



Alternative Certification Model 2020–21: National QA Exercise Key Messages

Subject	Latin
Level	National 5

This report provides information on themes emerging from the national quality assurance exercise, which is part of the Alternative Certification Model for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses.

A sample of candidates' assessed work from selected centres was reviewed to determine whether assessment was in line with the national standard. The evidence submitted may have been partial or incomplete and is unlikely to have represented all of the evidence that will be gathered to allow the centre to determine a provisional result.

The centres selected for review in this subject and at this level have been provided with specific feedback on the evidence that they submitted. The comments below highlight key points about the assessment approaches and instruments used and the sampled centres' assessment judgements, for all centres delivering the subject at this level to reflect upon and make any appropriate adjustments.

Section 1: Comments on approach to assessment

Centres generated the most valid evidence using assessment instruments that replicated the standard, duration, format and security of SQA question papers.

Centres used a range of assessment approaches, including the 2021 National 5 question papers, centre-devised questions, questions selected from a range of SQA past papers, and unit assessments.

Candidates did not need to produce evidence for both question paper components on a single occasion, but tasks did need to be unseen.

All the reviewed centres ensured that there was appropriate challenge in their assessment instruments, allowing candidates to provide a range of responses appropriate to their level of ability, skills, knowledge and understanding. There was also an acceptable balance of marks and question types, equivalent to the current format of the National 5 question papers. All the assessment tasks used were in line with national standards.

Marking instructions, amended where necessary, were submitted. There was evidence of centre-based standardisation, and helpful notes were included showing the decision-making process about how that centre marked a response consistently when it was not covered by the marking instructions.

Centres tried, as far as possible, to submit evidence for a range of candidate attainment. It is acknowledged that it is not always possible to do this, when presenting small numbers of candidates.

Where relevant, centres indicated where an assessment arrangement had been made for individual candidates.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

Assessment evidence can be partial (ie either evidence for the Literary Appreciation or for the Translating component) or full (ie evidence for both components). If partial, it was helpful when the centre included a brief description of all the evidence on which it planned to base the provisional results. This helped the reviewer to consider the submitted evidence in the context of the whole package of assessment evidence used for this session.

Before the provisional results are determined, centres should undertake a holistic review of each candidate's performance based on at least one piece of evidence for one author for the Literary Appreciation component and one piece of evidence for the Translating component. Supplementary, naturally occurring, evidence can also contribute to a holistic judgement.

Key evidence that has been gathered later in the course, when all or most of the course has been delivered, is likely to provide a better predictive value than evidence gathered in the early stages of the course.

It was helpful when centres included the cut-off scores that they planned to use to determine the provisional results. It was also useful when centres demonstrated that they had taken component weightings of marks into consideration.

It is always good practice to build-in collaborative approaches to marking and moderation of marking, where possible. This can be done at department level, where there is more than one Latin teacher, but ideally on a wider scale.

Most centres did provide strong evidence for internal, school-based and/or local authority quality assurance and moderation. The most robust evidence that was presented by centres included:

- ◆ records of the moderating process logging dates
- ◆ details of reviewers involved
- ◆ summary notes of moderation discussions
- ◆ evidence of re-marking in light of moderation feedback
- ◆ explanation notes of how marks were awarded.

It is strongly recommended that all assessment judgements are confirmed through centre-based or local support network quality assurance activities.

If more than one teacher in the centre is involved in the assessment process, it is helpful if assessment material is taken from each of them.

Some centres supplied very useful contextual information and supporting documentation surrounding the assessment process.

It is essential that assessment materials are regularly reviewed to check that the level of demand matches the current national standard. To ensure the correct level of demand for the Translating passage, there needs to be a careful check of the accuracy and syntax, ensuring that they meet the current National 5 requirements.

It is recommended that teachers are familiar with the national standards through the exemplified materials available on the SQA Understanding Standards web pages.

All the reviewed centres provided evidence that their candidates had been assessed accurately, fairly and consistently, in line with national standards.