



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY  
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

# **National Qualifications Framework Levels 1–3, 2004**

## **Languages**

### **National Moderator's Report**

## National Moderator's Report

### General Guidance for Assessors of Achievement and Unit Standards

The purpose of external moderation is to provide reassurance that assessor judgements are at the national standard and are made on the basis of assessment materials that are fair and valid.

All assessment materials are expected to:

- give the student the opportunity to meet the requirements of the standard
- have an assessment schedule that gives evidence of appropriate student responses and clear judgements at all levels.

The Ministry of Education contracted subject experts to write assessment resources for achievement standards. These are not pre-moderated. The intention is that they are modified to suit teaching programmes and student needs. They do not provide 'rules' but suggest different ways of assessing to the nationally-registered standard.

### General Overall Comment

The moderation of internally assessed achievement and unit standards in Languages and Latin in 2004 showed that the majority of schools used or modified the exemplars from the TKI website. These are not designed to be downloaded and used as they are, but personalised to suit each school's particular cohort of candidates. Some exemplars need adjusting to fit the requirements of moderation and should be checked for language at the required level. Very few unit standards were used in assessment.

There has been an improvement in teachers' understanding and interpretation of the standard and in assessor judgements. Most teachers have followed advice given in previous moderation rounds. However there is still a concern over the variation in the conditions set by teachers for assessments. In some cases, teachers changed their interpretation of the assessment criteria of the standard, when writing their own assessment activities or when making judgements. Teachers also frequently changed the assessment conditions to make achievement of the standard easier for students. It is important that teachers follow the *Guidelines for the Management of Internal Assessment* so that there is equity and consistency nationwide.

### Level 1

**AS 90073, 90079, 90085, 90091, 90097, 90103, 90109, 90120, 90126: Give a prepared talk in (selected second language) on a familiar topic**

Most teachers used Version 2 of the standards for their assessment instructions and assessment schedules this year. However there was confusion over what was meant by 'version' on the submission cover sheet, some thinking it referred to the version of the web activity being used.

Although the requirements of vocabulary and structures at Level 6 are now generally made clear to candidates in the activity, they must also be expressed in the assessment schedule.

Examples of learner response, which are required in the assessment schedule, were often misplaced. If the teacher wishes, candidates may also be given examples in the target language in the activity, but it is recommended that candidates be instructed not to use them if they are on the same topic.

### Additional notes

Again, the quality of the tapes supplied by schools with their submission materials was a concern to moderators. The talks must be audible on the tape if there is to be any moderation of assessor judgements. In some cases, interference from background noise meant the speaker was not

audible. If a tape-recorder is stopped during a talk it is helpful for moderation purposes and for national consistency to be informed of the reason for this. Student material recorded on video was usually of a much better standard.

**AS 90074, 90080, 90086, 90092, 90098, 90104, 90110, 90121, 90127: *Converse in (selected second language) in a familiar context***

Evidence of at least one Level 6 structure and Level 6 language must form part of the criteria of the assessment schedule.

There was some confusion over the placement of the examples of student response. These must be included in the assessment schedule and be written in the target language.

Conversation standards give the most cause for concern. The tasks need to be set and administered so that candidates are given the opportunity to speak for the required length of time and also add (*substantial*) *development*. Sometimes, in an attempt to have ‘natural’ conversations, teachers allow candidates to give very brief answers which do not contain enough language even for Achievement.

Some teachers also give significant help (re-phrasing questions, prompting candidates to seek information etc) whereas others do not. Under a national assessment system candidates must have equal opportunities to achieve. Therefore it is advisable that the same questions are given to all candidates, though not necessarily in the same order, and that standard prompts are used for all. Candidates should not be given the questions before the assessment takes place.

Teachers variously interpret the *clear/clearly* of the achievement standard with most dealing with any lack of audibility or comprehensibility by means of the *communication/errors* statement.

**AS 90077, 90089, 90095, 90101, 90107, 90113, 90130: *Write text in (selected second language) on a familiar topic, with the support of resources***

Evidence of at least one Level 6 structure and Level 6 language must form part of the criteria of the assessment schedule.

The type of activities chosen by teachers in 2004 allowed candidates to exhibit skill in less formal and more interesting types of writing. However, it was disappointing that little student work was submitted for this standard.

