



# NQ Verification 2017–18

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	English and Communication
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	May 2018

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H23Y 74 National 4 Assignment: Added Value Unit

National 5 Coursework Assessment Task: performance–spoken language

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

##### National 4 Assignment: Added Value Unit

The majority of centres were engaging well with the added-value approach to assessment by offering candidates personalisation and choice in the topics chosen and the research undertaken. There were, however, still a small number of centres offering approaches which did not allow for personalisation and choice. Centres are reminded that the approach taken for the added value unit must allow candidates 'choice of the selection of the topic'. A whole-class approach to the unit, therefore, does not 'facilitate personalisation and choice' and this approach should not be taken by centres.

Overall, the approaches taken demonstrated confidence from centres in developing both centre-devised and unit assessment support pack (UASP) approaches to this unit. There were a small number of centres which had developed approaches which did not meet the requirements of the assessment standards. This was in relation to approaches which did not cover at least one written text. Centres are reminded that at least one of the texts evaluated by the candidate must be a straightforward written text. While posters and similar media texts are suitable it is important for centres to ensure that there is written text included in the sources which can be evaluated.

### **National 5 Coursework Assessment Task: performance–spoken language**

Centres offered a wide range of engaging tasks for the spoken language element of the course. The approaches taken demonstrated a secure understanding of the approach and often carefully integrated this assessment task with learning and teaching. For example, group discussion of aspects of literary texts and individual presentations linked to topics chosen for persuasive writing. This demonstrates an integrated approach to assessment and candidates had clearly engaged with the topics, which was evident through their thoughtful and detailed handouts.

There were small instances where centres had not provided details of the tasks candidates had been given and this is something which should be included in submissions for verification.

## **Assessment judgements**

### **National 4 Assignment: Added Value Unit**

Overall centres were confident in their assessment judgements and were assessing candidates accurately. There was evidence of candidates developing strong independent evaluation skills required for assessment standard 1.1. In a small number of centres, however, there was too much focus on candidates demonstrating their understanding, rather than offering evaluation. It is important to note that for assessment standard 1.1 candidates must show that they can ‘evaluate’ at least two straightforward texts ‘using critical terminology’ and that providing information without evaluation is not enough to achieve this assessment standard.

Some centres were also unclear about the evidence candidates were required to provide in relation to assessment standard 1.4. For this assessment standard centres are reminded that the evidence required in relation to the candidates’ responses to oral questions should be in the form of:

- ◆ written or oral response(s) from the candidate

Oral evidence could include:

- ◆ a recording of a candidate’s oral response(s)

or:

- ◆ a detailed checklist of a candidate’s oral response(s)

or:

- ◆ detailed observation notes

### **National 5 Coursework Assessment Task: performance–spoken language**

Centres were very confident in delivering the assessment task in spoken language. All centres provided evidence which supported the requirements of the assessment task and often supplemented the verification sample with additional supportive evidence such as examples of candidates’ notes, cue-cards and PowerPoint printouts.

There was a close focus on the individual aspects of performance and centres were supporting their assessment judgements with clear evidence of how candidates had achieved the aspects of performance in their detailed checklist.

03

### **Section 3: General comments**

There was a very pleasing range of topics chosen for both the added value and spoken language course assessment. There was evidence that candidates had engaged with the tasks chosen and were meeting the assessment standards and individual aspects of performance.

Overall internal verification was effective and centres had presented samples which had been cross-marked or where sampling had taken place. There were a small number of centres where internal verification had not, however, identified where the sampled work had not met the unit requirements. Centres are reminded that the standards and requirements specified in columns one, two and three of the judging evidence table for added value must all be considered when assessing candidates.