



**Standard Grade and National Qualifications 2011
Internal Assessment Report
Gàidhlig and Gaelic (Learners)**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Standard Grade and National Qualifications in this subject.

Titles/levels of National Courses verified

Gàidhlig and Gaelic (Learners) — Intermediate 1 and 2

Assessment of Speaking — Higher

Titles/levels of Standard Grade Courses verified

Gàidhlig and Gaelic (Learners) — Standard Grade

General comments

Most centres have a clear and accurate understanding of requirements; however, a minority do not follow these to the letter.

Assessors are familiar with all necessary documentation and there is a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements.

Assessments from two centres were Not Accepted, but most were within the tolerance factor of 3 marks. Verification was conducted for a total of 10 centres.

Areas of good practice/areas for improvement

Most centres showed evidence of good practice and were adhering to the national standard. Some interlocutors showed good skills; they were patient and sympathetic and ready to assist with prompting when necessary. This, however, was commendably kept to a minimum, enabling pupils to perform well within the criteria set out. Generally, questions were suitably demanding at all levels, and a number of interlocutors succeeded in getting the best out of candidates, with evidence of good relationships between interlocutors and candidates.

Specific areas for improvement

Some centres should engage in more interactive discussion, leading to more spontaneous conversation as required by the task. Some recordings were unclear at times, and should be conducted carefully in order to minimise interference from any other sources/candidates. Recordings should be checked for clarity prior to submission.

Some centres awarded marks which were too high, while some erred on the conservative side and marks had to be revised upwards.

In one centre the interlocutors dwelt exclusively on questions related to pupils' chosen topic of study to the exclusion of other aspects of coursework and general topics. Therefore, pupils were exposed to displaying lack of knowledge of chosen topics more than their ability in speaking.

Some discussions were unnecessarily prolonged and in one or two instances almost double the allocated time. Assessments should be conducted within the time allocated.

Most questions were appropriate for the level specified. However, the interlocutor should avoid asking candidates for factual information such as lists of school subjects studied and allow scope for them to express or justify opinions. An interactive discussion leads to a more spontaneous conversation and shows the candidate's performance at its best; this was evident with some of the assessments.

It would be helpful to ask more open-ended questions at a relaxed pace to avoid one-word responses. The interlocutor should give candidates time to answer a question if they do not respond immediately. Also, the interlocutor should avoid repeating candidates' answers.

In some instances, it was noted that there was a tendency for candidates to be over-prepared when talking about their Individual Study, with a resultant lack of spontaneity when talking about this topic. The discussion should be an interaction between candidate and interlocutor on this topic, rather than a more formal speech.

Interlocutors should not spend too much time giving information in the course of assessments and should restrict themselves to asking questions.

Centres should refer to relevant documentation to ensure that standards are upheld.