2019 Integrated Learning Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the previous year’s assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Practical Inquiry (40%)

The practical inquiry is an opportunity for students to demonstrate practical application and development of knowledge, concepts and skills related to the program focus. Most students completed a diverse range of both practical and creative tasks, and then evaluated their learning referring to the development of a chosen capability. Moderators again noted that most 20-credit programs were designed with three practical inquiry tasks however those designed with two practical inquiry tasks included more tasks in Assessment Type 2.

Students who achieved at the high levels of the performance standards throughout the practical inquiry tasks were given multiple opportunities to show the development of their capability(ies), as well as multiple opportunities to address the criteria for assessment.

The subject outline requires that at least one practical inquiry task should include a discussion as a form of evidence. The discussion should be utilised by teachers to give students the chance to expand on the evidence provided to meed the performance standards to a high level. The discussion can be held during an individual practical task or can be used to supplement the evidence for the completed set of practical inquiries. Evidence that a discussion has taken place should be provided for moderation. Moderators noted that where there was no evidence of a discussion it often contributed to a lack of student evidence and therefore a shift in moderation results. Those students who achieved at high levels had clear, relevant and dynamic discussions that added to the depth of evidence that the student provided.

Moderators noted that students who were encouraged to seek feedback for their practical inquiry tasks and reflect on the feedback received generally achieved at a higher level. This supported the evidence available for the assessment criteria IAE3, and addressed the subject outline specification that students should have the opportunity to receive feedback from others and to participate in self-assessment.

Evidence provided for the practical inquiry must be student evidence. Teacher evidence, such as a checklist or report, can only be used as support for student evidence. Moderators noted that this year evidence was provided in a variety of forms, including photographic, video, blogs, websites, music or reports.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a set of tasks that were designed to cover the assessment criteria more than once, allowing students multiple opportunities to create and include evidence
* provided multiple perspectives gathered from multiple referenced sources
* had clear analysis of their findings and related them to the program focus
* reflected on their own learning using feedback received from others
* included annotated photos, drawings, videos and/or images to demonstrate evidence of their development in skills and/or knowledge
* explicitly identified one or more capability(ies) and explored the connections between the program focus and the development of that capability(ies), thereby showing connections to the real world
* included evidence of a discussion that was often student directed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* responded to tasks that were heavily scaffolded often limiting students’ opportunities to achieve at the higher levels
* contained very little student evidence, instead including teacher evidence and/or checklists
* had limited evidence IAE1 where students investigate and use information, concepts and ideas to develop learning
* did not reflect on feedback from others as a means of informing their own self-assessment
* made no reference to, or included limited explanation of, the development of their capability(ies)
* included no evidence of a discussion, or the discussion was highly scaffolded by the teacher, which provided limited student evidence.

Assessment Type 2: Connections (30%)

For the connections, the subject outline specifies that students work collaboratively with others to undertake specific tasks or activities that encourage them to make connections between the program focus and their development of a capability(ies). They individually identify their contribution to the collaborative task/activity and communicate their ideas and opinions. They evaluate their learning after receiving feedback from others and make references to their development of a relevant capability. Moderators noted that most 20-credit programs were designed with one connections task, although some were designed with two connections tasks if only two practical inquiries were completed.

Moderators noted that students who achieved at the higher levels were encouraged to seek feedback for their connections tasks and reflect on the feedback received. This evidence supported assessment criteria IAE3 and addressed the subject outline specification that students should have the opportunity to receive feedback from others and to participate in self-assessment. It should be noted that students can undertake similar planning and preparation but must respond individually and add their own personal annotations and reflections. Evidence for each student’s connections task must be assessed individually and must demonstrate the student’s individual role in and contribution to the task. It was also evident that students needed to be clear in their knowledge of the program focus and consider how to apply their knowledge, concepts, and skills for a specific purpose. Clarity in the task ensured relevance in their discussion concerning the development of a capability.

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed explicit and clear evidence of collaboration with specific examples of individual contribution to the task or activity
* included clear acknowledgment and sourcing of information
* presented evidence of learning in a variety of ways with clear individual annotations
* included authentic opportunities for collaboration and community connections to achieve a collaborative task, rather than merely making contact with others and using them as sources of information
* used feedback from others to inform evaluation of student’s own learning
* used a wide variety of sources that helped to demonstrate their understanding of a range of perspectives
* discussed the development of their chosen capability in detail
* had clearly designed assessment tasks which ensured all performance standards were addressed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* responded to tasks that did not provide opportunities for sustained collaboration — this limited the quality of evidence provided by the student
* failed to discuss the development of their chosen capability or address appropriate performance standards
* had very simplistic peer assessment which limited opportunities to provide evidence of self-analysis
* included limited evidence of collaboration, often relying on group evidence rather than individual outcomes
* provided limited evidence of a range of perspectives being considered throughout tasks (IAE2)
* provided limited evidence of a variety of sources being used (IAE1)
* required more authentic opportunities to ‘collaborate’ with others in a purposeful application of the program focus.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Personal Endeavour (30%)

The personal endeavour is the external assessment and is weighted at 30%. Each student’s personal endeavour is marked initially by the teacher, then submitted to the SACE Board and marked again by a marker appointed by the SACE Board. The personal endeavour assesses Application and Understanding (AU1 & AU3), Inquiry, Analysis and Evaluation (IAE1 & IAE2), Communication and Collaboration (CC2).

The personal endeavour is an opportunity for students to explore an area of the program focus that is of interest to them by investigating and analysing relevant information concepts, ideas and skills, and communicating their ideas and opinions about them. Students select one capability to be developed within their personal endeavour and explore the link between that capability and their area of interest.

The subject outline specifies that students in the same class should have a different focus to their personal endeavour, and that students should identify the capability they have selected within their evidence.

Markers noted that, although there was some variation in presentation, most personal endeavours were still submitted as written reports. Markers recommend encouraging students to submit their evidence in a form that best suits their individual learning style as well as the focus of their personal endeavour, as this may assist students to achieve at higher grade levels.

The more successful responses commonly:

* had personal significance or relevance to the student
* had a clearly designed purpose or question rather than a broad topic
* referenced appropriately a variety of sources
* provided evidence of comprehensive research which showed understanding of a variety of perspectives
* explicitly discussed the link between their chosen capability and the program focus
* annotated photos, data, tables, images etc. to demonstrate capability development and content knowledge.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were highly scaffolded with all students in the class responding to the same directed Personal Endeavour or having identical leading sentences
* showed little evidence of researching from a variety of sources, which restricted both depth and diversity of research and information (IAE1)
* were written as a recount of an event or experience without analysis of concepts, ideas and skills development from different perspectives (IAE2)
* only provided one perspective (IAE2)
* made simplistic links to their chosen capability, often quoting the SACE definitions of each capability in the last paragraph (AU3)
* included limited or no analysis or reflection of researched information (CC2).