



# **National Qualifications 2013 Internal Assessment Report**

## **Spanish**

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

# National Qualifications (NQ) Awards

Titles / levels of NQ Awards verified:

Spanish: Intermediate 1 (C063 10)

Spanish: Intermediate 2 (C063 11)

Spanish: Higher (C063 12)

## General comments

All Verifiers were impressed by the accuracy of centres' assessment of Speaking at Intermediate 1, 2 and Higher Spanish. It is obvious that practically all centres have a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standard. From the centres verified, almost all centres' assessments were concordant with Verifiers' judgements and only two centres, which were deemed to be overly generous in awarding marks, were Not Accepted. To sum up, centres appear to have a very good understanding of the national standards.

## Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres are clearly familiar with the Course Arrangements and specifically the recommendations contained in the document *National Qualifications Assessment of Speaking in Modern Languages* and with the categories, criteria and pegged marks contained therein. The evidence of the recordings submitted showed that assessors were fully aware of the requirements contained in Course Arrangements, instruments of assessment and other exemplification of Speaking materials.

## Evidence Requirements

All centres submitted the correct recorded evidence and all administrative details were completed properly. Centres are clearly aware of the requirement to submit CDs or cassette recordings of candidate performance. In all cases, recordings were of good quality and all forms submitted were completed accurately.

## Administration of assessments

Assessments at all three levels were normally carried out in an efficient, professional and appropriate manner with the interlocutor bringing out the best in candidates and being supportive throughout. Most centres administered the tests in accordance with the guidelines, using appropriate assessments for each level. In most centres, the times allocated to each activity was broadly adhered to. In centres where more than one interlocutor was involved in the conduct of the tests at any given level, a robust system of internal verification was in place.

## Areas of good practice

- ◆ Most candidates were well prepared and centres had some very good performances at all three levels and were well organised.
- ◆ It was pleasing to note that in some cases candidates evidently had topics which were of a personal interest to them. This led to a more genuine and natural discussion.
- ◆ Most centres showed great rapport with their candidates and put them at ease.
- ◆ Candidates tend to know what is expected of them and as a result seem more relaxed and able to perform to potential.
- ◆ Many candidates at both Intermediate 2 and Higher showed flair and were very accurate, using a wide range of vocabulary and structures and resulting in many excellent performances. Likewise genuine interaction taking place between interlocutor and candidate was noted by Verifiers.
- ◆ In most cases the length of assessment was appropriate, with very few examples of Speaking assessments which were either too long or too short

## Specific areas for improvement

In the majority of centres, most candidates were well prepared and there were many excellent performances with candidates performing to the best of their ability. Likewise, the assessment criteria were applied consistently and correctly by sympathetic interlocutors. However Verifiers commented on the following:

- ◆ Most centres adhered to SQA guidelines at all three levels, but some did not follow the correct procedures at Higher where the interlocutor must ensure that the follow-up discussion does develop from the original theme and topic **before** it continues into at least one of the other prescribed themes. Some candidate performances did not meet these two requirements.
- ◆ On occasions, poor pronunciation and intonation at all three levels detracted from otherwise sound performances. Please note that in the presentation at Higher and Intermediate 2, and overall in Intermediate 1, that candidates may be penalised for poor pronunciation and intonation.
- ◆ Some presentations at both Intermediate 2 and Higher are unnecessarily long, often to the detriment of the candidate in general and of less able candidate in particular. Centres should adhere to upper time limits.
- ◆ There are still some candidates in the Higher and Intermediate 2 discussions who are being over-prepared, and are just offering a series of mini presentations with a resultant lack in spontaneity. The discussion should be a genuine discussion and not merely a memory test.