should be entered on the printout in the column headed “Principal Assessor’s Decision”.

If there is no evidence of a penalty being imposed "Stet" should be entered.

General

Ellen Aitken may be contacted on extension 689016862 for assistance.

The Principal Assessor should phone Ellen Aitken when all the above cases have been actioned.
Assessment Appeals

Standard Grade

General

Assessment appeals enable the centre to provide SQA with alternative evidence in cases of lower than expected examination performance. They also act as the final mechanism for detecting and correcting any marking error in a candidate’s scripts.

Prior to the issue of results, a review of element awards is conducted by computer on the basis of a comparison with centres’ Course/external estimate grades. Where justified, element awards are improved into line with estimates.

As full use will have been made of centres’ estimates, appeals consideration is based on assessment of Coursework evidence and, where appropriate, review of examination scripts.

Material Provided

We provide appeals worksheets by element, in centre number order. The bundles of coursework evidence and examination scripts are arranged in the same order.

- please replace the material in the appropriate bundles after each case has been actioned

- do not amalgamate scripts with coursework evidence

Arriving at a Decision

Consideration falls into two stages

- assessment of the coursework evidence

- scrutiny of the examination scripts.

You can grant the appeal at either of these stages but you cannot reject it until both stages have been carried out in sequence. Assume that the centre is asking for the estimate grade to be awarded.

Absentees

Sometimes a candidate in the same group has received an absentee award at an earlier stage. In such cases, we will provide you with a list of absentee candidates in the Course, showing any awards made, the coursework evidence on which the awards were based and, where they exist, the examination scripts. The appeals worksheet will show the word Absentee against these candidates’ names. Absentee decisions should be taken into account when dealing with appeals as absentee and appeals decisions must be consistent. When a decision has been reached on the appeal cases, the Absentee indicator on the appeals worksheet should be ticked to show that the absentee cases have been taken into account.

Please note that no change should be made to the absentee award(s).
Considering Assessment Appeals

Assess the coursework evidence against the GRC. If, on the basis of the coursework evidence, an improved award

a is justified and raises the award to the estimate, deem the appeal successful

or

b is justified but the improved grade is less than the estimated grade, review the scripts (check the marking and the accuracy of addition and recording of marks) and award the better of the two available grades. This may or may not equal the estimated grade. Before reviewing a script consider the change required in order to improve the award justified by the coursework evidence.

If, for example, a candidate is estimated at grade 2 in an element, has gained grade 4 at the examination and the coursework evidence supports a grade 3, there is no point in looking at the candidate’s General Level script as only the Credit Level script could lead to the award of the estimate grade.

or

c is not justified, review the scripts and improve the award where this is justified through correction of an error. If no error is found, deem the appeal unsuccessful.

Monitoring the standard of decisions

As Principal Assessor you should ensure that all appeals decisions made by the examining team are to the national standard. You should sample the work of each member of the team. If you identify a discrepancy, you should discuss it immediately with the Examiner concerned and take whatever remedial action is necessary, including reassessment of any decisions made earlier.

Principal Assessors will therefore deal with fewer cases themselves, depending on the size of their team.

Points to Note

Before closing an appeal, ensure that the candidate’s examination work has been reviewed, that all of the answers etc have been marked and that the marks have been added up correctly. An appeal may not be deemed unsuccessful until this has been done.

When the task has been completed the Examiner should initial and date the total mark on the script. If an alteration is required to the total mark this should also be initialed and dated, and recorded in such a way that it is clear whether the change derives from summation of the marks or from the marking.

Some cases are shown on the worksheet as ‘invalid’ and no action is required. Cases are invalid where a candidate has

- an estimate which is code ‘8’
- an estimate which is the same as or less than the award
• the award which is the best available for the papers sat
• an award of grade 1
• already received official absentee consideration.

Grades 1-7 are available on appeal but do not award a candidate on appeal a grade better than the best grade available from the papers attempted. Where grade 7 has resulted from an examination attempt at Credit Level only, an award of grade 3 or 4 may be made if justified by the coursework evidence. Similarly, where grade 7 has resulted from an attempt at General Level only, grade 5 or 6 may be awarded.

However, where a candidate has failed to achieve a grade 2 by one mark on the Credit paper, grade 3 can normally be awarded and similarly grade 5 on a General paper. You can extend beyond the one mark where the marks scale is a long one (in Standard Grade terms).

If you cannot improve an award at grade 7, provide a brief explanation. This should be, signed against the award on the appeals worksheet by the team member concerned.

