German Extension General Senior Syllabus 2020 v1.2

Subject report 2020

February 2021

Contents

Introduction

The first summative year for the new Queensland Certificate of Education (QCE) system was unexpectedly challenging. The demands of delivering new assessment requirements and processes were amplified by disruptions to senior schooling arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. This meant the new system was forced to adapt before it had been introduced — the number of summative internal assessments was reduced from three to two in all General subjects. Schools and the QCAA worked together to implement the new assessment processes and the 2020 Year 12 cohort received accurate and reliable subject results.

Queensland's innovative new senior assessment system combines the flexibility and authenticity of school-based assessment, developed and marked by classroom teachers, with the rigour and consistency of external assessment set and marked by QCAA-trained assessment writers and markers. The system does not privilege one form of assessment over another, and both teachers and QCAA assessors share the role of making high-stakes judgments about the achievement of students. Our commitment to rigorous external quality assurance guarantees the reliability of both internal and external assessment outcomes.

Using evidence of student learning to make judgments on student achievement is just one purpose of assessment. In a sophisticated assessment system, it is also used by teachers to inform pedagogy and by students to monitor and reflect on their progress.

This post-cycle report on the summative assessment program is not simply being produced as a matter of record. It is intended that it will play an active role in future assessment cycles by providing observations and findings in a way that is meaningful and helpful to support the teaching and learning process, provide future students with guidance to support their preparations for summative assessment, and promote transparency and accountability in the broader education community. Reflection and research are necessary for the new system to achieve stability and to continue to evolve. The annual subject report is a key medium for making it accessible to schools and others.

Background

Purpose

The annual subject report is an analysis of the previous year's full summative assessment cycle. This includes endorsement of summative internal assessment instruments, confirmation of internal assessment marks and external assessment.

The report provides an overview of the key outcomes of one full teaching, learning and assessment cycle for each subject, including:

- information about the application of the syllabus objectives through the design and marking of internal and external assessments
- information about the patterns of student achievement in each subject for the assessment cycle.

It also provides advice to schools to promote continuous improvement, including:

- identification of effective practices in the design and marking of valid, accessible and reliable assessments
- identification of areas for improvement and recommendations to enhance the design and marking of valid, accessible and reliable assessment instruments
- provision of tangible examples of best practice where relevant, possible and appropriate.

Audience and use

This report should be read by school leaders, subject leaders and teachers to inform teaching and learning and assessment preparation. The report is to be used by schools and teachers to assist in assessment design practice, in making assessment decisions and in preparing students for external assessment.

The report is publicly available to promote transparency and accountability. Students, parents, community members and other education stakeholders can learn about the assessment practices and outcomes for General subjects (including alternative sequences and Senior External Examination subjects, where relevant) and General (Extension) subjects.

Report preparation

The report includes analyses of data and other information from the processes of endorsement, confirmation and external assessment, and advice from the chief confirmer, chief endorser and chief marker, developed in consultation with and support from QCAA subject matter experts.

Subject data summary

Subject enrolments

- Number of schools offering the subject: 2.

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

Units 3 and 4 internal assessment results

2020 COVID-19 adjustments

To support Queensland schools, teachers and students to manage learning and assessment during the evolving COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, the QCAA Board approved the removal of one internal assessment for students completing Units 3 and 4 in General and Applied subjects.

In General subjects, students completed two internal assessments and an external assessment. Schools made decisions based on QCAA advice and their school context. Therefore, across the state some instruments were completed by most schools, some completed by fewer schools and others completed by few or no schools. In the case of the latter, the data and information for these instruments has not been included.

Total results for internal assessment

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

IA1 results

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

IA2 results

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

IA3 results

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

External assessment results

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

Final standards allocation

There were insufficient student enrolments in this subject to provide useful analytics.

Grade boundaries

The grade boundaries are determined using a process to compare results on a numeric scale to the reporting standards.

Standard	A	B	C	D	E
Marks achieved	100–80	79–62	61–41	40–19	18–0

Internal assessment

The following information and advice pertain to the assessment design and assessment decisions for each IA in Units 3 and 4. These instruments have undergone quality assurance processes informed by the attributes of quality assessment (validity, accessibility and reliability).

Endorsement

Endorsement is the quality assurance process based on the attributes of validity and accessibility. These attributes are categorised further as priorities for assessment and each priority can be further broken down into assessment practices. Data presented in the assessment design sections identifies the reasons why IA instruments were not endorsed at Application 1, by the priority for assessments. An IA may have been identified more than once for a priority for assessment, e.g. it may have demonstrated a misalignment to both subject matter and to the assessment objective. Refer to the quality assurance tools for detailed information about the assessment practices for each assessment instrument.

