NQ Chinese Languages Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024–25

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Chinese Languages
Verification activity:	Event
Round:	2
Date published:	June 2025

National Course components and National Units verified

Course code	Course level	Component title
C845 75	National 5	Mandarin (Simplified): performance–talking
C846 75	National 5	Mandarin (Traditional): performance–talking
C845 76	Higher	Mandarin (Simplified): performance–talking
C846 76	Higher	Mandarin (Traditional): performance–talking
C811 76	Higher	Cantonese: performance–talking

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H22B 74	National 4	Mandarin (Simplified): assignment

Note: the performance–talking is an internally assessed component of course assessment (IACCA).

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The Chinese Languages verification team noted for the National 4 Mandarin (Simplified) assignment, some centres selected for verification did not use a valid and accepted approach to assessment, and the format of the task did not allow candidates to address the assessment standards fully. The presentation should last between 1 and 2 minutes and the interlocutor should ask at least four questions in the conversation.

At both National 5 and Higher performance–talking, the approaches to assessment used by the centres selected for verification were valid and accepted. Most centres used SQA's coursework assessment task for the performance–talking effectively, as set out in the [National 5](#) and [Higher](#) Modern Languages course specifications.

Assessment judgements

The Chinese Languages verification team noted for the National 4 Mandarin (Simplified) assignment, some centres made assessment judgements either not in line with national standards, or not completely reliable or accepted. We remind centres that, without any interim evidence or with incomplete evidence available to be verified, you cannot decide a pass or fail for the whole unit.

At both National 5 and Higher, most centres demonstrated how marks had been awarded in line with national standards. Assessors made effective use of the marking instructions to support the marks awarded to each candidate on the Verification Sample Form.

Most centres verified provided commentary in the candidate assessment record against the marks awarded for each section of the performance–talking. Some centres included detailed explanation as to why they opted for one pegged mark over another for each section of the performance. This is good practice.

For the National 4 assignment added value unit, centres should:

- encourage candidates to make clear links between the analysis and the focus of their specialist study
- include all acceptable answers relating to assessment standard 1.1 in the judging evidence table, or equivalent
- justify unit assessment outcomes against each assessment standard and provide evidence of all the assessments recorded on the Verification Sample Form

Note: at all levels, it is good practice for centres to include brief notes explaining how they reached assessment judgements.

Section 3: general comments

Most centres verified submitted adequate evidence.

For the purposes of SQA verification, centres should:

- provide documented evidence of their internal verification procedures and processes and how this was applied to the candidate evidence sampled. To support the effectiveness of internal verification, it is good practice for centres to use SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit
- ensure they submit the evidence of each candidate that is entered on the Verification Sample Form
- ensure that the marks entered on the candidate assessment record (or similar document) match the marks entered on the Verification Sample Form