Nothing should be removed by an Examiner for personal use.

Recording the Decision

Centres sometimes query appeals decisions so it is important that you record details of the stages through which each appeal has gone. For each appeal tick (J) the appropriate column(s) of the section headed ‘PA Decision’ on the appeals worksheet as follows:

appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence alone - tick (√) EV column only;

appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence and scrutiny of scripts - or appeal rejected - tick (J) EV and SC columns.

In addition, indicate your decision in the “Exam Res” column by either stroking through the original award and replacing it with the improved award, or entering "Stet" alongside the unaltered award.

Explanations of decisions which might seem inconsistent to centres

It may appear inconsistent if the prelim results show two candidates with the same/similar results yet one candidate receives an improvement while the other does not. The reason could be that the prelin indicates a good understanding only in some areas of the Course. In the examination scripts, one of the candidates has demonstrated a good grasp of other parts of the Course. These two pieces of evidence have therefore allowed that candidate to have their award improved. On the other hand, the candidate whose award was not improved perhaps only offered evidence in the script on the same part of the Course covered already in the prelim evidence. Without, demonstrated evidence of attainment at the level required no improvement was possible. A brief comment explaining such differences would be useful.
Completion of Action

Before allowing members of the examining team to leave, Principal Assessors should contact Ann Brand (ext 6858) to check whether there are more appeals to be considered and to make arrangements for dealing with any that may be submitted after the examining team has gone.

Assistance

If, having read these instructions, you require further clarification or any other assistance you should in the first instance contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2 and Higher

General

Assessment appeals enable the centre to provide SQA with alternative evidence in cases of lower than expected examination performance. They also act as the final mechanism for detecting and correcting any marking error in a candidate’s scripts.

The new National Courses offer great benefits to the assessment appeals process. Centres will be asked to submit the evidence from the constituent Units of the Course. This should allow teams to see the performance of candidates over the entire Course.

Prior to the issue of results, a review of awards will be conducted by computer on the basis of comparison with centres’ Course/external estimate awards. Where justified awards are improved into line with estimates. After the review has taken place, candidates who remain with band 7 - a near miss - in a National Course will receive a grade C in the National Course of the same title at the level below, provided they have successfully completed the Units of the Course.

As full use will have been made of centres’ estimates, appeals consideration is based on assessment of coursework evidence and, where appropriate, review of examination scripts.

Material Provided

We provide two sets of appeals worksheets in centre number order. One set will list those candidates whose results are required urgently and the other lists non-urgent cases. The bundles of coursework evidence and examination scripts are arranged in the same order.

1. please replace the material in the appropriate bundles after each case has been actioned

2. do not amalgamate scripts with coursework evidence,

The coursework evidence should include the evidence on which the Unit assessments were made. In the main, this will comprise candidate responses to NABs. Internal assessments are externally moderated, but because this is based on light sampling, it is possible that you might find Unit evidence which does not support the award of a Pass in the Unit. Note this on the worksheet, and the centre will be moderated next year.

Arriving at a Decision

Priority should be given to the urgent cases.

Consideration falls into two stages

1. assessment of the coursework evidence

2. scrutiny of the examination scripts.

You can grant the appeal at either of these stages but you cannot reject it until both stages have been carried out in sequence. Assume that the centre is asking for the estimate to be awarded.
Absentees

Sometimes a candidate in the same group has received an absentee award at an earlier stage. In such cases, we will provide you with a list of absentee candidates in the Course, showing any awards made, the coursework evidence on which the awards were based and, where they exist, the examination scripts. The appeals worksheet will show the word Absentee against these candidates’ names. Absentee decisions should be taken into account when dealing with appeals as absentee and appeals decisions must be consistent. When a decision has been reached on the appeal cases, the Absentee indicator on the appeals worksheet should be ticked to show that the absentee cases have been taken into account.

Please note that no change should be made to the absentee award(s).

Considering Assessment Appeals

Assess the coursework evidence against the assessment criteria. If, on the basis of the coursework evidence, an improved award

a is justified and raises the award to the estimate, deem the appeal successful

or

b is justified but the improved award is less than the estimate, review the scripts (check the marking and the accuracy of addition and recording of marks) and grant the better of the two available awards. This may or may not equal the estimate. Before reviewing a script consider the change required in order to improve the award justified by the coursework evidence

or

c is not justified, review the scripts and improve the award where this is justified through correction of an error. If no error is found, deem the appeal unsuccessful.

