



# **NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports**

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>French</b>
<b>Levels</b>	<b>N3 – Advanced Higher</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>October 2016</b>

**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

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Modern Languages — French</b>
<b>Verification event/visiting information</b>	<b>Event</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>March 2016</b>

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H274 73	National 3	French: Understanding Language
H275 73	National 3	French: Using Language
H274 74	National 4	French: Understanding Language
H275 74	National 4	French: Using Language
H276 74	National 4	French: Added Value Unit
H274 75	National 5	French: Understanding Language
H275 75	National 5	French: Using Language
H274 76	Higher	French: Understanding Language
H275 76	Higher	French: Using Language
H274 76	Advanced Higher	French: Understanding Language
H275 76	Advanced Higher	French: Using Language

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

The approaches to assessment used by centres selected for verification were all 'Accepted'. This demonstrates that centres have followed guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages reports, and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

A large majority of centres have used the Unit assessment support packs to assess their candidates.

If a centre has used a centre-devised assessment or amended a task and/or a judging evidence table, the created/revised task and judging evidence table must be included within the submission for verification.

If centres are not confident about the validity of their centre-devised assessment, they should request for their assessment to be prior verified through SQA's prior verification service. This should be requested before instruments are used to assess candidates.

Centres should ensure that they clearly indicate which Unit assessment support pack or prior verified assessment they have used, eg Package 1, N5, Reading. It is recommended that one copy of the judging evidence table, the task, the texts and transcripts — for listening tasks — are also included for the whole sample. There is, however, no need to include one copy inside each candidate's clear envelope.

When using Unit assessment support packs, it is important that centres use the most up to date online version. Centres have not been penalised for using previous versions of the Unit assessment support packs, but centres will be expected in future to use the most up to date version. Should a previous version be used, it would be helpful to the nominee verifier if centres included the corresponding version of the judging evidence table, text(s) and questions.

Many centres successfully adapted these assessments to suit the needs of their candidates or to allow for personalisation and choice without affecting the Assessment Standards and Outcomes. This is to be praised.

It is important to note, however, that amendments should not alter the mandatory Assessment Standards included in the judging evidence table and any amendments must only be reflected in the exemplification column (column 4) of the table, where necessary.

A few centres in the sample devised their own assessments and most did so effectively using judicious and imaginative approaches. Some of these centre-devised assessments had been prior verified and accepted as a valid approach.

If a centre has used a centre-devised assessment, which has been prior verified, the verification certificate should be included with material submitted for external verification. If a centre has translated a reading or listening task from a Unit assessment support pack from one language into another, the centre must ensure that the standards and level of difficulty of the original text are adhered to. The centre may need to adapt the translation to that effect. When centres sent their assessments of the Added Value Unit for National 4, the centre-devised tasks were on the whole appropriate, varied and on interesting topics.

For some tasks, centres may want to consider more structured questions to support candidates and should ensure they are in line with the assessment guidelines, eg in listening assessments, some centres have asked candidates to give detailed notes rather than answering specific questions. This can be an

accepted approach as long as the judging evidence table makes clear what responses are expected from candidates to address each Assessment Standard.

Centres should feel free to reformat the assessments provided in the Unit assessment support packs by slightly amending the questions, the texts or the layout to suit their candidates' needs while maintaining the standards. Should the amendments to the texts or questions be minor, these would not require to be prior verified.

It is acceptable to add a glossary for vocabulary that might not be available in some editions of a dictionary. However, centres must ensure this does not provide an answer to any of the questions in the task.

Even where no justification is required in a Unit assessment support pack at National 3 to National 5, it may be useful to ask candidates to justify their choice when attempting the overall purpose question in the reading or listening tasks. This might avoid any misunderstanding/misreading of the statements/question by the candidates.

## **Assessment judgements**

The assessment judgements made by assessors in centres have all been 'Accepted' as they were overall in line with national standards. Some recommendations were made when specific minor issues arose. This demonstrates that centres have successfully implemented guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages reports, and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. Overall, staff have made best use of the expertise already in place in centres or in clusters of centres. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

Centres are reminded that, for verification purposes, and where possible, they should submit a range of evidence, ie some passes and some fails, including judgements for borderline evidence. This should ensure more effective and relevant feedback.

