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Section 1: Verification group information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification group name:</th>
<th>Gaelic (Learners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verification event/visiting information</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date published:</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Courses/units verified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>Unit title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C831</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Gaelic (Learners) Performance–talking (IACCA)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C831</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Gaelic (Learners) Performance–talking (IACCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internally-assessed component of course assessment

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres had an appropriate approach to assessment at Higher. The new discussion format allows for more natural performances by candidates and the most effective interlocutors were those who engaged with the candidates but who also allowed them to steer the performance.

The approach to assessment at National 5 was appropriate in the majority of cases. However, some centres still did not follow the format for the performance as laid out in the National 5 Modern Languages course specification. The presentation must precede the conversation, with the conversation flowing naturally from the former. Also, assessors should not stop the recording and introduce the next section in English.
As always, centres are reminded that an extended performance beyond the recommended time in the National 5 Modern Languages course specification does not usually aid the candidate.

**Assessment judgements**

At both National 5 and Higher, assessment judgements were generally in line with national standards. In general, where an initial assessment may not have been fully in line with National Standards, internal verification was robust, and centres overall made it clear through their commentaries where assessment decisions were made and corrected where required. Some excellent examples of internal verification were seen across centres.

However, where internal verifiers were not Gaelic teachers, on some occasions inappropriate terminology was used and decisions were made which caused a grade to be awarded which was not in line with the pegged marks. Internal verifiers should ensure that they are acquainted with the terminology of the detailed marking information and with the use of pegged marks, especially at Higher.

**Section 3: General comments**

Overall, the standard of candidate performance was very high at both National 5 and Higher, and centres should be commended for the diligence with which they prepare candidates for the performance-talking assessment. Performances were on the whole natural sounding and sustained well, and it was apparent that candidates were being presented at the correct level for their ability.

Issues arose with the provision of recordings of performances for several centres. This related to the use of Coomber machines and CD-Rs. Teachers and lecturers should aim to record candidates’ performances digitally into MP3 or MP4 format and submit them on a USB stick. While the use of cassette tapes and CD-Rs recorded directly on Coomber machines is still acceptable, teachers and lecturers are encouraged to make use of new technology in making their recordings.

Centres should always be aware of the evidence required by SQA in each verification round and should refer to the key publications for verification of the performance-talking:

- *Generating the evidence sample*
- *Evidence for external verification of National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher internally-assessed components of course assessments*

Both these publications (and other documents for the verification of units) are available on the SQA National Qualifications external verification web page.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that the evidence they submit matches that on the documentation before submitting to SQA.