Monitoring the standard of decisions

As Principal Assessor you should ensure that all appeals decisions made by the examining team are to the national standard. You should sample the work of each member of the team. If you identify a discrepancy, you should ‘discuss it immediately with the Examiner concerned and take whatever remedial action is necessary, including reassessment of any decisions made earlier.

Principal Assessors will therefore deal with fewer cases themselves, depending on the size of their team.

Points to Note

Before closing an appeal, ensure that the candidate’s examination work has been reviewed, that all of the answers etc have been marked and that the marks have been added up correctly. An appeal may not be deemed unsuccessful until this has been done.

When the task has been completed the Examiner should initial and date the total mark on the script. If an alteration is required to the total mark this should also be initialled and dated, and recorded in such a way that it is clear whether the change derives from summation of the marks or from the marking.
Some cases are shown on the worksheet as ‘invalid’ and no action is required. Cases are invalid where a candidate has

- an estimate which is the same as or less than the award
- an award of grade ‘A
- already received official absentee consideration.

Do not write comments or rough working on coursework evidence as some centres request its return. Nothing should be removed by an Examiner for personal use.

Partial Attempts at the Examination

Where a candidate has not attempted all parts of the examination and who did not receive absentee consideration, an appeal decision cannot be based on any coursework evidence submitted for the parts not taken.

Recording the Decision

Centres sometimes query appeals decisions so it is important that you record details of the stages through which each appeal has gone. For each appeal tick (J) the appropriate column(s) of the section headed ‘PA Decision’ on the appeals worksheet as follows:

- appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence alone tick (J) EV column only;
- appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence and scrutiny of scripts - or appeal rejected - tick (J) EV and SC columns.

In addition, indicate your decision in the appropriate column by either stroking through the original award and replacing it with the improved award, or entering "Stet" alongside the unaltered award.

Explanations of decisions which might seem inconsistent to centres

It may appear inconsistent if the prelim results show two candidates with the same/similar results yet one candidate receives an improvement while the other does not. The reason could be that the prelim indicates a good understanding only in some areas of the Course. In the examinations scripts, one of the candidates has demonstrated a good grasp of other parts of the Course. These two pieces of evidence have therefore allowed that candidate to have their award improved. On the other hand, the candidate whose award was not improved perhaps only offered evidence in the script on the same part of the Course covered already in the prelim evidence. Without demonstrated evidence of attainment at the level required no improvement was possible. A brief comment explaining such differences would be useful.

Completion of Action

Before allowing members of the examining team to leave, Principal Assessors should contact Ann Brand (ext 6858) to check whether there are more appeals to be considered and to make arrangements for dealing with any that may be submitted after the examining team has gone.
Assistance

If, having read these instructions, you require further clarification or any other assistance you should in the first instance contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
SCE Higher

General

Assessment appeals enable the centre to provide SQA with alternative evidence in cases of lower than expected examination performance. They also act as the final mechanism for detecting and correcting any marking error in a candidate's scripts.

Prior to the issue of results, a review of awards will be conducted by computer on the basis of a comparison with centres’ estimates. Where justified, awards are improved into line with estimates.

As full use will have been made of centres’ estimates, appeals consideration is based on assessment of coursework evidence and, where appropriate, review of examination scripts.

Material Provided

We provide two sets of appeals worksheets in centre number order. One set will list those candidates whose results are required urgently and the other will list non-urgent cases. The bundles of coursework evidence and examination scripts are arranged in the same order.

- please replace the material in the appropriate bundles after each case has been actioned
- do not amalgamate scripts with coursework evidence,

Arriving at a Decision

Priority should be given to the urgent cases

Consideration falls into two stages

- assessment of the coursework evidence
- scrutiny of the examination scripts

You can grant the appeal at either of these stages but you cannot reject it until both stages have been carried out in sequence. Assume that the centre is asking for the estimate to be awarded.

Absentees

Sometimes a candidate in the same group has received an absentee award at an earlier stage. In such cases, we will provide you with a list of absentee candidates in the Course, showing any awards made, the coursework evidence on which the awards were based and, where they exist, the examination scripts. The appeals worksheet will show the word Absentee against these candidates’ names. Absentee decisions should be taken into account when dealing with appeals as absentee and appeals decisions must be consistent. When a decision has been reached on the appeal cases, the Absentee indicator on the appeals worksheet should be ticked to show that the absentee cases have been taken into account.

