



# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 1

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Modern Languages: German
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	January 2014

#### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

##### **C734 74 National 4**

H27R 74 Understanding Language

H27S 74 Using Language

H27T 74 Assignment — Added Value Unit

##### **C734 75 National 5**

H27R 75 Understanding Language

H27S 75 Using Language

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Most centres used Unit assessment support materials or prior verified materials.

It is good practice to include one copy of each assessment instrument used and its judging evidence table.

If a Unit assessment support pack has been adapted, centres should include the modified assessment instrument and the corresponding, modified judging evidence tables.

For assessment of Reading and Listening, while it is good practice to tick/annotate/comment on correct pieces of information, it is suggested that centres apply judging evidence holistically and refrain from using marks.

For assessment of Listening, where centres have developed candidate answer sheets for use with Unit assessment support packs, they must be careful not to add a title in English which nullifies questions such as, 'What is the speaker talking about?' This invalidates the assessment approach, as it does not allow candidates to meet Assessment Standard 2.1.

For assessment of Talking, it is worth noting that it rarely benefits candidates when recommended time limits are exceeded.

For assessment of Talking in National 4 Assignment (Added Value Unit), at the end of the presentation, the performance of some candidates at Assessment Standard 1.4 showed that simple language, (questions and answers), used accurately is very effective at meeting the Assessment Standard.

For assessment of Reading in National 4 Assignment (Added Value Unit), it is worth noting that an overall purpose question is not required, unless the centre wishes the assessment to be dual purpose, ie also cover Reading for the Understanding Language Unit. Candidates should only be assessed in Reading at Assessment Standard 1.1 for the Added Value Unit and not at Assessment Standards that apply to other Units.

For assessment of Reading in National 4 Assignment (Added Value Unit), centres should ensure texts are of a reasonable length, with a reasonable ratio of supported/unsupported questions, (broadly similar to Unit assessment support pack exemplification), and that candidates demonstrate understanding of two texts.

Centres should ensure they refer to the correct judging evidence tables when assessing the National 4 Assignment (Added Value Unit). Some centres had referred to the judging evidence tables for other Units. Some centres had amended the judging evidence table from the Unit assessment support pack to match their own Added Value Unit. This is good practice and was helpful to the verification process.

## **Assessment judgements**

Assessors should use professional judgement and a holistic approach in deciding whether candidates have achieved the Assessment Standards.

For assessment of Reading and Listening, centres should be aware that candidates must get the overall purpose question correct if they are to meet Assessment Standard 1.1 and pass the assessment overall. However, if the candidate gets this wrong, it is acceptable for the assessor to re-assess just this aspect of the assessment orally with the candidate. This should be a discussion,

and not just an opportunity to tick a different box. If the assessor is satisfied that the candidate has met Assessment Standard 1.1 during this conversation, it is acceptable to note this on the candidate's script and assessment records. If the assessor feels the candidate has yet to meet Assessment Standard 1.1, the candidate should be re-assessed at a later date using a different instrument of assessment.

For assessment of Reading and Listening, candidates do not have to answer every question correctly as they could demonstrate achievement of the Assessment Standards across questions.

For assessment of Reading and Listening, it is advisable to be holistic in interpreting judging evidence tables regarding which questions relate to which Assessment Standards. While the overall purpose question clearly relates only to Assessment Standard 1.1/2.1, it is worth noting that some other questions may be viewed as relating to both Assessment Standards 1.1/2.1 and 1.2/2.2. Therefore, centres should look at all a candidate's answers, when reaching assessment judgements. As stated above, candidates could demonstrate achievement of the Assessment Standards across questions.

For assessment of Reading and Listening, some centres were overly cautious in their interpretation of what fitted Assessment Standard 1.2/2.2, and penalised candidates.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

All Units to be verified should appear on the Verification Sample Form.

Some centres provided a list of contents to assist Verifiers in understanding what had been submitted. This is good practice and is helpful to the verification process.

It is good practice for all the evidence for each candidate to be submitted together.

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.

Centres should ensure they make an overall assessment judgement for each Unit on the Verification Sample Form which matches the candidate assessment records — for example, Interim or Complete, and then Pass or Fail.

For assessment of Talking, centres should include detailed transcripts or assessor commentaries if no audio recording is being submitted. The centre's evaluation comments are required, but verification cannot proceed without comprehensive evidence detailing what candidates actually said, (as opposed to what they had prepared to say).

Some centres have developed answer papers for candidates by spacing out questions as originally formatted in the Unit assessment support packs. This is good practice and supports candidates to achieve their potential.

It is difficult to verify consistency of assessment judgements when evidence is submitted for fewer than three candidates in each skill, even though the centre is presenting more candidates.

All centres should provide evidence of internal verification. Some centres provided evidence of detailed internal verification processes. This is good practice.