Centres should ensure that they submit documentation for each piece of evidence, clearly demonstrating how assessment judgements are made and clearly indicating the overall outcome of pass or fail and for each Assessment Standard of the Outcome, eg an assessment outcome record or commentary or checklist for each candidate.

Detailed commentaries about each candidate's performance are very useful for internal and external verification purposes. However, it is acknowledged that this approach can be time-consuming. Therefore, a detailed checklist for each candidate's performance can be just as useful for the verifier, and more practical for the centre. This could also be used as effective feedback to candidates.

Centres should amend judging evidence tables in Unit assessment support packs with a range of possible answers to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made for each Assessment Standard (column 4).

Centres should merge in-house information on judging evidence with judging evidence tables to create one document to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made.

Centre-devised information on judging evidence must be clearly referenced against each Assessment Standard. The award of marks is not a feature of Unit assessments. The inclusion of 'marks out of' is not noted for verification purposes.

Many centres have clearly justified how they made their assessment judgements. This is to be commended. Some centres noted each Assessment Standard next to each of the candidates' responses or on their written scripts as 1.2/2.3 etc to evidence where the candidates had addressed these Assessment Standards. This is good practice as it is very useful and appropriate for internal and external verification purposes. A couple of centres used a colour-coded approach, highlighting each response addressing an Assessment Standard in a different colour in the judging evidence table and then highlighting the candidates' scripts using this system. It was very clear where each Assessment Standard had been met.

Centres should take a holistic and positive approach to marking candidate work. A candidate should be given credit for answers as long as the candidate meets each Assessment Standard overall, regardless of whether they are necessarily in the correct place. For instance, if a candidate 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 by demonstrating understanding of main details etc. Equally, one answer from a candidate might address more than one Assessment Standard. This depends on the difficulty of the text the response relates to: is this section of the text simple, straightforward, detailed, detailed and complex, complex and sophisticated?

Centres are reminded that assessors should ignore extraneous material that does not contradict the response.

The judging evidence table in the Unit assessment support pack should be used as a guide: the answers listed in column 4 are only exemplifications of how a candidate may address each Assessment Standard. It is recommended that centres populate the judging evidence table (column 4) with a range of other possible answers that have been accepted by the centre.

It is important that centres have a consistent approach to assessing candidate evidence. For instance, if an explanation is expected to support the answer to the overall purpose question, this should be clear in the question or it should be noted that this has been verbally explained to candidates and it should be noted in the judging evidence table. The same standard of answers should be expected from all candidates in the sample and therefore in the cohort. Centres are

reminded that if a candidate does not respond correctly to the overall purpose question (Assessment Standard 1.1/2.1), the assessor can ask the candidate to explain their response orally. This could allow the candidate to justify their choice or change their choice with justification, and therefore possibly address this Assessment Standard. This conversation should be briefly summed up on the candidate's script or individual record form. Following judgement of a script by the assessor, a change of choice in the multiple-choice box without justification would not demonstrate that the candidate has understood the overall purpose of the text.

### **Specificities of the assessment of talking**

For the assessment of talking in the Using Language Unit, there is no requirement to submit an audio recording of candidate work. If no audio recording is submitted, centres must submit a detailed checklist or commentary with some examples of what each candidate says referenced against each Assessment Standard for the Outcome.

If a centre would like SQA to give more extensive feedback on the verification of a talking assessment, audio recordings would ensure a more detailed and accurate comment. Centres could decide to only audio-record candidate evidence submitted for verification.

For the assessment of talking in the Using Language Unit, it is recommended that centres use a variety of questions, including unexpected and more open questions to assess candidates. This would allow for a more natural conversation and for candidates to demonstrate their ability to sustain the conversation.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

### **What evidence should a centre send in for a verification round?**

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

Centres should only send evidence at one level per candidate and should think carefully about how much evidence to submit. For instance, if a candidate has completed a reading assessment and failed it, been re-assessed and passed the re-assessment, it is only necessary to send in the re-assessment.

