# NQ Verification 2013–14

# Key Message Reports

| | |
|---|---|
| **Verification group name:** | Latin |
| **Levels** | N3 to N5 |
| **Date published:** | July 2014 |

**This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.**

# NQ Verification 2013–14 Key Messages Round 1

## 01 ▶ Section 1: Verification group information

| Verification group name: | Latin |
|---|---|
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | January 2014 |

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

H21F74   National 4 Translating
H21F75   National 5 Translating
H21H75   National 5 Literary Appreciation

## 02 ▶ Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

All centres used Unit assessment support packs (including the judging evidence tables) for the Literary Appreciation and about half for the Translating, and used them effectively.

The centres that used their own translating materials were generally very good in their assessment approaches. While assessors have to decide what is in the best interests of the candidate, in order to maintain a national standard that is fair to all candidates, centres should conform to the recommended 15 blocks (for a passage of 120 words maximum) with alternative essential ideas, where appropriate.

**Assessment judgements**

All centres using Unit assessment support packs (including the judging evidence tables) for the Literary Appreciation and the Translating made generally very effective judgements, as did those using their own assessment materials.

However, centres should, where possible, make full use of internal verification processes by cross-checking candidate work. Where internal verification has been carried out, this should be indicated clearly.

## 03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

Most candidates had been well prepared for the assessments and the overall performance was strong.

# NQ Verification 2013–14 Key Messages Round 2

 **Section 1: Verification group information**

| Verification group name: | Latin |
|---|---|
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | March |

## National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H21F 73       Translating (National 3)

H21F 74       Translating (National 4)

H21F 75       Translating (National 5)

H21H 75       Literary Appreciation (National 5)

H21K 74       Added Value Unit (National 4)

 **Section 2: Comments on assessment**

### Assessment approaches

Most centres used Unit assessment support packs (including the 'judging evidence' tables) for the *Literary Appreciation* Unit and for the *Translating* Units, and used them effectively.

Some centres devised their own assessments (and supplied the equivalent of 'judging evidence' tables) for both *Literary Appreciation* and *Translating* and did so effectively. One centre devised an interesting approach to assessing the *Literary Appreciation* National 5 Unit by offering candidates a varied approach to their answers, eg making up a house-for-sale advert; adding key details to a

drawing to show knowledge of the Pliny ghost story; as well as the more conventional written answers.

There was evidence of good assessment approaches in the National 4 Added Value Unit assessment, with candidates being offered various ways of meeting the Assessment Standards, eg presenting evidence in a poster; making a short presentation in front of some fellow pupils; as well as more conventional written forms of evidence.

## Assessment judgements

All centres using Unit assessment support packs (including the 'judging evidence' tables) for the *Literary Appreciation* and the *Translating* Units made generally very effective judgements, as did those using their own assessment materials. Evidence from centres for the National 4 Added Value Unit showed effective judgement of the four Assessment Standards.

Please note that it is acceptable for assessors to use marks in their judgements and to put these on the candidate scripts. It is also acceptable for assessors to highlight errors on the scripts and to give written feedback on the scripts.

It was good to see several centres including comments to show how assessment judgements were made when the 'judging evidence' tables (or their equivalent) required professional interpretation, especially in borderline cases. This also applied when assessors used follow-up questions to confirm whether a candidate passed an Assessment Standard or not.

In the National 4 Added Value Unit, assessors should indicate what questions they asked their candidates when presenting the evidence.

In the *Literary Appreciation* Unit it is not necessary for a candidate to pass every question in an Assessment Standard. A pass should be based on all the questions involved in that standard, eg if there are two questions relating to Assessment Standard 1.1 and each question asks for two details, then a pass would be if at least two details were successfully given out of the possible four over both questions.

In the *Translating* Units the 2/1/0 marking scheme is to be recommended. Full marks may be awarded for a block, even if minor mistakes are made. The sense of the block may be conveyed accurately even if there is a reversal of active and passive voices.

Most centres made very good use of internal verification processes by cross-checking candidate work. However, it should be noted that where internal verification has been carried out, this should be indicated clearly; and all centres, even when there is only one Latin assessor, should aim to have some kind of internal verification in place.

# Section 3: General comments

Most candidates had been well prepared for the assessments and the overall performance was strong.

There was evidence of candidates engaging well with the new Courses and of very good practice being implemented.