



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Languages — Urdu
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	February 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H26X 76 Higher Urdu: Using Language

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The approach to assessment used by centres that were selected for verification were all Accepted or Accepted with Recommendations (Accepted*). All centres sampled in round 1 used the SQA Unit assessment support packs (UASPs).

When using Unit assessment support packs, centres are reminded that a more up-to-date version of the approach may be available online (SQA Secure).

It is encouraging to note that centres indicated clearly which Unit assessment support pack they used, eg Package 1, National 5, Reading. It is helpful if a copy of the judging evidence table and the texts (and transcripts for listening tasks) are also included for the whole sample. There is no need to include a copy inside each candidate's evidence envelope.

Centres may wish to reformat the approach to assessment provided in the Unit assessment support packs by slightly amending the questions, texts or layout to suit their candidates' needs while maintaining the standards.

Assessment judgements

The majority of the assessment judgements made by assessors were 'Accepted'. Where the assessment judgements for centres have been accepted, centres provided evidence in the form of judging evidence tables or centre-devised documents which provided a note of acceptable answers. In addition, the majority of centres also provided evidence of how assessment judgements had been made in relation to the different Assessment Standards, eg 1.1 and 1.2 in Reading.

Some centres noted each Assessment Standard next to each of the candidates' responses or on their scripts as 1.1, 1.2 etc. to evidence where the candidates had addressed these Assessment Standards. This is good practice as it is very useful for internal and external verification purposes. It is encouraging to note that all centres verified took a holistic and positive approach to marking candidate work and no centres applied marks on any scripts. Centres should note that it is particularly helpful to nominee verifiers to have a candidate assessment record (provided in SQA UASPs) annotated with the reasoning behind decisions to pass or fail Assessment Standards and an Outcome.

Centres should amend judging evidence tables found in the UASPs to include a range of possible answers to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made for each Assessment Standard. Centres are advised to include all acceptable answers against the Assessment Standards in the one document (judging evidence table or equivalent) since this allows nominee verifiers to understand how assessment judgements have been made.

A candidate should be given credit for answers as long as the candidate meets the Assessment Standards overall, regardless of whether they are necessarily in the correct place. For instance, if a pupil does not have the correct information in one question, but has it in another, they may still be able to demonstrate evidence of addressing an Assessment Standard.

For Assessment Standard 1.1 in Higher (reading), centres are advised to encourage candidates to provide an explanation for the overall purpose with reference to the text. Where the overall purpose question asks for examples, candidates should be encouraged to provide specific information from the text in English. For example, '*the text promotes studying abroad because only young people from rich families could study abroad before, but now there are lots of alternatives for people to study abroad.*'

In relation to the Unit talking assessment, if a centre would like SQA to give more extensive feedback, audio recordings would ensure a more detailed and accurate comment.

Section 3: General comments

The majority of centres submitted very clear and well-organised packages for verification, which is to be commended. This facilitated the verification process and assisted in providing useful feedback to centres.

In line with SQA verification guidance, if a centre is presenting candidates at National 3 to Advanced Higher, the SQA will notify the centre which levels will be verified: **either** National 3–5 **or** Higher and Advanced Higher.

- ◆ If the centre is presenting three levels (National 3, 4 and 5), a centre should submit a sample of 18 candidates split evenly between the three levels.
- ◆ If the centre is presenting at only two levels, a centre should submit a sample of 12 candidates split evenly between the two levels.
- ◆ If presenting at one level, a centre should submit a sample of 12 candidates at the one level.

If a candidate has assessments for the same Unit (eg a reading assessment and a listening assessment completing the Understanding Language Unit), then both may be submitted for verification. If a combined approach has been used, only one assessment per candidate should be included in the sample.

Centres are requested to complete the Candidate Evidence Flyleaf. It would be useful for the centre to indicate whether the centre agrees to give SQA permission to use candidate evidence for Understanding Standards materials.

Centres are reminded they should complete the Verification Sample Form to indicate which Unit(s) and level(s) were used to assess the candidates. It should also provide the overall pass/fail judgement for each candidate.

All centres included evidence of internal verification. Examples of good internal verification highlighted how some centres had quality assured the reliability of the application of the judging evidence. Centres are reminded that they must have an effective internal quality assurance system in place which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards. For further guidance, the centre could refer to the [Internal Verification Toolkit](#).