



NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 2

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Mandarin
Verification event/visiting information:	Event
Date published:	June 2022

National Courses/Units verified:

C845 75	Mandarin (Simplified) Performance–talking (IACCA*)
C845 76	Mandarin (Simplified) Performance–talking (IACCA)

*Internally-assessed component of course assessment

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The verification team for Chinese can report that all centres selected for verification in round 2 verification used the SQA coursework assessment task for the performance–talking, as set out in the National 5 and Higher course specification documents.

The approaches to assessment used by all the centres selected for verification were valid and accepted. Centres encouraged candidates to use a range of contexts and topics for discussion in the performance–talking at National 5 and Higher. This is to be commended.

However, centres are advised to pay more attention to the following aspects:

- ◆ Assessors should refer to the information regarding the recommended duration for both the presentation and the conversation within the performance–talking at National 5, ensuring that neither of the two sections is too short nor too long. The same applies to the recommended duration for the discussion at Higher. Centres are advised to refer to the information in the [National 5](#) and [Higher](#) Modern Languages course specifications regarding the recommended length of the performance–talking.

- ◆ Assessors should ask more open-ended questions which enable candidates to demonstrate their full ability to use Chinese at National 5 or Higher.
- ◆ Assessors could consider engaging candidates in a variety of ways to encourage fuller interaction.

Assessment judgements

The verification team for Chinese can report that the assessment judgements made by assessors in all centres selected for verification were 'accepted' or 'accepted with recommendations'.

Marks awarded by centres selected for verification were in line with national standards, reliable and accepted. Assessors made effective use of the SQA marking instructions to support the marks awarded to each candidate.

At National 5 and Higher, at least two contexts are covered as per the course assessment tasks. Centres used the candidate assessment record effectively to record a breakdown of the marks awarded on the two subsections at National 5 (presentation and conversation).

Although centres' marking at National 5 and Higher was in line with national standards, some performances were marked somewhat leniently at National 5, while some performances were marked more severely at Higher.

Centres are advised to pay more attention to the following aspects:

- ◆ For the purposes of SQA external verification, it would be useful if all centres could provide some commentary in the candidate assessment record (or equivalent document). In particular, it would be useful to have an explanation of why the centre opted for one pegged mark over another.
- ◆ Centres must also provide the marks awarded for each section of the performance—talking at National 5 (presentation, conversation, sustaining the conversation), along with a total out of 30 marks
- ◆ With regards to applying marking information at National 5 and Higher, centres are advised to refer to Understanding Standards materials for internally-assessed components of course assessment, accessible on the [SQA secure website](#).

03

Section 3: General comments

Most of the centres selected for verification submitted a sample of evidence at National 5 and Higher which had been adequately prepared. This is to be commended.

Centres should refer to the key publications for verification of the performance—talking available on the [National Qualifications - external verification web page](#), such as:

- ◆ [Verification Submission Guidance — Internally-assessed components of course assessments](#)

For the purposes of external verification, centres are also advised to provide evidence of effective internal verification with some explanation of the processes applied. Centres should refer to the [internal verification toolkit](#).