



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

Subject	Gàidhlig
Level	National 5 / Higher / Advanced 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

At National 5 and Higher levels, a number of centres were selected, which provided a range of evidence. This was evidence in reading, listening and writing, and one centre submitted evidence for the Performance — talking. Evidence varied from one piece of evidence for individual candidates to three or four pieces.

At Advanced Higher, evidence was provided for Translation and Practical Criticism.

For all levels, almost all centres submitted evidence which was either the SQA 2021 paper or the 2020–21 Stòrlann prelim paper.

It was apparent that in the main, centres have engaged well with SQA's subject-specific guidance, and all assessments undertaken were valid.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

In most cases centres submitted judgements which were in line with national standards, although there were one or two cases of some judgements at Higher which were lenient. However, these were very few and only related to either individual candidates' submissions or particular component evidence.

There was evidence of good practice with commentaries being supplied to support assessment judgements. These could be as simple as short comments on the side of an answer, though some were more detailed summaries of how assessment judgements were reached, including evidence of professional dialogue between colleagues. Both are very good practice.

Some centres supplied annotated marking instructions which were also very useful.

In most cases there was evidence of clear and effective internal verification procedures, which supported the assessment judgements made.