Centres should only send one piece of evidence per candidate per Outcome for one Unit (ie no more than two pieces of evidence in total), eg:

- ◆ 1 reading and/or 1 listening evidence for the Understanding Language Unit
- ◆ 1 talking and/or 1 writing evidence for the Using Language Unit
- ◆ 1 reading and 1 talking evidence for a combined approach (for example on the same topic of 'taking a gap year')

The same assessment task(s) must be submitted for the candidates at any one level in the sample (eg six candidates being assessed in reading at National 4

with the same instrument of assessment rather than two or three different instruments of assessment).

The verification team is not concerned with whether a candidate has passed or failed an Outcome/Unit. Nominees only verify that the judgements made by the centre's assessors are acceptable or not. Indeed a candidate may well have been re-assessed by the centre since the evidence was submitted. Centres will enter the final Unit Outcomes for their candidates at a later stage (see centre's SQA Co-ordinator).

Centres should use a separate flyleaf and clear envelopes for each candidate.

### **How to complete the SQA Verification Sample Form**

It is important that the SQA Verification Sample Form is completed correctly and matches the information on candidate scripts and the Candidate Evidence Flyleaf. This is very important, as the judgement (pass/fail) entered on the Verification Sample Form is what the verification exercise is based on, regardless of what is entered on the candidates' scripts or individual record forms.

Centres should arrange candidates in alphabetical order for each level and/or Unit on the Verification Sample Form: eg A–Z at National 3 reading, then A–Z at National 4 listening, then A–Z at National 5 writing. The order of the candidates' evidence must match the order on the Verification Sample Form.

The Unit code (eg H274) and level code (eg 73) need to be clearly and correctly entered. You will find the list of Unit/level codes on page 1 of this report.

The Pass/Fail column should **only** be completed with 'pass' **or** 'fail' and should not be left blank.

If a centre submits complete evidence for a Unit, eg a reading and listening assessments for the Understanding Language Unit, then the Pass/Fail column on the Verification Sample Form should be completed to show the overall outcome for the Unit, **not** for each individual assessment. For example, a candidate needs to pass both a reading and a listening assessment to pass the entire Understanding Language Unit.

Some centres submitted 'Complete' evidence (eg evidence of reading and listening), however, on the Verification Sample Form, they stated that the evidence submitted was 'Interim'.

No entry should be made in the 'Nominee Review' column.

The judgement entered on the Verification Sample Form is for verification purposes (ie have the centre's assessor(s) judged the evidence in line with national standards) and is not necessarily final as there might be an opportunity for a candidate to be re-assessed at a later stage, if not already done.

## **How to complete the Candidate Evidence Flyleaf**

Centres should enter:

- ◆ 'Complete' when both elements for one Unit are included, eg when reading and listening for the Understanding Language Unit are submitted. Note that 'Complete' does not necessarily mean 'Final'; a candidate could be re-assessed at a later stage.
- ◆ 'Interim' when a single element from a Unit is included; eg only the reading element of the Understanding Language Unit is included.
- ◆ 'Mixed' when elements of two Units are combined (eg reading and talking).

## **What evidence of internal verification and quality assurance should a centre send?**

This could be a covering note explaining the process used (eg cross-marking, discussion on validity of centre-devised assessments at meetings) and a clear indication on the candidate scripts or on the candidate record form that the work was internally verified and the judgements agreed.

Some centres have spent a remarkable amount of time detailing their quality assurance procedures, which is to be commended.

In order to avoid duplication of systems, the internal verification/quality assurance arrangements could be modelled on a whole centre/local authority one, rather than being developed for each subject.

Centres devising their Internal Verification procedures may find SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit helpful: [www.sqa.org.uk/ivtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/ivtoolkit).

## **How do I share my concerns/queries about any aspects of the verification process for French?**

Any queries/concerns should be sent to SQA via the centre's SQA Co-ordinator. They should not be included in any envelopes destined for verification. The verification team, consisting of nominees and SQA appointees, cannot respond to these, as their role is to focus on the verification process.

