



# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Languages — French
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2015

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H276 74 National 4: French: Added Value Unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

It was pleasing to note that the approaches to assessment used by centres that were selected for verification were almost all 'Accepted'. This demonstrates that centres have followed guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

A large majority of centres have used centre-devised assessments to assess their candidates reflecting the approach set in the published Added Value Unit assessment support pack. This has allowed for personalisation and choice. The tasks were on the whole appropriate, varied and on interesting topics.

Centres should make sure they clearly indicate if they have translated and adapted the Unit assessment support pack or devised a new assessment to assess the Added Value Unit. Centres must include the texts and a judging evidence table if they have used a centre-devised assessment to assess candidates. It is also recommended that they include an adapted judging evidence table when using a translation and an adaptation of the SQA-produced Unit assessment support pack: National 4 Added Value Unit.

Centres should feel free to reformat the assessments provided in the Unit assessment support packs by slightly amending the questions, the texts or the layout to suit their candidates' needs while maintaining the standards.

It is recommended that centres refer to the SQA Unit assessment support pack: National 4 Added Value Unit for guidance regarding length of texts, level of challenge and difficulty to ensure that the language is straightforward and that the questions are supportive and appropriate at National 4.

## **Assessment judgements**

Again, it is pleasing to report that a large majority of the assessment judgements made by assessors in centres have been 'Accepted' as they were in line with national standards. This demonstrates that centres have successfully implemented guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. Overall, staff have made best use of the expertise already in place in centres or in clusters of centres. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

Many centres have clearly justified how they made their assessment judgements. This should be commended. This is good practice as it is very useful and appropriate for internal and external verification purposes.

Centres should ensure that they submit documentation for each piece of evidence, clearly demonstrating how assessment judgements are made and clearly indicating the overall outcome of pass or fail for each Assessment Standard of the Outcome, eg an assessment outcome record/ commentary/ checklist for each candidate.

Detailed commentaries about each candidate's performance are very useful for internal and external verification purposes; however, it is acknowledged that this approach can be time-consuming. Therefore, a detailed checklist for each candidate's performance can be just as useful for the verifier, and more practical for the centre. This could also be used as effective feedback to candidates.

Centres should merge in-house information on judging evidence with judging evidence tables to create one document to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made.

It is recommended that centres populate the judging evidence table (column 4) with a range of other possible answers that have been accepted by the centre.

## **Specificities of Assessment Standard 1.3 and 1.4**

Overall candidate performance was appropriate for this level and in some cases candidates went beyond what is expected at National 4.

For the assessment of talking and listening in the Added Value Unit Assessment Standards 1.3 and 1.4, there is no requirement to submit an audio recording of

candidate work. However, audio-recordings allow verifiers to provide more detailed and useful feedback to centres.

If no audio recording is submitted, centres must submit a detailed checklist or commentary with some examples of what each candidate says referenced against each Assessment Standard for the Outcome.

It is recommended that centres use a range of open-ended questions to allow candidates to meet Assessment Standard 1.4. This will allow candidates to demonstrate that they can handle straightforward language and use a reasonable range of vocabulary appropriate to National 4. Candidates should also be encouraged to answer unexpected questions. Performances should not be scripted in advance and should allow for personalisation and choice, although candidates should be aware of the type of questions they could be asked on the selected topic.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

### **What evidence should a centre send in for a verification round?**

Most centres submitted very clear and well-organised packages for verification, which is to be commended. This has facilitated the verification process and assisted in providing useful feedback to centres.

### **How to complete the SQA Verification Sample Form**

It is important that the SQA Verification Sample Form is completed correctly and matches the information on candidate scripts and the Candidate Evidence Flyleaf. This is very important, as the judgement (Pass/Fail) entered on the Verification Sample Form is what the verification exercise is based on, regardless of what is entered on the candidates' scripts or individual record forms.

Centres should arrange candidates in alphabetical order on the Verification Sample Form. The order of the candidates' evidence must match the order on the Verification Sample Form.

The judgement entered on the Verification Sample Form is for verification purposes and is not necessarily final as there might be an opportunity for a candidate to be re-assessed at a later stage if not already done.

### **What evidence of internal verification and quality assurance should a centre send?**

This could be a covering note explaining the process used (eg cross-marking, discussion on validity of centre-devised assessments at meetings, etc.) and a clear indication on the candidate scripts or on the candidate record form that the work was internally verified and the judgements agreed.

Some centres have detailed their quality assurance procedures, which is to be commended.

Centres devising their Internal verification procedures may find the SQA's verification toolkit helpful: <http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/71679.5825.html>.

**How do I share my concerns/queries about any aspects of the verification process for French?**

Any queries/concerns should be sent to SQA via the centre's SQA Co-ordinator. They should not be included in any envelopes destined for verification. The verification team consisting of nominees and appointees cannot respond to these, as their role is to focus on the verification process.