

14 August 2006

To: SQA Co-ordinator
Secondary schools and FE colleges
EA special schools
Independent secondary
Higher education institutions

Action by Recipient	
	Response required
✓	Note and pass on
	None — update/information only

Contact Name: Jim McDonald/Alan Wilson at Glasgow
Direct Line: 0845 213 5515/5517
E-mail: jim.mcdonald@sqa.org.uk
alan.wilson@sqa.org.uk

Dear Colleague

National Qualifications update

The contents of this letter should be passed on to the member of staff responsible for Modern Languages.

Modern Languages update

We wish to bring the following matters to your attention.

1 Examination diet 2006

Please note the following in relation to this year's diet:

- ◆ The release of component marks will again take place at the date of certification.
- ◆ Principal Assessor (PA) reports will be available for French, German Italian, Russian and Spanish at all levels, and for Urdu at Standard Grade. The PA reports will appear on SQA's website in autumn 2006.
- ◆ Finalised marking instructions for all 2006 examinations will be published on SQA's website by November 2006.

2 Higher Urdu 2007 onwards

A National Course with external examination will be available in Higher Urdu from 2007. First certification will take place in 2008. SQA has appointed a development officer whose responsibility will include the production of Unit assessments and specimen papers.

3 Exemplification of Writing, Higher

New pegged mark descriptors for each Writing task at Higher have been produced, and are attached to this letter. Exemplification based on these new descriptors for each task at Higher will be available on the secure area of SQA's website in session 2006/07. The SQA Co-ordinator in your centre can access and download these materials.

4 Revision of NQ Language in Work Units

Revised Unit specification and NAB assessments are now available on the secure area of SQA's website, and are for use in session 2006/07 onwards. These materials are available at all NQ levels in French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish. They can be downloaded by your SQA Co-ordinator. **Previous Specifications and NAB assessments are no longer valid.**

5 Audio recording of Speaking Performance at Intermediate and Higher

Please note that centres may wish to retain evidence on either tape or CD for performance in Speaking at the above levels, for the purposes of verification (moderation). A separate tape or CD must be available for every candidate in the submitted sample.

6 Advanced Higher: paper I, inferential question

From 2007 onwards, the Reading section of paper I will contain one inferential question worth 7 marks, which alters the previous composition of two inferential questions, which were worth 5 marks each. Pegged marks of 7-5-3-1-0 will be available for this question, and revised descriptors for these marks are attached to this letter.

7 Professional Development Workshop (PDW), Advanced Higher

Issues relating to the production of the Folio, Translation and approaches to the discursive essay at Advanced Higher will be the focus of the next PDW event, to be held at Napier University, Edinburgh, on Saturday 11 November 2006. Workshops will be offered in French, German, Italian and Spanish, with group sessions dealing with generic issues.

8 Verification (moderation) of Standard Grade Speaking

Verification (previously moderation) visits will take place in November and December this session. Centres selected for verification will be informed beforehand to arrange a suitable time for the Verifier to visit. Centres delivering **Urdu** at Standard Grade should note that the above arrangements for verification will also apply to Urdu from session 2006/07 onwards.

Yours faithfully,



Jim McDonald
Qualifications Manager



Alan Wilson
Qualifications Manager

Encs

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Very Good	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All bullet points are covered fully, in a balanced way, including a number of complex sentences. • Some candidates may also provide additional information. • A wide range of verbs/verb forms, tenses and constructions is used. • Overall this comes over as a competent, well thought-out account of the event which reads naturally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate handles all aspects of grammar and spelling accurately, although the language may contain some minor errors or even one more serious error. • Where the candidate attempts to use language more appropriate to post-Higher, a slightly higher number of inaccuracies need not detract from the overall very good impression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate is comfortable with almost all the grammar used and generally uses a different verb or verb form in each sentence. • There is good use of a variety of tenses, adjectives, adverbs and prepositional phrases and, where appropriate, word order. • The candidate uses co-ordinating conjunctions and subordinate clauses throughout the writing. • The language flows well.
Good	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All bullet points are addressed, generally quite fully, and some complex sentences may be included. • The response to one bullet point may be thin, although other bullet points are dealt with in some detail. • The candidate uses a reasonable range of verbs/verb forms and other constructions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate generally handles verbs and other parts of speech accurately but simply. • There may be some errors in spelling, adjective endings and, where relevant, case endings. • Use of accents may be less secure. • Where the candidate is attempting to use more complex vocabulary and structures, these may be less successful, although basic structures are used accurately. • There may be minor misuse of dictionary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be less variety in the verbs used. • Most of the more complex sentences use co-ordinating conjunctions, and there may also be examples of subordinating conjunctions where appropriate. • In one bullet point the language may be more basic than might otherwise be expected at this level. • Overall the writing will be competent, mainly correct, but pedestrian.

