



# NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	English and Communication
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2023

### National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H23H 74	National 4	English: Analysis and Evaluation
H23T 74	National 4	English: Creation and Production
H23W 74	National 4	Literacy
J2A9 75	SCQF 5	English: Analysis and Evaluation
J2AC 75	SCQF 5	English: Creation and Production
H23W 75	SCQF 5	Literacy
J2AB 76	SCQF 6	English: Analysis and Evaluation
J2AD 76	SCQF 6	English: Creation and Production
J217 76	SCQF 6	English: Analysis and Evaluation with a Scottish Context

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

##### Reading and listening

##### Assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2

Most centres continue to make effective use of SQA's unit assessment support packs to assess reading and listening, using current materials from SQA's secure website.

At SCQF levels 5 and 6, a number of centres were able to make use of candidates' reading for understanding, analysis and evaluation prelims to evidence assessment standards 1.1 and 1.2 of the analysis and evaluation units.

### **National 5 Literacy: assessment standard 1.3**

A number of centre-devised assessments, specifically prelims, did not offer candidates sufficient opportunity to meet assessment standard 1.3 (evaluating effectiveness) and show that they 'can make a range of evaluative comments on different aspects of texts'.

In SQA's Literacy unit assessment support pack: package 4 (bridging pack), the judging evidence tables indicate that 'a question or questions specifically addressing evaluation might need to be added' in these situations.

### **Outdated versions of assessments**

A number of centres submitted evidence using either outdated versions of SQA unit assessment support packs, centre-devised assessments based on outdated assessment standards, or SQA prior-verified assessments that were based on pre-2017 assessment standards.

Centres are reminded that, following the revision of assessment standards in 2017, the requirement to identify audience and purpose in reading and listening was removed and no longer needs to be assessed.

All prior-verified materials published on SQA's secure website include a date of publication and have a cover page that states 'This assessment must be read in conjunction with the relevant unit specification.'

A number of centre-devised assessments, and assessments based on outdated assessment standards, did not offer candidates sufficient opportunity to achieve assessment standards 1.2 and 2.2, as candidates did not have the opportunity to select and comment on at least two examples of language.

Note: SQA offers a free [prior verification service](#) to centres who devise their own assessments. This gives the centre confidence that their assessment is fit for purpose and meets national standards.

### **Critical essays as evidence of reading**

The use of a critical essay prelim on a previously studied text is not a valid approach to evidence reading within analysis and evaluation, or literacy. The critical essay could be used as evidence of writing if an unseen approach was used. An example of the unseen approach to a critical evaluation is exemplified in SQA unit assessment support pack, National 5 Literacy: package 1 unit-by-unit approach.

### **Writing**

At all levels, there were some very effective centre-devised assessments, which offered candidates personalisation and choice. Candidates showed real engagement when given the opportunity to explore a range of topics and genres within their writing. At SCQF levels 5 and 6, assessment was most often combined with portfolio coursework.

## **Assessment judgements**

### **Reading and listening**

Most centres judgements were valid, reliable and in line with national standards. Most centres clearly indicated on candidate scripts where assessment standards were evidenced and provided detailed assessment commentaries as part of their internal verification processes.

There were some instances where candidates had been incorrectly judged to have met assessment standards 1.2 and 2.2, even though they had not successfully selected and commented on at least two features of language.

There were some occasions where candidates had been incorrectly judged to have met assessment standard 1.3 for the reading outcome within literacy, even though they had not given sufficient evidence that they 'can make a range of evaluative comments on different aspects of texts'.

### **Writing**

Most centres provided clear detail in their submitted evidence to indicate where and how candidates had met the assessment standards for writing.

There were occasions when judgements were too severe. This was often related to 'convey[ing] meaning on first reading'.

## **Section 3: general comments**

Most centres clearly indicated how their internal verification was carried out and there was evidence of their processes in operation through annotation of candidate scripts and/or additional documentation. As a result, most centres' assessment judgements were able to be easily verified.

Not all centres provided an overview of their internal verification procedures, and it was not possible to comment on its effectiveness.

Note: centres must ensure that they are using the most up-to-date assessment materials. When devising their own summative assessments, centres must ensure that all assessment standards can be fully met by candidates. Centres should make use of SQA's free [prior verification service](#) to support them in devising and adapting assessment material.