Please note that no change should be made to the absentee award(s),
Considering Assessment Appeals

Assess the coursework evidence against the syllabus. If, on the basis of the coursework evidence, an improved award

a  is justified and raises the award to the estimate, deem the appeal successful

or

b  is justified but the improved award is less than the estimate, review the scripts (check the marking and the accuracy of addition and recording of marks) and grant the better of the two available awards. This may or may not equal the estimate. Before reviewing a script consider the change required in order to improve the award justified by the coursework evidence

or

c  is not justified, review the scripts and improve the award where this is justified through correction of an error. If no error is found, deem the appeal unsuccessful.

Monitoring the standard of decisions

As Principal Assessor you should ensure that all appeals decisions made by the examining team are to the national standard. You should sample the work of each member of the team. If you identify a discrepancy, you should discuss it immediately with the Examiner concerned and take whatever remedial action is necessary, including reassessment of any decisions made earlier.

Principal Assessors will therefore deal with fewer cases themselves, depending on the size of their team.

Points to Note

Before closing an appeal, ensure that the candidate’s examination work has been reviewed, that all of the answers etc have been marked and that the marks have been added up correctly. An appeal may not be deemed unsuccessful until this has been done.

When the task has been completed the Examiner should initial and date the total mark on the script. If an alteration is required to the total mark this should also be initialled and dated, and recorded in such a way that it is clear whether the change derives from summation of the marks or from the marking.

Some cases are shown on the worksheet as ‘invalid’ and no action is required. Cases are invalid where a candidate has

- an estimate which is the same as or less than the award
- an award of band ‘A’
- already received official absentee consideration.

Where an appeal for an improved award has been unsuccessful, consider awarding a band ‘D’ if it has not already been gained by the appellant.
Do not write comments or rough working on coursework evidence as some centres request its return. Nothing should be removed by an Examiner for personal use.

Partial Attempt at the Examination

Where a candidate has not attempted all parts of the examination and who did not receive absentee consideration, an appeal decision cannot be based on any coursework evidence submitted for the parts not taken.

Recording the Decision

Centres sometimes query appeals decisions so it is important that you record details of the stages through which each appeal has gone. For each appeal tick (✓) the appropriate column(s) of the section headed “PA Decision” on the appeals’ worksheet as follows:

- Appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence alone - tick (J) EV column only;
- Appeal granted after assessment of coursework evidence and scrutiny of scripts - or appeal rejected - tick (J) EV and SC columns.

In addition, indicate your decision in the “Amended Band” column by either stroking through the original award and replacing it with the improved award, or entering "Stet" alongside the unaltered award.

Explanations of decisions which might seem inconsistent to centres

It may appear inconsistent if the prelim results show two candidates with the same/similar results yet one candidate receives an improvement while the other does not. The reason could be that the prelim indicates a good understanding only in some areas of the Course. In the examinations scripts, one of the candidates has demonstrated a good grasp of other parts of the Course. These two pieces of evidence have therefore allowed that candidate to have their award improved. On the other hand, the candidate whose award was not improved perhaps only offered evidence in the script on the same part of the Course covered already in the prelim evidence. Without demonstrated evidence of attainment at the level required no improvement was possible. A brief comment explaining such differences would be useful.

Completion of Action

Before allowing members of the examining team to leave, Principal Assessors should contact Ann Brand (ext 6858) to check whether there are more appeals to be considered and to make arrangements for dealing with any that may be submitted after the examining team has gone.

Assistance

If, having read these instructions, you require further clarification or any other assistance you should in the first instance contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).
Certificate of Sixth Year Studies

General

Assessment appeals enable the centre to provide SQA with alternative evidence in cases of lower than expected examination performance. They also act as the final mechanism for detecting and correcting any marking error in a candidate’s scripts.

Material Provided

We provide two sets of appeals worksheets in centre number order. One set will list candidates whose results are required urgently and the other lists the non-urgent cases. The bundles of coursework evidence and examination scripts are arranged in the same order.

- please replace the material in the appropriate bundles after each case has been actioned.
- do not amalgamate scripts with coursework evidence.

Arriving at a Decision

Priority should be given to the urgent cases.

Consideration falls into three stages

- consideration of the order of merit
- assessment of the coursework evidence
- scrutiny of the examination scripts.

You can grant the appeal at any of these stages but you cannot reject it until all stages have been carried out in sequence. Assume that the centre is asking for the estimated ranking to be awarded.