## **Can a prelim be used to assess Units?**

This is not a recommended approach as the Unit assessments have a formative goal, following the study of a specific topic/context. It is important that candidates are not disadvantaged by a 'dual purpose' approach, which does not take into account differences between reaching a competency level in a Unit assessment and undertaking a Course assessment. If this approach is selected, the centre would have to create clear links against each Assessment Standard in the judging evidence table. It is important that the overall purpose question used — either commercial or centre-devised — by its nature covers the whole text and not only a section of the text.



## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

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

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H276 74	National 4	Added value unit
H7Y2 77	Advanced Higher	Specialist study unit
C730 75	National 5	Performance: talking (IACCA)
C730 76	Higher	Performance: talking (IACCA)

\*Internally assessed component of course assessment

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

##### Added value unit

It was pleasing to note that the approaches to assessment used by centres that were selected for verification were all 'accepted'. This demonstrates that centres have followed guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the verification key messages and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–16. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

Some centres have used centre-devised assessments to assess their candidates reflecting the approach set out in the published added value unit assessment support pack. This has allowed for personalisation and choice. The tasks were on the whole appropriate, varied and on interesting topics.

Centres must include the texts and a judging evidence table if they have used a centre-devised assessment to assess candidates. It is also recommended that they include an adapted judging evidence table when using a translation and an adaptation of the SQA-produced unit assessment support pack: *Modern Languages Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit*.

Centres should feel free to reformat the assessments provided in the unit assessment support packs by slightly amending the questions, the texts or the layout to suit their candidates' needs while maintaining the standards.

It is recommended that centres refer to the SQA unit assessment support pack: *Modern Languages Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit* for guidance regarding length of texts, level of challenge and difficulty to ensure that the language is straightforward and that the questions are supportive and appropriate at National 4. Some centre-devised texts were slightly beyond National 4 level so more supportive questions would have better supported candidates.

### **Specialist study unit**

The logbook produced by SQA and located in the unit assessment support pack of the specialist study unit was used by most centres.

It was encouraging to see that candidates worked through the process to meet assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2 in preparation for their portfolio.

There was clear indication of independent research by candidates for the specialist study unit.

Some candidates used a focus that could have been reworded to allow for a better analysis (eg 'loss of innocence in two texts' could have been changed to 'to what extent is there a loss of innocence...').

Some candidates changed their focus half way through, therefore centres should advise candidates to adjust their focus for assessment standard 1.1 in their log accordingly.

### **National 5 and Higher performance: talking (IACCA)**

All the centres verified in this round used the SQA guidelines for the internally assessed component of course assessment — *National 5/Higher Modern Languages Performance: talking assessment task*.

In line with the *National 5/Higher Modern Languages Performance: talking assessment task*, centres are reminded that the presentation and follow-up conversation must be carried out in a single assessment event, ie the presentation must be followed by the conversation during the single recording of the performance.

Candidates must use detailed language at National 5 and detailed and complex language at Higher in the performance. At these levels, long lists of more than two or three items (eg places in town, school subjects) or repetitions of

straightforward descriptions (eg hair and eyes) are unlikely to allow candidates to use a suitable range of structures and vocabulary.

*Specifics in relation to the presentation*

In the presentation, a small number of candidates seemed to struggle with the complexity of the language of the topic they had chosen. Centres should provide advice to candidates as to what level of language they should be able to cope with and should ensure comprehension of their presentation in preparation for delivering it.

A few presentations were significantly long or short and affected the candidates' performances. Centres are advised to refer to the information regarding the recommended length of time the presentation and the conversation should last, so that candidates are able to demonstrate their ability to meet the demands of National 5/Higher as provided in the document *Modern Languages Performance: talking, General assessment information*.

*Specifics in relation to the conversation*

Interlocutors should try to avoid asking closed questions, especially for more able candidates. Questions such as '*qu'est-ce que tu préfères, la physique ou la biologie?*' are likely to invite very short answers and prevent candidates from demonstrating their full ability. Alternatively, these questions could be immediately followed by '*Pourquoi?*' to elicit fuller answers.

For the most part, interlocutors were supportive, especially with nervous candidates. Where interlocutors were aware of candidates' interests, this helped more natural/spontaneous conversations.