Total number of items endorsed in Application 1

Number of items submitted each event	IA1	IA2	IA3
Total number of instruments	2	2	2
Percentage endorsed in Application 1	50	100	100

Confirmation

Confirmation is the quality assurance process based on the attribute of reliability. Teachers make judgments about the evidence in students' responses using the instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG) to indicate the alignment of students' work with performance-level descriptors and determine a mark for each criterion. These are provisional criterion marks. The QCAA makes the final decision about student results through the confirmation processes. Data presented in the assessment decisions section identifies the level of agreement between provisional and final results.

Number of samples reviewed at initial, supplementary and extraordinary review

IA	Number of schools	Number of samples requested	Supplementary samples requested	Extraordinary review	School review	Percentage agreement with provisional
1	2	10	0	0	0	100
2	1	5	0	0	0	100
3	1	5	0	0	0	100

Internal assessment 1 (IA1)

Examination — combination response (20%)

Internal assessment 1 requires students to analyse German texts and create German texts, and relates to one area of study that has been covered in Unit 3. It is used to determine student achievement in assessment objectives 1–5 through questions related to unseen audio, audiovisual or visual German stimulus texts. Student responses must be completed individually, under supervised conditions, and within set timeframes. The IA1 is comprised of a short response and an extended response. Both components of the examination must be completed within five school days.

Assessment design

Validity

Validity in assessment design considers the extent to which an assessment item accurately measures what it is intended to measure and that the evidence of student learning collected from an assessment can be legitimately used for the purpose specified in the syllabus.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — validity practices

Validity priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Alignment	1
Authentication	0
Authenticity	0
Item construction	0
Scope and scale	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Validity priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- appropriate subject matter alignment for the unit and topic

- questions which allowed students to demonstrate the assessable objectives and performance-level descriptors of the ISMG

- short response stimulus items which conformed to assessment specifications, i.e.

  – two to three unseen audio, audiovisual or visual German stimulus texts

  – each stimulus text used for only one component

  – written text and transcripts with a total length of 500–800 words when combined

  – audio and audiovisual texts

    ▪ heard three times

    ▪ may be delivered slower than background speaker pace, with judicious pausing permitted

    ▪ delivered so as to not compromise the authenticity of the task

- visual texts which did not compromise complexity by providing cues to understanding of other stimulus materials
- extended response stimulus items which conformed to assessment specifications, i.e.
  - up to two unseen authentic visual stimulus texts related to the short response stimulus (but which did not compromise complexity by providing cues to understanding of other stimulus materials, and did not exceed a combined total length of 60 words)
  - stimulus and questions were provided 15 minutes prior to the student response, during which time students were permitted to make notes
- questions which allowed for unique student responses, by avoiding
  - leading questions
  - questions containing too much detail from the text
- a clear context for the assessment task
- appropriate item construction in the task
- stimulus items relevant to the subject matter, and of suitable scope and scale.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- clearly meet all assessment objectives across the questions in the instrument, e.g. word questions to show a clear alignment to assessment objectives and the ISMG
- include only unseen authentic audio, audiovisual or visual texts. Use of written texts is not part of the assessment specifications for IA1
- provide two unseen authentic visual stimulus texts which contain text of up to 60 words in length when combined.

Accessibility

Accessibility in assessment design ensures that no student or group of students is disadvantaged in their capacity to access an assessment.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — accessibility practices

Accessibility priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Transparency	1
Language	0
Layout	0
Bias avoidance	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Accessibility priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- bold, italics and other formatting features only where relevant
- clear instructions using cues that align to the specifications, objectives and ISMG.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- use clear instructions that align to the specifications, objectives and ISMG.

Assessment decisions

Reliability

Reliability is a judgment about the measurements of assessment. It refers to the extent to which the results of assessments are consistent, replicable and free from error.

Agreement trends between provisional and final results

Criterion number	Criterion name	Percentage agreement with provisional	Percentage less than provisional	Percentage greater than provisional
1	Analysing German texts	100	0	0
2	Creating German texts	100	0	0

Effective practices

Accuracy and consistency of the application of the ISMG for this IA was most effective when:

- responses showed the use of both textual conventions and language features to infer meaning

- responses analysed the relevant information in the stimulus and drew substantiated conclusions related to the stimulus.

Samples of effective practices

There are no student response excerpts because either the student/s did not provide permission or there were third-party copyright issues in the response/s.

Internal assessment 2 (IA2)

Examination — extended response (25%)

Internal assessment 2 requires students to analyse German texts and create German texts, and is used to determine student achievement in assessment objectives 2–6. It requires students to analyse and evaluate stimulus and to respond in German in the form of a 600–1000 word analytical essay, addressing a particular task or question for an area of study not examined in IA1. Students have a set preparation time of four weeks and may use class time to engage with the two stimulus texts provided by the teacher, one of which must be an authentic visual German stimulus text and one of which must be an authentic written stimulus of 400–600 words in German. Students must also select and consider an additional text approved by the teacher in their response. The response must be written in 120 minutes under supervised conditions to ensure authenticity.

