



NQ Verification 2015–16

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	English
Verification event/visiting information	Event/visiting
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H23Y 74 National 4 Added Value

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Throughout the samples presented for verification there were an extremely high number of approaches which met all of the Assessment Standards. The majority of approaches were clear, motivating, relevant and structured to support the candidates in achieving this Unit.

Personalisation and choice were generally evident across the samples, and a variety of different approaches was taken which allowed for stimulating activities to be presented. Some centres had taken an approach which adapted the UASP to help guide their candidates, while other centres had given a great deal of personal choice to the candidates — both approaches worked well in helping candidates to produce work that was something they had clearly engaged with and which met all of the Assessment Standards.

There were still a small number of centres who had not understood the requirement that one of the texts chosen by the candidates to be evaluated needed to be a written text (a requirement for Assessment Standard 1.1).

There were also a very small number of centres who had presented an approach which did not allow for personalisation and choice. This tended to be evident in a class based approach to the texts chosen.

Assessment judgements

An extremely high number of the centre submissions provided assessment judgements that were accurate and in line with the Assessment Standards. Some centres had developed very good methods of feedback and clear comments, particularly in relation to Assessment Standard 1.4, which allowed assessment judgements to be clearly evidenced. Generally, there was excellent supportive feedback given to candidates on how to achieve the Assessment Standards, and this allowed assessment judgements to be clearly evidenced.

The small number of Assessment Judgements that were not in line with Assessment Standards tended to be when centres were too severe. This could be seen, in particular, when centres were expecting candidates to do more than the Assessment Standards required, leaning more towards the Standards expected for National 5 Folio or National 5 Creation and Production. Centres are reminded of the minimum competence required at this level (National 4), and that it is important not to push the standard beyond what is required at this level.

There were a small number of centres which demonstrated a lack of evidence for candidates' responses to questions, required for Assessment Standard 1.4. The evidence required for Assessment Standard 1.4 is:

- written or oral response(s) from the candidate

Oral evidence which could include:

a recording of a candidate's oral response(s)

or:

a detailed checklist of a candidate's oral response(s)

or:

detailed observation notes

03

Section 3: General comments

Internal verification was evident in many samples and in a variety of ways. Almost all centres had strong evidence of internal verification.

There was a great deal of good practice evident, but many centres where good practice was evident did not allow their materials to be used for exemplification purposes. It would be helpful if centres could allow for good practice to be shared.

Visiting verification was received with a great deal of positivity. Centres responded well to verification and used this opportunity to offer opinions and seek guidance. This was an approach to verification that was welcomed by almost all centres.