## **Level 2**

**AS 90383, 90389, 90396, 90402, 90408, 90485, 90414, 90420, 90427: *Give a prepared spoken presentation in (selected second language) on a less familiar topic***

According to Explanatory Note 6 the spoken presentation must be *of a minimum length of two minutes* and ‘not about two minutes’ as in the time length for the conversation standard. However, the emphasis should lie on the quality of the presentation. The wording of the title requires care, as it is a *presentation* not a ‘talk’.

At Achievement with Merit and Achievement with Excellence levels it is important that the spoken presentation is *organised* as this forms part of the criteria of the standard which must be adhered to if national consistency is to be achieved. Candidates need to be told this in the instructions for the activity. *Delivery is confident and fluent* is a criterion only of Achievement with Excellence. Assessors should make sure that *substantial development* is adhered to for Achievement with Excellence, as there is some inconsistency in the interpretation of *substantial*. The achievement

criteria for Achievement and Achievement with Merit both ask for use of a *variety of vocabulary and structures*.

**AS 90384, 90390, 90397, 90403, 90409, 90415, 90421, 90428, 90486: *Converse in (selected second language) in a less familiar context***

Until all standards are reviewed care must be taken with the wording for the time length. There are inconsistencies in the wording of Explanatory Note 6 between the three conversation standards when referring to evidence and the candidate's contribution to the conversation. The candidate's contribution to the conversation may be *about two minutes* and he/she should be given direction about this in the instructions.

It is important that the activity assessing the conversations is set in a way that sounds natural and yet still offers candidates an opportunity for *substantial development and wide variety of vocabulary and structures*.

It needs to be noted that the word *simple* does not appear in the language criterion at Level 2 and that *interaction is confident and fluent* is a criterion of Achievement with Excellence only.

**AS 90387, 90400, 90406, 90412, 90418, 90431, 90489: *Produce crafted writing (selected second language) on a less familiar topic, with the support of resources***

Lack of candidate material was a disappointment.

It should be noted that the error statements for Achievement and Achievement with Merit are the same. The emphasis is on *crafted writing* and this applies to each of the achievement levels.

The required minimum word length (Explanatory Note 6) must be given to the candidates in their instructions and also form part of the criteria of the assessment schedule. It should be noted that for Achievement with Excellence *extensive development* should cover depth as well as the number of points developed.

The criteria for Achievement and Achievement with Merit both demand that *language (be) generally used appropriately and any errors do not significantly hinder communication*. This has created a few problems for arriving at an assessment judgement because, if all other criteria are at an Achievement with Merit level, judgement is often forced between either Not Achieved or Achievement with Merit. This problem should be eliminated when the draft-reviewed version of the achievement standard comes into effect in 2005.

### **Level 3**

**AS 90547, 90553, 90559, 90565, 90571, 90577, 90583, 90589, 90672: *Give a prepared speech in (selected second language) using complex language, in a formal situation***

The wording of the speaking time *a minimum of two to three minutes* has confused some teachers. Emphasis should lie on the quality and breadth of the speech, especially when assessing Achievement with Merit and Achievement with Excellence. At these levels the candidate must give a speech, which (*substantially*) *develops relevant information and/or ideas*. Candidates should be carefully prepared to ensure that they meet these requirements.

Confusion was also apparent over the criterion of *a variety of complex vocabulary and language structures*. Explanatory Note 4 defines *complex* as involving language *up to and including Level 8 of the curriculum or equivalent*. The achievement criteria for Achievement and Achievement with

Merit both require this *variety of complex vocabulary and structures*. Because of this it was difficult for teachers and moderators to assess candidates in situations where they did not make errors that *significantly hindered communication*, developed ideas and used some vocabulary and structures at the appropriate level, but did not really have a variety. Despite this difficulty assessor judgements were mainly correct.

It is a criterion of this standard, at all levels, that candidates express a *point of view*. Many teachers asked for the point of view to be developed for Achievement with Merit and Achievement with Excellence though this is not a requirement. However a point of view must be clearly expressed and should not have to be inferred. Many topics chosen by teachers were not really conducive to the expression of a point of view. Candidates should be encouraged to use phrases that clearly express a point of view.

**AS 90548, 90554, 90560, 90566, 90572, 90578, 90584, 90590, 90673: Engage in an extended conversation in (selected second language) using complex language in less familiar contexts**

Achievement criteria for Achievement and Achievement with Merit both require a *variety of complex vocabulary and structures*. This caused some problems and made these standards at times difficult to assess.

It is important that there is ‘exchange’ at all levels in these standards. In a conversation this is just as important as ‘development’. Some topics lent themselves better than others to providing opportunities for candidates to add (*substantial*) development.

Teachers were unsure about whether the candidate had to ask a question in order to ‘exchange information’. The candidate is expected to seek information, but it is preferable that the teacher says as little as possible and is not therefore obliged to share too much information via responses and feedback.

In these standards as well, the conversation time of *a minimum of two to three minutes* caused some difficulties in assessment. The emphasis should lie on the quality and breadth of the contribution, especially when assessing Achievement with Merit and Achievement with Excellence. It should be remembered that for Achievement with Excellence the interaction must be *confident and fluent*.

**AS 90551, 90563, 90569, 90575, 90581, 90593, 90749: Produce crafted writing in (selected second language) using complex language, with the support of resources**

As for Level 2, the Achievement with Excellence criterion for the crafted text *extensively develops ... relevant information* should cover depth as well as the number of points developed. This makes a distinction, therefore, between the criterion for Achievement with Excellence and that of Achievement with Merit which is *substantially develops*.

Despite the availability of resources, as permitted in these standards, it was difficult for some candidates to gain Achievement. Candidates need a lot of training and preparation in the classroom to be able to use resources effectively and independently.

## Latin: Level 1

### **AS 90017 Latin: *Describe a major aspect of Roman civilisation***

Most teachers used activities from the web but many are still not aware that they are expected to modify these. The assessment schedule should be for the activity that their students are doing. As there is little material accessible to Latin learners at this level the choice of topics for assessment is consequently limited.

As Version 2 of the standard will be moderated against in 2005, it is important that the assessment schedule reflects accurately the revised criteria of the achievement standard and the requirements of the task. This will help in making consistent and accurate assessor decisions.

### **AS 90018 Latin: *Describe the contribution of the Romans to one aspect of western civilisation***

The achievement standard criteria need to be clearly stated in both the candidates' instructions and the assessment schedule. *A range of sources* is required at all levels. Most candidates were able to describe, explain and evaluate the contribution of the Romans to one aspect of western civilisation.

It is a pity that some candidates are not bothering to complete or attempt this standard, presumably because of the few credits offered.

## Latin: Level 2

### **AS 90262 Latin: *Demonstrate knowledge of prepared literary Latin passages by a variety of authors on a given theme***

Care should be taken that the criterion of *knowledge of the literary passages* is met according to Explanatory Note 4 of the standard. In some cases teachers are only asking for demonstration of one point instead of two or more.

Examples of expected candidate response for all parts of an activity must be provided in the assessment schedule, as for the other internally assessed Latin standards. These examples should apply to the activities done by the candidates, not just down-loaded from the web.

There were some very good examples of student work submitted for moderation.

### **AS 90263 Latin: *Examine the wider context of the prepared literary Latin passages***

It is to be hoped that the reviewed Level 2 standards to come into use in 2005 will clarify this standard. The definition of *comprehensive* has caused difficulties for some teachers when forming assessment judgements. To gain Achievement with Excellence the information given must cover all parts of the task equally and must include nearly all the supporting detail.

## Latin: Level 3

### **AS 90509 Latin: *Analyse familiar literary Latin passages on a given theme by at least two authors***

There was some confusion over Explanatory Note 4 as to whether aspects for analysis are required from both a and b. It is to be hoped that future review of this standard will clarify this. Most teachers used or followed the format of the web activities. However, again teachers failed to understand that the assessment schedule must be specific to their activity. It must contain the

expected answers as well as the criteria of the standard against which the judgements are to be made. There was a mixture of themes and a wide range of authors selected.

Candidates generally produced very high quality work and there was obvious enjoyment in undertaking analysis of Latin literature.

**AS 90510 Latin: *Discuss the wider context of prepared literary Latin passages***

When developing their own activities for assessment in this standard, teachers must remember that it is aspects of the wider context of the prepared literary passages that are to be assessed. In judgement for Achievement with Excellence, understanding of the criterion *comprehensive* is important. Similarly, some candidates were awarded Achievement with Excellence without any evaluation of the results of the research.

Work for this standard was of very high quality, no doubt reflecting the high calibre of candidates.