Assessment design

Validity

Validity in assessment design considers the extent to which an assessment item accurately measures what it is intended to measure and that the evidence of student learning collected from an assessment can be legitimately used for the purpose specified in the syllabus.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — validity practices

Validity priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Alignment	0
Authentication	0
Authenticity	0
Item construction	0
Scope and scale	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Validity priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- stimulus texts that allowed for unique student responses

- topics and subject matter relevant to the unit

- carefully crafted scaffolding to avoid leading to a predetermined response

- appropriate scope and scale to allow students to fully demonstrate assessment objectives at the highest performance levels within the conditions mandated by the syllabus.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- include one authentic visual text which should not provide clues to other stimulus texts. Teachers should not create their own visual texts by patching individual visuals and comments together.

Accessibility

Accessibility in assessment design ensures that no student or group of students is disadvantaged in their capacity to access an assessment.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — accessibility practices

Accessibility priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Bias avoidance	0
Language	0
Layout	0
Transparency	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Accessibility priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- no bias or inappropriate content

- images, diagrams and other visual elements which were legible, clear, and relevant

- audio and audiovisual elements which were clear and audible

- appropriate language and avoidance of unnecessary jargon, specialist language or colloquial language in questions.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- contain minimal use of fonts, colours and bold, as these can be distractions for students.

Assessment decisions

Reliability

Reliability is a judgment about the measurements of assessment. It refers to the extent to which the results of assessments are consistent, replicable and free from error.

Agreement trends between provisional and final results

Criterion number	Criterion name	Percentage agreement with provisional	Percentage less than provisional	Percentage greater than provisional
1	Analysing German texts	100	0	0
2	Creating German texts	100	0	0

Effective practices

Accuracy and consistency of the application of the ISMG for this IA was evident across all schools in 2020, and was demonstrated when:

- responses showed the use of both textual conventions and language features to infer meaning

- responses analysed the relevant information in the stimulus and drew substantiated conclusions related to the stimulus.

Internal assessment 3 (IA3)

Project — investigative folio (30%)

The summative internal assessment 3 focuses on a student-led investigation that requires the application of cognitive, technical and creative skills and theoretical understandings in relation to an area of interest not studied in Unit 3. The IA3 requires students to analyse German texts and create German texts, and assesses objectives 1–6. Part 1 is an 8–10 minute multimodal presentation or equivalent digital media production in German on a personal focus and/or topic of interest which provides an analysis and evaluation of a collection of student-selected authentic German texts not previously studied in German or German Extension and covering a range of text types. Part 2 is a 10–12 minute individual spontaneous student-centred conversation about the presentation.

Assessment design

Validity

Validity in assessment design considers the extent to which an assessment item accurately measures what it is intended to measure and that the evidence of student learning collected from an assessment can be legitimately used for the purpose specified in the syllabus.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — validity practices

Validity priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Alignment	0
Authentication	0
Authenticity	0
Item construction	0
Scope and scale	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Validity priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- approved student-selected stimulus items relevant to the task

- scaffolding which did not lead to a predetermined response

- appropriate scope and scale to allow students to fully demonstrate assessment objectives at the highest performance levels within the conditions mandated by the syllabus

- questions that allowed students to draw their own conclusions.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- apply relevant strategies for checkpoints, and that these are documented with dates provided

- apply and enforce strategies to ensure authenticity of student work.

Accessibility

Accessibility in assessment design ensures that no student or group of students is disadvantaged in their capacity to access an assessment.

Reasons for non-endorsement by priority of assessment — accessibility practices

Accessibility priority	Number of times priority was identified in decisions*
Transparency	0
Language	0
Layout	0
Bias avoidance	0

*Total number of submissions: 2. Each priority might contain up to four assessment practices.

Effective practices

Accessibility priorities were effectively demonstrated in assessment instruments that featured:

- no bias or inappropriate content

- appropriate language use, avoiding unnecessary jargon, specialist language or colloquial language

- proofread tasks that modelled accurate spelling, grammar, punctuation and other textual features

- use of bold, italics and other formatting features only where relevant

- clear instructions using cues that aligned to the specifications, objectives and ISMG.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that assessment instruments:

- include clear instructions for both Part 1 and Part 2 of the task.

- adhere to word and time lengths as per the syllabus to ensure no student is disadvantaged. Syllabus section 3.9.1 states that assessment of the Creating German texts criterion must have 10–12 minutes of student-centred conversation. Teachers should limit their involvement in the conversation so that the student has the opportunity to fully develop their answers.

Assessment decisions

Reliability

Reliability is a judgment about the measurements of assessment. It refers to the extent to which the results of assessments are consistent, replicable and free from error.

Agreement trends between provisional and final results

Criterion number	Criterion name	Percentage agreement with provisional	Percentage less than provisional	Percentage greater than provisional
1	Analysing German texts	100	0	0
2	Creating German texts	100	0	0

Effective practices

Accuracy and consistency of the application of the ISMG for this IA was most effective when:

- responses showed the use of both textual conventions and language features to infer meaning

- responses analysed the relevant information in the stimulus and drew substantiated conclusions related to the stimulus.

Samples of effective practices

There are no student response excerpts because either the student/s did not provide permission or there were third-party copyright issues in the response/s.

External assessment

Examination — extended response (25%)

Assessment design

Assessment specifications and conditions

Extended response

The summative external examination is an extended response using stimulus material from a range of different text types and on topics from the areas of study. Students were asked to select one stimulus from the choice of provided materials. They responded in the form of an analytical essay, by providing perspectives on the ideas in the stimulus material and relating them to the topics studied in Units 3 and 4.

Criterion: Analysing German texts

This criterion requires students to:

- analyse and evaluate ideas in German texts
- draw conclusions and justify their points of view.

Criterion: Creating German texts

This criterion requires students to:

- provide a personal, critical and/or creative response to stimulus
- adhere to the conventions of the text type.

Conditions

- Time: 2 hours plus 20 minutes planning time.
- Length: an extended response of 500–700 words.
    - Other: German dictionaries are not allowed.
    - Notes are not allowed.

The assessment instrument required students to write an extended response to one of three provided stimulus materials related to each area of study identified in Unit 3. Students were asked to discuss how a selected stimulus related to their own focus/topic from Unit 4: Independent investigation. Questions were derived from the context of Unit 4: independent investigation. This assessment was used to determine student achievement in the following assessment objectives:

1. apply knowledge of language elements, structures and textual conventions to understand how meaning is conveyed in the provided stimulus materials

2. apply knowledge of language elements, structures and textual conventions to create meaning in texts, in relation to the provided stimulus materials

3. identify how meaning, attitudes, perspectives and values underpin the provided stimulus materials, and how they influence audiences

4. analyse and evaluate information and ideas to draw conclusions and justify points of view and arguments, in relation to the provided stimulus materials

5. create texts that convey information and ideas in German for context, purpose and audience and cultural conventions, in relation to the provided stimulus materials

6. structure, sequence and synthesise information to respond personally, critically and/or creatively to the provided stimulus materials.

The stimulus was three written texts. They were designed to elicit an extended response which analysed one of the texts and also related to the student's own investigative response.

Assessment decisions

Overall, students responded well to the following assessment aspects:

- Analysing German texts — understanding and analysis
- Creating German texts — structure.

Effective practices

Criterion: Analysing and creating German Texts

Effective student responses:

- included an introduction, at least two body paragraphs and a conclusion (structure)
- used a consistent register, and a wide range of vocabulary, grammar and tenses (language elements)
- used proficient and complex German to create fluent sentences (meaning)
- used a wide range of cohesive devices purposefully (cohesion)
- demonstrated thorough understanding of one perspective in the chosen stimulus; they included references from the stimulus which were relevant to the argument (understanding)
- identified a relevant perspective in the chosen stimulus, and provided an authoritative interpretation of how this perspective influenced audiences (analysis)
- clearly stated a judgment about a perspective in the chosen stimulus, and drew well-substantiated conclusions about this judgment using both the chosen stimulus and their own ideas (evaluation)
- clearly stated a thesis to be substantiated, and developed a discriminating personal, critical or creative argument to support the thesis across the response (argument).

Student samples of effective responses

There are no student response excerpts because either the student/s did not provide permission or there were third-party copyright issues in the response/s.

Practices to strengthen

It is recommended that when preparing students for external assessment, teachers consider reminding students:

- of the importance of indicating their area of study and the title of their independent investigation

- that it is not appropriate to use 'du' or 'ihr' in a formal essay and to be consistent in their application of this. Use of 'man' should be encouraged

- that in order to achieve the highest marks, students need to use a greater range of complex sentences correctly, including use of subordinate and relative clauses with correct word order and punctuation, and especially correct use of commas

- should include a range of tenses (past, present and future) as well as mood, e.g. present and past subjunctive

- that errors in language elements can also impact on meaning. A wide range of cohesive devices are required for full marks and this is an area which some students found difficult and used simplistic and repetitive words and phrases rather than a variety

- of the need to link the judgment both back to their chosen stimulus as well as their own ideas. Some students found it difficult to connect their chosen stimulus to the ideas they had developed through their independent investigation. In some cases, this was a result of a mismatch between the topic they had chosen for the investigation and the stimulus

- to ensure they clearly state a thesis in the introduction and develop a personal, critical or creative argument to support the thesis across the response.