Absentees

Sometimes a candidate in the same group has received an absentee award at an earlier stage. In such cases, we will provide you with a list of absentee candidates in the Course, showing any awards made, the coursework evidence on which the awards were based and, where they exist, the examination scripts. The appeals worksheet will show the word Absentee against these candidates’ names. Absentee decisions should be taken into account when dealing with appeals as absentee and appeals decisions must be consistent. When a decision has been reached on the appeal cases, the Absentee indicator on the appeals worksheet should be ticked to show that the absentee cases have been taken into account.

Please note that no change should be made to the absentee award(s).

However, there may be cases where an appellant is placed higher on the Order of Merit than a candidate granted an absentee award at the examination. Provided you are satisfied with the Order of Merit group performance, you should improve the award to the same as the absentee candidate. Where this is not the case, indicate the reason on the appeals worksheet.
Where an appellant and an absentee candidate appear on the same Order of Merit, consider if the appeal result could have a bearing on the absentee award to the extent of its being upgraded. If you decide on any such changes indicate these on the absentee review sheet, not on the appeals worksheet.

Considering Assessment Appeals

Assess the coursework evidence against the criteria. If, on the basis of the Order of Merit, an improved award is justified deem the appeal successful

or

b is justified but the improved award is less than that estimated, assess the coursework evidence and where necessary, review the scripts (check the marking and the accuracy of addition and recording of marks) and grant the better of the two available rankings. This may or may not equal the estimate. Before reviewing a script consider the change required in order to improve the award justified by the Order of Merit and/or coursework evidence

or

c is not justified after the above stages, review the scripts and improve the award where this is justified through correction of an error. If no error is found, deem the appeal unsuccessful.

Monitoring the standard of decisions

As Principal Assessor you should ensure that all appeals decisions made by the examining team are to the national standard. You should sample the work of each member of the team. If you identify a discrepancy, you should discuss it immediately with the Examiner concerned and take whatever remedial action is necessary, including reassessment of any decisions made earlier.

Principal Assessors will therefore deal with fewer cases themselves, depending on the size of their team.

Points to Note

Before closing an appeal, ensure that the candidate’s examination work has been reviewed, that all of the answers etc have been marked and that the marks have been added up correctly. An appeal may not he deemed unsuccessful until this has been done.

When the task has been completed the Examiner should initial and date the total mark on the script. If an alteration is required to the total mark this should also be initialled and dated, and recorded in such a way that it is clear whether the change derives from summation of the marks or from the marking.

Some cases are shown on the worksheet as ‘invalid’ and no action is required. Cases are invalid where a candidate has

- an estimated ranking which is the same as or less than the award
- an award of 'A'
  - already received official absentee consideration.

Do not write comments or rough working on coursework evidence as some centres request its return. Nothing should be removed by an Examiner for personal use.

Recording the Decision

Centres sometimes query appeals decisions so it is important that you record details of the stages through which each appeal has gone. For each appeal tick (√) the appropriate column(s) after the section headed “Result of Appeal” on the appeals worksheet as follows:

- appeal granted after consideration of order of merit alone - tick (J) O/M column only;
- appeal granted after assessment of order of merit and coursework evidence - tick (J) O/M and EV columns only;
- appeal granted after assessment of order of merit, coursework evidence and scrutiny of scripts - or appeal rejected - tick (√) O/M, EV and script columns.

In addition, indicate your decision in the “Result of Appeal” column by either stroking through the original award and replacing it with the improved rank, or entering "Stet" alongside the unaltered award.

Explanations of decisions which might seem inconsistent to centres

It may appear inconsistent if the prelim results show two candidates with the same/similar results yet one candidate receives an improvement while the other does not. The reason could be that the prelim indicates a good understanding only in some areas of the Course. In the examination scripts, one of the candidates has demonstrated a good grasp of other parts of the Course. These two pieces of evidence have therefore allowed that candidate to have their award improved. On the other hand, the candidate whose award was not improved perhaps only offered evidence in the script on the same part of the Course covered already in the prelim evidence. Without demonstrated evidence of attainment at the level required no improvement was possible. A brief comment explaining such differences would be useful.

Completion of Action

Before allowing members of the examining team to leave, Principal Assessors should contact Ann Brand (ext 6858) to check whether there are more appeals to be considered and to make arrangements for dealing with any that may be submitted after the examining team has gone.

Assistance

If, having read these instructions, you require further clarification or any other assistance you should in the first instance contact Ann Brand (ext 6858).