NQ Verification 2015–16
Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	English and Communication
Levels	N3 – Advanced Higher
Date published:	October 2016

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.

NQ Verification 2015–16
Key Messages Round 1

01 ► Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	English
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

National 3 to Advanced Higher

02 ► Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Approaches taken by the centres displayed a great deal of confidence in both creating centre-devised assessment approaches and adapting SQA Unit assessment support packs in order to meet the needs of the learners. The assessments produced were creative, engaging and focused on the Assessment Standards.

Centres also demonstrated clear, well thought out and integrated assessment approaches which linked learning and teaching with internal assessment. This was also seen in relation to internal and external assessment approaches. This commendable method of combining assessment with learning and teaching allows assessment to occur as natural part of learning and teaching.

This was the first time Advanced Higher had been verified and centres exhibited a confident and secure grasp of the requirements at this level. Texts chosen were challenging and demonstrated personalisation and choice. Candidates genuinely seemed engaged by the texts chosen and the writing tasks and there was evidence of some exemplary work. There were a very small number of centres which did not allow candidates to compare texts or produce a research outline with a clear purpose, which is required for Analysis and Evaluation.

Assessment judgements

Centres were engaging fully with Assessment Standards and were making clear and accurate decisions. Centres were also demonstrating how assessment judgements had been made, which was evident through the use of the highlighting of candidates' work, checklists which related to Assessment Standards and the annotation of candidates' work. This was both helpful to candidates and revealed a secure understanding of the requirements of the Assessment Standards.

For Advanced Higher, centres had developed a number of methods to demonstrate candidates' critical reflection, required for Assessment Standard 1.3 of Creation and Production. This was evident through the use of such methods as: checklists with suggested features to be reflected upon; the use of Track Changes and electronically annotating texts to demonstrate comparisons.

There were still some minor occurrences of centres not exemplifying an understanding of audience and purpose with evidence, required in Analysis and Evaluation, Assessment Standard 1.1 and 2.1. A similarly small number of centres were assessing candidates without fully engaging with the Assessment Standards.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

Internal verification was taking place in almost all centres. Centres were presenting evidence of cross-marking with internal verifiers making comments and suggestions about candidate work, along with departmental meetings where standardisation exercises had been minuted.

Here are also a number of useful links which can be accessed by centres in order to support understanding of standards:

- ♦ [Understanding Standards nominee training (agenda, presentation and workshop tasks)](#)
- ♦ [Understanding Standards secure materials](#) (login required)
- ♦ [Prior-verified materials](#) (login required)
- ♦ [Unit assessment support pack materials](#) (login required)
- ♦ [Literacy secure materials](#) (login required)
- ♦ [Common Questions](#)
- ♦ [Audio presentations on Course elements (National 3 to Advanced Higher)](#)
- ♦ [July 2014 Key Messages Report](#)
- ♦ [Oct 2015 Key Messages Report](#)

NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units verified:

H23Y 74   National 4   Added Value

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Throughout the samples presented for verification there were an extremely high number of approaches which met all of the Assessment Standards. The majority of approaches were clear, motivating, relevant and structured to support the candidates in achieving this Unit.

Personalisation and choice were generally evident across the samples, and a variety of different approaches was taken which allowed for stimulating activities to be presented. Some centres had taken an approach which adapted the UASP to help guide their candidates, while other centres had given a great deal of personal choice to the candidates — both approaches worked well in helping candidates to produce work that was something they had clearly engaged with and which met all of the Assessment Standards.

There were still a small number of centres who had not understood the requirement that one of the texts chosen by the candidates to be evaluated needed to be a written text (a requirement for Assessment Standard 1.1).

There were also a very small number of centres who had presented an approach which did not allow for personalisation and choice. This tended to be evident in a class based approach to the texts chosen.

Assessment judgements

An extremely high number of the centre submissions provided assessment judgements that were accurate and in line with the Assessment Standards. Some centres had developed very good methods of feedback and clear comments, particularly in relation to Assessment Standard 1.4, which allowed assessment judgements to be clearly evidenced. Generally, there was excellent supportive feedback given to candidates on how to achieve the Assessment Standards, and this allowed assessment judgements to be clearly evidenced.

The small number of Assessment Judgements that were not in line with Assessment Standards tended to be when centres were too severe. This could be seen, in particular, when centres were expecting candidates to do more than the Assessment Standards required, leaning more towards the Standards expected for National 5 Folio or National 5 Creation and Production. Centres are reminded of the minimum competence required at this level (National 4), and that it is important not to push the standard beyond what is required at this level.

There were a small number of centres which demonstrated a lack of evidence for candidates' responses to questions, required for Assessment Standard 1.4. The evidence required for Assessment Standard 1.4 is:

- written or oral response(s) from the candidate

  Oral evidence which 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

03 ▸ Section 3: General comments

Internal verification was evident in many samples and in a variety of ways. Almost all centres had strong evidence of internal verification.

There was a great deal of good practice evident, but many centres where good practice was evident did not allow their materials to be used for exemplification purposes. It would be helpful if centres could allow for good practice to be shared.

Visiting verification was received with a great deal of positivity. Centres responded well to verification and used this opportunity to offer opinions and seek guidance. This was an approach to verification that was welcomed by almost all centres.