A few conversations were unnecessarily prolonged or significantly short and affected the candidates' performances. Centres are advised to refer to the information regarding the recommended length of time the presentation and the conversation should last, so that candidates are able to demonstrate their ability to meet the demands of National 5/Higher as provided in the document *Modern Languages Performance: talking, General assessment information*.

The majority of centres asked questions in the conversation, which followed on naturally from the presentation topic chosen by candidates as recommended in the *National 5 Modern Languages Performance: talking assessment task* document. Many assessors went on to refer to other contexts, which allowed for personalisation and choice. Naturally moving on to other contexts or topics also allows the candidates to demonstrate a variety of language. On occasions, where candidates were asked questions about the same topic/context as in their presentation, candidates were often limited to repeating parts of their presentation in their answers. Centres should therefore try to avoid asking questions about items that candidates have already addressed in the presentation. At Higher, centres are reminded that the conversation must lead into at least one other context.

Centres should ensure that questions are chosen so that the conversation flows naturally and gives further opportunity for personalisation and choice.

Some centres were overly prescriptive in preparing candidates for the conversation. Conversations should be as spontaneous as possible for the level assessed. A small number of conversations appeared to be excessively rehearsed. It is recommended that centres ask a range of questions adapted to the responses of each candidate rather than asking the same questions to the whole cohort. A wider variety of questions in the conversation can aid candidates to develop strategies to cope with the unexpected (in line with Appendix 1 of the *Modern Languages Performance: talking, General assessment information* which is available from SQA's website).

## **Assessment judgements**

### **Added value unit**

Again, it is pleasing to report that all the assessment judgements made by assessors in centres have been 'accepted' as they were in line with national standards.

Many centres have clearly justified how they made their assessment judgements. This should be commended. This is good practice as it is very useful and appropriate for internal and external verification purposes.

Detailed commentaries about each candidate's performance are very useful for internal and external verification purposes; however, it is acknowledged that this approach can be time-consuming. Therefore, a detailed checklist for each candidate's performance can be just as useful for the verifier, and more practical for the centre. This could also be used as effective feedback to candidates.

Centres should merge in-house information on judging evidence with judging evidence tables to create one document to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made. The verified centres had successfully combined their centre-devised judging evidence tables with the SQA judging evidence table.

### **Specialist study unit**

The centres in the sample verified in this round of verification were all accepted as their judgements were in line with national standards.

One centre provided very detailed feedback to candidates using their centre-devised logbook. However, it was somewhat disjointed and therefore unnecessarily complex to use for internal verification and for central verification purposes as it was not clear where each assessment standard had been met.

Where the candidates had a detailed discussion with the assessor about aspects of analysis, it would have been useful to the candidates and the assessor for the content of this discussion to have been recorded, albeit briefly or in bullet point form, in the logbook. This would have added weight to the analysis of evidence section against assessment standard 1.2.

### **National 5 and Higher performance: talking (IACCA)**

It is pleasing to report that a large majority of centres have applied the marking instructions for the performance in talking accurately and in line with national standards.

It is important that assessors only use the most up-to-date Marking Information Grid for the talking performance at National 5/Higher, in conjunction with the National 5/Higher Grammar Grid to make their assessment judgements. Referring to previous examination procedures (eg 'good, satisfactory, etc') is not necessarily beneficial since the format of the assessment has changed.

Overall candidate performance was high. Pronunciation was the main issue for many of the candidates who did not perform well. Verifiers — sympathetic (native or non-native) speakers of French — must be able to understand candidates, no matter how good the content of their presentation/conversation is. It was felt that, on occasions, assessors had been lenient regarding pronunciation, possibly because they already had an inclination as to what candidates were going to say.

In general, centres provided clear commentaries to demonstrate how they made the assessment judgement, which was very useful for the nominee verifiers. This is also useful for internal verifiers and promotes constructive professional dialogue. Centres are encouraged to provide brief information about how they made the assessment judgement for all candidates submitted in the sample. Evidence of 'dialogue' between the assessor and the internal verifier in the form of checklists, respective notes in two different colours of pen or fuller commentaries were very useful. It is, however, essential for the centre to provide a final mark.

#### *Specifics in relation to the sustaining the conversation element*

There was some inconsistency in approach and in marking. Some centres were too severe in awarding marks.