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Satisfactory	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate uses mainly simple, more basic sentences. The language is perhaps repetitive and uses a limited range of verbs and fixed phrases not appropriate to this level. In some examples, one or two bullet points may be less fully addressed. In some cases, the content may be similar to that of good or very good examples, but with some serious accuracy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The verbs are generally correct, but basic. Tenses may be inconsistent, with present tenses being used at times instead of past tenses. There are quite a few errors in other parts of speech – personal pronouns, gender of nouns, adjective endings, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in the use of accents. Some prepositions may be inaccurate or omitted e.g. I went the town. While the language may be reasonably accurate in three or four bullet points, in the remaining two control of the language structure may deteriorate significantly. Overall, there is more correct than incorrect and there is the impression overall that the candidate can handle tenses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate copes with the past tense of some verbs. A limited range of verbs is used to address some of the bullet points. Candidate relies on a limited range of vocabulary and structures. When using the perfect tense, the past participle is incorrect or the auxiliary verb is omitted on occasion. Sentences may be basic and mainly brief. There is minimal use of adjectives, probably mainly after “is” e.g. The boss was helpful. The candidate has a weak knowledge of plurals. There may be several spelling errors e.g. reversal of vowel combinations.
Unsatisfactory	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In some cases the content may be basic. In other cases there may be little difference in content between Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. The language is repetitive, with undue reliance on fixed phrases and a limited range of common basic verbs such as <i>to be, to have, to play, to watch</i>. While the language used to address the more predictable bullet points may be accurate, serious errors occur when the candidate attempts to address the less predictable areas. The Directed Writing may be presented as a single paragraph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to form tenses is inconsistent. In the use of the perfect tense the auxiliary verb is omitted on a number of occasions. There may be confusion between the singular and plural form of verbs. There are errors in many other parts of speech – gender of nouns, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in spelling and, where appropriate, word order. Several errors are serious, perhaps showing mother tongue interference. There may be one sentence which is not intelligible to a sympathetic native speaker. One area may be very weak. Overall, there is more incorrect than correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate copes mainly only with the predictable language required at the earlier bullet points. The verbs “was” and “went” may also be used correctly. There is inconsistency in the use of various expressions, especially verbs. Sentences are more basic. An English word may appear in the writing or a word may be omitted. There may be an example of serious dictionary misuse.

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Poor	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content and language may be very basic. • However, in many cases the content may be little different from that expected at Unsatisfactory or even at Satisfactory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the verbs are incorrect or even omitted. • There are many errors in other parts of speech – personal pronouns, gender of nouns, adjective endings, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in spelling and word order. • Prepositions are not used correctly. • The language is probably inaccurate throughout the writing. • Some sentences may not be understood by a sympathetic native speaker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate cannot cope with more than one or two basic verbs, frequently “had” and “was”. • The candidate displays almost no knowledge of past tenses of verbs. • Verbs used more than once may be written differently on each occasion. • The candidate has a very limited vocabulary. • Several English or “made-up” words may appear in the writing. • There are examples of serious dictionary misuse.
Very Poor	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content is very basic <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate has not completed at least three of the core bullet points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Virtually) nothing is correct. • Most of the errors are serious. • Very little is intelligible to a sympathetic native speaker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate copes only with “have” and “am”. • Very few words are correctly written in the foreign language. • English words are used. • There may be several examples of mother tongue interference. • There may be several examples of serious dictionary misuse.

