



# NQ Verification 2014–15 Key Messages Round 2

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Languages — German
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2015

### National Courses/Units verified:

H27T 74 National 4: German: Assignment — Added Value Unit

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

The verification team for German is pleased to report that the approaches to assessment used by centres that were selected for verification have all been 'Accepted'. This demonstrates that centres have followed guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. This should be reassuring for practitioners and is to be commended.

Centres should feel free to reformat the assessments provided in the SQA Unit assessment support packs by slightly amending the questions, the texts or the layout to suit their candidates' needs while maintaining the standards.

### Assessment judgements

The verification team for German is also pleased to report that all of the assessment judgements made by assessors in centres have been 'Accepted' as they were in line with national standards. This demonstrates that centres have successfully implemented guidelines and made use of the feedback and support provided by SQA in publication updates, the Verification Key Messages and at events (for nominees and practitioners) during 2014–15. Overall, staff have made best use of the expertise already in place in centres or in clusters of centres.

Centres justified how they made their assessment judgements. This is good practice as it is very useful and appropriate for internal and external verification purposes.

Detailed commentaries about each candidate's performance are very useful for internal and external verification purposes. However, it is acknowledged that this approach can be time-consuming. Therefore, a detailed checklist for each candidate's performance can be just as useful for the verifier, and more practical for the centre. This could also be used as effective feedback to candidates.

Centres should merge in-house information on judging evidence with judging evidence tables to create one document to demonstrate how assessment judgements are made.

The judging evidence table in the Unit assessment support pack should be used as a guide: the answers listed in column 4 are only exemplifications of how a candidate may address each Assessment Standard. It is recommended that centres populate the judging evidence table (column 4) with a range of other possible answers that have been accepted by the centre.

### **Assessment Standards 1.3 and 1.4**

Overall candidate performance was appropriate for this level and in some cases candidates went beyond what is expected at National 4.

For the assessment of talking and listening in the Added Value Unit Assessment Standards 1.3 and 1.4, there is no requirement to submit an audio recording of candidate work. However, audio-recordings allow external nominee verifiers to provide more detailed and useful feedback to centres.

If no audio recording is submitted, centres must submit a detailed checklist or commentary with **some** examples of what each candidate says referenced against each Assessment Standard for the Outcome.

It is recommended that centres use a range of open-ended questions to allow candidates to meet Assessment Standard 1.4. This allows candidates to demonstrate that they can handle straightforward language and use a reasonable range of vocabulary appropriate to National 4. Candidates should also be encouraged to answer unexpected questions. Performances should not be scripted in advance and should allow for personalisation and choice, although candidates should be aware of the type of questions they could be asked on the selected topic.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Most centres submitted clear and well-organised packages for verification, which is to be commended. This facilitated the verification process.

It is good practice to submit individual Candidate Assessment Records which have been completed in ways which clearly convey assessors' decisions/ judgements and the reasons for these.

It is important that the SQA Verification Sample Form is completed correctly and matches the information on candidate scripts, the Candidate Evidence Flyleaf and the Candidate Assessment Record. This is important, as the judgement (Pass/Fail) entered on the Verification Sample Form is what the verification exercise is based on, regardless of what is entered on the candidates' scripts or individual Candidate Assessment Record forms.

Centres should arrange candidates in alphabetical order on the Verification Sample Form. The order of the candidates' evidence must match the order on the Verification Sample Form.

The judgement entered on the Verification Sample Form is for verification purposes and is not necessarily final as there might be an opportunity for a candidate to be re-assessed at a later stage if not already done.

All centres should provide evidence of internal verification. Some centres provided evidence of detailed, effective internal verification processes. This is good practice and often flagged up and resolved issues which might otherwise have caused problems. For example, where the process used involved practices such as cross-marking, and there was a clear indication on the candidate scripts or on the Candidate Assessment Record as to how the discussion had gone and how the final assessment judgement had been agreed, this greatly assisted external verification.

Centres devising their internal verification procedures may find [SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit](#) helpful.

Overall, external nominee verifiers commented positively on the organisation and presentation of evidence by centres in verification samples at Round 2.