Candidates do not necessarily have to ask a question in the conversation to gain marks for this element. Some centres incorrectly justified not awarding pegged mark 5 when candidates did not ask any questions.

In some cases, candidates paused — briefly — during the conversation to think about their answers; this is a natural part of a conversation. Assessors should give candidates appropriate time to think and respond. However, if candidates struggle to answer certain questions, assessors should try to support the candidate by rephrasing, asking another question or changing the topic.

Some conversations sounded more natural as candidates answered with a mixture of longer and shorter answers and it was clear it was not scripted. Using scripted conversations may not allow candidates to meet the criteria for the top pegged marks in the performance. Instead, candidates could prepare for their conversation thinking about the type of questions the assessor is likely to ask on their chosen topic and thinking about what key words the interlocutor is likely to use in his/her questions.

Examples of how candidates could demonstrate their ability to sustain the conversation include the following:

- ◆ a mixture of extended and shorter answers (ie not a suite of short presentations/monologues)
- ◆ appropriate thinking time
- ◆ natural interjections ('*euuh/ bah/ ben/ alors*')
- ◆ acknowledgement that they have understood the question ('*oui, je suis d'accord/non, pas du tout*'). Some centres included a brief commentary to describe how the candidate showed how they had understood through non-verbal means the question/response from the interlocutor
- ◆ asking questions that are relevant to the conversation and at relevant times
- ◆ sustaining the conversation, asking for repetition or clarification (eg '*pardon?*')

This is not an exhaustive list and one example from the above list on its own may not be sufficient to be awarded full marks.

03

## Section 3: General comments

### Added value unit

Overall candidate performance was appropriate for this level and in some cases candidates went beyond what is expected at National 4.

For the assessment of talking and listening in the added value unit assessment standards 1.2 and 1.3, there is no requirement to submit an audio recording of candidate work. However, audio-recordings allow verifiers to provide more detailed and useful feedback to centres.

If no audio recording is submitted, centres must submit a detailed checklist or commentary with some examples of what each candidate says referenced against each assessment standard for the outcome. In this round, centres that did not include audio recordings for the added value unit included detailed commentaries to demonstrate how candidates met the assessment standards, which was good practice.

It is recommended that centres use a range of open-ended questions to allow candidates to meet assessment standard 1.3. This will allow candidates to demonstrate that they can handle straightforward language and use a reasonable range of vocabulary appropriate to National 4. Candidates should also be encouraged to answer unexpected questions. Performances should not be scripted in advance and should allow for personalisation and choice, although candidates should be made aware of the type of questions they could be asked on the selected topic.

Some centres prepared and supported candidates by asking the same questions, but also included some unexpected questions to facilitate a more natural conversation.

Unnecessarily prolonged presentations and conversations can affect a candidate's performance in a detrimental way. Centres are advised to follow SQA guidelines more closely.

Centres should avoid asking questions in the follow-up conversation where the information has already been addressed in the presentation.

Some centres have detailed their quality assurance procedures, which is to be commended.

### **Specialist study unit**

Centres can adapt the SQA logbook or create their own as long as it is supportive for the candidate and illustrates how the assessment standard has been met, particularly the analysis for assessment standard 1.2.

Candidates need to demonstrate clearly that analysis has taken place by providing enough evidence of analysis to meet assessment standard 1.2. This may include a series of ideas for analysis, relevant quotes which relate clearly to the focus. Centres should refer to the two exemplars of the completed specialist study unit available on the SQA website.

### **National 5 and Higher performance: talking (IACCA)**

Centres submitted candidates' performances on CDs and memory sticks. It is recommended that centres check the sound quality of the CDs, and MP3/4 files that are submitted for verification. In the case of CDs, it is essential that they can be played on a range of devices and not solely on the device used for recordings. We recommend that USB keys are put into a separate envelope within the large brown envelope and that this is sealed and labelled.

Most centres clearly labelled candidate evidence, which is necessary for the verification team to proceed with the verification process.

Centres must include a breakdown of the marks (presentation + conversation + sustaining the conversation) for each candidate and the total mark must be entered on the Verification Sample Form.