



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Urdu
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

X770 75 National 5 Performance: talking
X770 76 Higher Performance: talking
(Internally assessed component of course assessment)

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Two centres were verified in this round and both of the centres used SQA's guidelines for the Higher internally assessed component of course assessment — Performance: talking.

The quality of the performances at National 5 for both of the centres was generally good. The candidates were guided by the assessors to choose a variety of the topics to enable them to demonstrate a suitable range of structures and vocabulary appropriate to this level.

Centres are reminded that topics such as 'myself and my family' are not appropriate to Higher because this type of topic restricts the candidate's ability to demonstrate the detailed and complex language required at this level. Sometimes the topics chosen at National 5 are not appropriate at Higher and assessors must encourage candidates to choose a variety of topics from different contexts.

Centres are reminded that they should check the quality of the audio recording of the performance and that recordings are playable. Recording from one centre for some candidates had loud background noise. The microphone seemed far away from the candidates, which made it difficult to hear them clearly.

Presentation section of the performance

Most of the performances were appropriate to National 5 and Higher and were within the time limit. However, some of the presentations dragged on too long and some of the candidates did not reach the minimum time limit required.

Centres should refer to the *Modern Languages Performance: talking General assessment information* document for information regarding the recommended length of time the presentation should last.

Conversation section of the performance

Interlocutors asked a good range of open-ended questions to elicit detailed answers from most of the candidates, but some performances sounded rather rehearsed. Interlocutors were mostly supportive of their candidates and prompted them, as appropriate, during the conversation.

A few conversations were either unnecessarily prolonged or too short, which does not help the candidate. SQA's guidelines on time must be followed and can be found in the *Modern Languages Performance: talking General assessment information* document.

Assessment judgements

Overall, the quality of candidate performance was high and indeed some performances went beyond the standards expected at National 5 and Higher.

Both the centres verified had applied the marking instructions for the performance in talking accurately and in line with national standards.

One of the centres provided brief commentaries to demonstrate how they made the assessment judgement, which was helpful for the nominee verifiers. This is also useful for internal verifiers and promotes constructive professional dialogue. The other centre did not provide any comments on the assessment judgement for their candidates.

Centres are encouraged to provide brief information about how they made their assessment judgements for all candidates submitted in the sample. Evidence of dialogue between the assessor and the internal verifier and final decision is very useful.

Sustaining the conversation/performance section

There was some inconsistency in the application of the marking instructions and some were too severe (eg candidates awarded full marks and other candidates awarded 3 marks for performances of an equal standard). Centres are reminded that candidates do not have to ask a question in the conversation to achieve 5 marks for this section. Centres are also reminded that the 5 mark section applies to the conversation as a whole and not to a candidate's ability to answer unpredictable or specific questions.

Section 3: General comments

Both of the centres verified showed good practice, as they provided a breakdown of the marks and their candidate materials were well-organised.

However, they did not submit evidence of internal verification for talking performances or provide any detail on the candidate assessment record, of why candidates were awarded one pegged mark rather than another.

Centres are advised to submit evidence of internal verification and to refer to SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit available at www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit