



NQ Verification 2016–17

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	English and Literacy
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2017

National Courses/Units verified:

National 3	Understanding Language, Producing Language and Literacy
National 4	Analysis and Evaluation, Creation and Production and Literacy
National 5	Analysis and Evaluation, Creation and Production and Literacy
Higher	Analysis and Evaluation, Creation and Production
Adv. Higher	Analysis and Evaluation of Literary Texts and Creation and Production

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres demonstrated a very secure approach to assessment through a variety of interesting and engaging tasks which candidates responded well to. There was an increased number of centres presenting centre-devised approaches which exhibited a confidence in the unit requirements. There was evidence of genuinely relevant tasks which were appropriate to candidates' personal experiences, supported important skills for work and which allowed candidates to be aware of their society/culture.

When UASPs were used, there was a more connected approach taken, where the UASP was linked to other themes/ideas discussed in the course. This showed a greater confidence and familiarity in integrating the SQA assessments into the natural learning and teaching taking place in the classroom.

Assessment approaches taken by centres also showed innovative and thoughtful ways in which to link course assessment to unit assessment. This seemed to offer candidates a naturally occurring means of unit assessment and supported candidates' learning.

For Advanced Higher, in particular, there were a great variety of texts chosen for analysis which stimulated very sophisticated responses from candidates. Again, the dissertation was well linked to the Analysis and Evaluation unit.

Assessment judgements

At all levels, centres demonstrated a very secure understanding of the assessment standards and evidenced their assessment judgements through a variety of methods ranging from clear grids on writing pieces, highlighting candidates' materials, and marking scripts where candidates' had achieved the assessment standards. The detailed and considered annotations not only provided evidence of why assessment judgements had been made, but also provided clear support to candidates. Again, this approach to evidencing assessment judgements was meaningful and linked to the natural assessment approach used in the classroom.

There are still a number of instances where centres are not providing a detailed checklist to provide evidence of candidates meeting the assessment standards. Centres are reminded that, if a checklist is provided, there should be details/comments which provide evidence of the assessment standards having been achieved. Examples of detailed checklists can be found on the Understanding Standards section of the SQA website.

For Advanced Higher there was evidence, in a small number of centres, where the evaluation of secondary sources was often limited or not evident. Centres are reminded of the requirement that for Analysis and Evaluation, assessment standard 2.2, candidates must 'select, analyse and evaluate primary and secondary sources'.

03

Section 3: General comments

From National 3 to Higher some centres are still assessing assessment standards 1.1 and 2.1. Centres are reminded of the following statement from report *Understanding the next steps for session 2016–17*:

Analysis and Evaluation unit (N3 to Higher) — there is no longer a requirement to assess assessment standard 1.1 'Identifying and explaining the purpose and audience, as appropriate to genre' in the Reading outcome and 2.1 'Identifying and explaining the purpose and audience' in the Listening outcome.

For National 3 the unit title is Understanding Language and 'audience and purpose' no longer needs to be assessed in assessment standards 1.1 and 2.1. The requirement to 'Identify the main idea' remains.

A more holistic approach to assessment may be beneficial to some centres/candidates where it is clear that assessment has been approached in a single sitting. Centres are reminded that evidence can be gathered at various stages throughout the course to meet the assessment standards.

Internal verification was now evident in almost all centres presented. The verification provided was organised, streamlined and effective with clear and supportive approaches being taken by centres.

When visiting centres it was evident that there was a great deal of confidence in unit assessment both in approaches taken and assessment judgements. This type of verification offered a much broader insight into the many different approaches being taken and the valuable experiences candidates were being given through these relevant and engaging activities.