What if....?	
the candidate only addresses one part of one of the introductory, predictable bullet points?	In such a case the candidate is deemed to have not addressed the bullet points and a 2 mark penalty is made (i.e. 2 marks are deducted from the final mark awarded). This procedure applies at all categories.
some bullet points fit into one category but others are in the next, lower category?	It is important to look carefully at which bullet points are better addressed. If the better sections include the more predictable bullet points, the marker is less likely to be generous than if the unpredictable bullet points are of a better quality. If there is a serious decline after the initial bullet points, a lower mark must be awarded. It is also important to consider the balance of the bullet points. Sometimes a candidate writes twice as much about the opening bullet points – or even bullet points which are not there – than for the four remaining bullet points. In such cases, the lower mark being considered should be awarded.
the marker is having great difficulty in deciding whether the writing is good enough to pass or not quite good enough to pass?	It is essential to consider carefully the accuracy of the verbs overall. If more verbs are correct than wrong, then it is likely that the candidate deserves to pass, unless there are many other inaccuracies in the writing.
the Directed Writing, from the point of view of content, looks as if it belongs in a top category, but where accuracy is concerned, contains some possibly serious grammatical errors in more basic structures as a result of using relatively advanced structures combined with a less than confident knowledge of the more basic structures?	This is a case where the candidate is more adventurous, but less accurate. It is always important to assess what it is the candidate <u>can</u> do, and thus highlight the positive. However, in such cases, it is likely that the candidate will be awarded 9.

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Very Good	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The topic is covered fully, in a balanced way, including a number of complex sentences. Some candidates may also provide additional information. A wide range of verbs/verb forms and constructions is used. There may also be a variety of tenses. Overall this comes over as a competent, well thought-out response to the task which reads naturally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate handles all aspects of grammar and spelling accurately, although the language may contain some minor errors or even one more serious error. Where the candidate attempts to use language more appropriate to post-Higher, a slightly higher number of inaccuracies need not detract from the overall very good impression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate is comfortable with almost all the grammar used and generally uses a different verb or verb form in each sentence. There is good use of a variety of tenses, adjectives, adverbs and prepositional phrases and, where appropriate, word order. The candidate uses co-ordinating conjunctions and subordinate clauses throughout the writing. The language flows well.
Good	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The topic is addressed, generally quite fully, and some complex sentences may be included. The candidate uses a reasonable range of verbs/verb forms and other constructions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate generally handles verbs and other parts of speech accurately but simply. There may be some errors in spelling, adjective endings and, where relevant, case endings. Use of accents may be less secure. Where the candidate is attempting to use more complex vocabulary and structures, these may be less successful, although basic structures are used accurately. There may be minor misuse of dictionary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be less variety in the verbs used. Most of the more complex sentences use co-ordinating conjunctions, and there may also be examples of subordinating conjunctions where appropriate. At times the language may be more basic than might otherwise be expected at this level. Overall the writing will be competent, mainly correct, but pedestrian.

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Satisfactory	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate uses mainly simple, more basic sentences. The language is perhaps repetitive and uses a limited range of verbs and fixed phrases not appropriate to this level. The topic may not be fully addressed. In some cases, the content may be similar to that of good or very good examples, but with some serious accuracy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The verbs are generally correct, but basic. Tenses may be inconsistent. There are quite a few errors in other parts of speech – personal pronouns, gender of nouns, adjective endings, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in the use of accents. Some prepositions may be inaccurate or omitted e.g. I go the town. While the language may be reasonably accurate at times, the language structure may deteriorate significantly in places. Overall, there is more correct than incorrect and there is the impression overall that the candidate can handle tenses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate copes with the present tense of most verbs. A limited range of verbs is used. Candidate relies on a limited range of vocabulary and structures. Where the candidate attempts constructions with modal verbs, these are not always successful. Sentences may be basic and mainly brief. There is minimal use of adjectives, probably mainly after “is” e.g. My friend is reliable. The candidate has a weak knowledge of plurals. There may be several spelling errors e.g. reversal of vowel combinations.
Unsatisfactory	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In some cases the content may be basic. In other cases there may be little difference in content between Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. The language is repetitive, with undue reliance on fixed phrases and a limited range of common basic verbs such as <i>to be, to have, to play, to watch</i>. While the language used to address the more predictable aspects of the task may be accurate, serious errors occur when the candidate attempts to address a less predictable aspect. The Personal Response may be presented as a single paragraph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to form tenses is inconsistent. In the use of the perfect tense the auxiliary verb is omitted on a number of occasions. There may be confusion between the singular and plural form of verbs. There are errors in many other parts of speech – gender of nouns, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in spelling and, where appropriate, word order. Several errors are serious, perhaps showing mother tongue interference. There may be one sentence which is not intelligible to a sympathetic native speaker. Overall, there is more incorrect than correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate copes mainly only with predictable language. There is inconsistency in the use of various expressions, especially verbs. Sentences are more basic. An English word may appear in the writing or a word may be omitted. There may be an example of serious dictionary misuse.

