The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.
National Courses

Titles/levels of National Courses verified:

French (Intermediate 1)
French (Intermediate 2)
French (Higher)

General comments
In general, the 10 centres that were verified demonstrated a good understanding of the appropriate conduct and content of the speaking assessment at all three levels.

Of the 10 centres submitted for postal verification, two were Not Accepted. In one case, this was the result of over-severe marking at Intermediate 2 level, while with the other, the issue was over-generous marking in the discussion element at Higher level.

Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials
The interlocutors conducting the tests were clearly familiar with all of the above.

Evidence Requirements
Centres are clearly aware of the requirements to submit recordings of candidate performance.

However, there are still a number of centres that submit incorrectly completed forms and documentation, or that submit evidence which is not required. Three centres submitted detailed notes and evidence to justify their assessments of their candidates’ performances. While this can be useful to inform the verification process, it is not a requirement.

Administration of assessments
Most of the centres administered the tests in accordance with the available guidelines and documentation. However, there were still a number of instances where the duration of the assessments, both in the presentation and discussion elements at Intermediate 2 and Higher levels, were overlong.

While there were several instances of excellent interaction and communication between interlocutor and candidate, there remain some interlocutors who have a tendency to allow what should be a ‘discussion’ to take the form of a series of prepared questions, with the candidate responses taking the form of rehearsed mini-monologues. A supportive and interactive approach by the interlocutor brings out the best in the candidate and gives him/her the opportunity to develop and sustain communication in a natural manner.
Areas of good practice
Those interlocutors who conducted the assessment in a sympathetic and supportive manner tended to bring out the best in their candidates.

Specific areas for improvement
As mentioned, the submission of the appropriate documentation completed correctly.

In a few centres, there is a need to adhere more rigidly to:

♦ the guidelines relating to the duration of the assessment, and
♦ the guidelines as to what constitutes a ‘discussion’ between candidate and interlocutor