



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

Subject	Mandarin
Level	Higher

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

The selected centres each submitted at least two pieces of evidence for each candidate. Reading evidence, listening evidence, directed writing evidence and performance-talking evidence for learners at Higher has been reviewed this year. There was a range of learner attainment provided.

Most centres used the SQA NQ question paper for 2020–21 as the basis for its evidence and also submitted amended marking instructions. Where the centres devised their own assessments, the level demanded in all the assessment evidence was appropriate for the level. The range of questions in the reading evidence and listening evidence demonstrated appropriate challenge, requiring learners to provide differentiated response types. Assessment instruments indicated appropriate signposting for learners. Assessment questions were well constructed, clear, and allowed learners to access all marks where appropriate. Approaches to assessment were valid.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

The centres provided robust evidence, which has been assessed in line with national standards, including annotated marking instructions which have been applied effectively. Some centres also included brief notes explaining how the assessment judgements were reached in the evidence provided. This is good practice.

Most centres submitted candidate assessment records as well as evidence of internal verification. There was evidence that the internal verification process adopted by the centres was thorough, detailed and highly effective. Documented professional dialogue between the assessor and internal verifier has promoted consistency of standards.

Overall, the centres' assessment judgements were in line with national standards.