Category	Mark	Content	Accuracy	Language Resource – Variety, Range, Structures
Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content and language may be very basic. • However, in many cases the content may be little different from that expected at Unsatisfactory or even at Satisfactory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the verbs are incorrect or even omitted. • There are many errors in other parts of speech – personal pronouns, gender of nouns, adjective endings, cases, singular/plural confusion – and in spelling and word order. • Prepositions are not used correctly. • The language is probably inaccurate throughout the writing. • Some sentences may not be understood by a sympathetic native speaker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate cannot cope with more than 1 or 2 basic verbs, frequently “has” and “is”. • Verbs used more than once may be written differently on each occasion. • The candidate has a very limited vocabulary. • Several English or “made-up” words may appear in the writing. • There are examples of serious dictionary misuse.
Very Poor	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content is very basic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Virtually) nothing is correct. • Most of the errors are serious. • Very little is intelligible to a sympathetic native speaker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate copes only with “have” and “am”. • Very few words are correctly written in the foreign language. • English words are used. • There may be several examples of mother tongue interference. • There may be several examples of serious dictionary misuse.

What if....?	
the candidate exceeds the recommended word count?	This in itself need not be important, although it is important to be clear that it is possible to attain top marks, if the writing does not exceed 150 words. It is important to assess what has been written – sometimes by exceeding the word count the candidate’s control of the language deteriorates and this has to be reflected in the mark awarded.
the candidate has been asked to address a topic with two aspects but only addresses one of these?	In such a case the candidate is deemed to have not addressed the task fully. The quality of the language should be assessed and the writing should then be placed in the next category down, e.g. if the writing would otherwise have been awarded 8, it should instead be awarded 6.
some parts of the writing fit into one category but others are in the next, lower category?	If the better sections contain more sophisticated language, it may still be appropriate to choose the higher marks. However, if the better sections contain relatively basic constructions and attempts to use more sophisticated language are unsuccessful, then it is most likely that the writing is at the 6/4 interface and the Marking Criteria should be used to help the marker come to a final decision.
the marker is having great difficulty in deciding whether the writing is good enough to pass or not quite good enough to pass?	It is essential to consider carefully the accuracy of the verbs overall. If more verbs are correct than wrong, then it is likely that the candidate deserves to pass, unless there are many other inaccuracies in the writing.

2007 Advanced Higher Reading

Pegged mark criteria for inferential question

- ◆ A pegged mark must be awarded only after reference to specific guidance given for that question in the amended/finalised marking instructions.
- ◆ A range of performance is available within each of the criteria.
- ◆ A mark of zero will be awarded to a performance which offers no appropriate inferencing skills, as outlined in the criteria for the other pegged marks.

Pegged marks	Criteria
7 OR 5	The candidate provides a clear, concise and reflective answer, drawing inferences which are entirely appropriate, analytical and which demonstrate a sophisticated and accurate reading of the text. The answer clearly relates to the advice given in the marking instructions.
3 OR 1	The candidate provides an answer which may contain some degree of misreading, but which offers evidence of appropriate inferencing skills. The candidate may, however, tend to supply information from the text with little attempt to draw inferences.
0	The candidate's answer simply provides information to be found in the text with no attempt to draw inferences.