Modified subjects review
2019

Introduction

This document provides key information about the review process for Stage 1 and Stage 2 modified subjects. Its purpose is to promote a shared understanding of the roles and procedures that contribute to the integrity of students' results in the following modified subjects that support students' planning, literacy, numeracy, and research skills:

• Stage 1 English: Modified
• Stage 1 Mathematics: Modified
• Stage 1 Personal Learning Plan: Modified
• Stage 2 Research Project: Modified.

Purposes of review

The role of the review is to confirm the school's assessment decisions at the end of the teaching and learning program and before the SACE Board reports students' results. The review process does not involve re-marking student work. The review process confirms a school's 'completed' and 'not completed' assessment decisions.

The purposes of review are to ensure:

• that the 'completed' and 'not completed' assessment decisions in each subject have been applied consistently
• that school-assessed results awarded to students across schools are comparable and fair
• valid school assessment results.

Operating principles

The following operating principles underpin the review procedures for modified subjects that meet the compulsory requirements of the SACE:

Consistency

Review feedback supports schools to ensure the consistency of students' results in modified subjects that meet the compulsory requirements of the SACE.

Fairness

A student is neither advantaged nor disadvantaged by having their work included in the sample submitted for review.

Interdependence and responsibility

The procedures for assuring the integrity of SACE assessments are based on the interconnected and complementary responsibilities of the student, the teacher, school leaders, and the SACE Board in the assessment process.

Sampling

Review is based on evidence provided in a sample of student work from the school.

Transparency

The procedures for assuring the integrity of SACE assessments are explicit and open to scrutiny.

Validity

The purpose of the review is to confirm the school's assessment decisions about student achievement, based on the assumption that the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and the specifications of the subject outline have been followed, and that 'completed' and 'not completed' assessment decisions have been applied consistently.

Definitions

The following terms are used in this document:

- *review sample* — up to three sets of evidence selected by a school to represent the school's 'completed', 'not completed' and borderline 'not completed' assessment decisions in a subject. It also includes a
  - *completed* student description sheet *that outlines the learning context (e.g. student background, accommodations required, and learning needs) and personal learning goals for each student in the sample*
  - *copy of the relevant learning and assessment plan(s)*
  - *copy of the* Stage 2 Research Project: Modified — school planner, *if applicable*
- *set of evidence* — an entire set of student work as specified in the approved learning and assessment plan, or pending completion of the final task.

Assumptions

When reviewing student work, reviewers assume that:

- students have been taught and assessed according to the specifications of the current subject outline for modified subjects
- assessment has been conducted according to SACE Board policies and procedures
- the 'completed' and 'not completed' assessment decisions have been applied consistently across the cohort
- the results on the student description sheet submitted by the school to the SACE Board are correct at the time of the review.

Reviewing involves:	*Reviewing does **not** involve:*
• looking for evidence in a sample to support the teacher's assessment decisions • considering the student's evidence of learning and the match between this evidence and the student's personal learning goals • providing feedback that schools can use to confirm or adjust (as appropriate) final results.	• marking or initiating a result • checking that the teacher has marked errors in the student work correctly • looking for disagreement with the teacher • giving advice about improvements, or commenting on the work of individual students.

Roles and Responsibilities

Review Leadership Team
- Executive Manager, Curriculum and Assessment
- Manager, Curriculum and Assessment
- SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment

The SACE Board:
- appoints a SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment to lead and support the review process
- asks schools to nominate teachers to act as reviewers
- ensures that reviewers are not allocated to
  - their own school
  - a school with which they have an association
  - a school with which they have a conflict of interest
- trains reviewers in the review procedures
- requires all assessment panel members to
  - maintain confidentiality throughout and after the review process in accordance with the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Review Code of Practice (see Appendix 1)
  - declare any potential conflicts of interest (see Appendix 1)
- ensure the security of school and student results, information, and materials
- schedules reviewers to review in pairs.

The school:
- nominates teachers to act as reviewers, as requested by the SACE Board
- prepares review samples for collection by the SACE Board.

The SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment:
- leads the review process
- conducts a benchmarking exercise before the start of the review, using common sets of student materials and training reviewers to use evidence of learning in student materials to support assessment decisions
- ensures that reviewers monitor adherence to the specifications of the subject outline

- oversees the outcome of the review process by ensuring that reviewers review assessment decisions consistently by:
  - monitoring reviewers' decisions, ensuring the integrity of the review process
  - supervising reviewers' decisions before any adjustments are recommended
- advises reviewers about work health and safety (see Appendix 2)
- advises reviewers about the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (ICAC) (see Appendix 3)
- In addition, the SOCA supervises the collection of examples of student work that may be suitable for future clarifying, benchmarking and/or as support materials.

Reviewers:

- complete the following before the review begins
  - declare any conflicts of interest (see Appendix 1)
  - sign a confidentiality agreement with the SACE Board (see Appendix 1)
  - participate in a benchmarking activity
  - participate in reviewer training
- review according to the review procedure (see pages 10 to 11) and the instructions of the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment
- identify potential support materials
- identify potential breaches of rules (when applicable).

Confidentiality and security

Conflict of interest

Reviewers are ***not*** to:
- review the work of students from any school at which they teach or with which they have a conflict of interest
- contribute to discussion about the review of any school at which they teach or with which they have a conflict of interest
- access information about the outcome of the review process for any school at which they teach or with which they have a conflict of interest.

Confidentiality

Reviewers maintain the confidentiality of information about students' results and schools before, during, and after the review process.

Security

Reviewers ensure the security of school and student results, information, and materials by returning:
- the Stage 1 and Stage 2 review feedback sheet to the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment
- student materials to the correct review bag.

Review Procedures

The review process is based on a sample of students' work prepared by participating schools. The review sample is selected by the school according to the parameters determined by the SACE Board.

The SACE Board provides feedback to schools about the outcomes of the review.

This feedback is used by schools to confirm or adjust (as appropriate) students' final results before these are submitted to the SACE Board.

Reviewing is conducted according to the following procedures. These procedures are also reflected in the procedure flow chart (see Appendix 4).

Step-by-step process

1. Reviewers are allocated to pairs.

2. The review pair is allocated a school to review by the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment.

3. The review pair collects the review bag(s) for their allocated school.

4. The review pair checks the review sample for:
   - up to three sets of evidence per subject selected by a school to represent the school's 'completed', 'borderline not completed', and 'not completed' assessment decisions
   - a completed student description sheet for each set of evidence that outlines the learning context (e.g. student background, accommodations required, and learning needs) and personal learning goals for each student in the sample
   - a copy of the relevant learning and assessment plan(s)
   - a copy of the Stage 2 Research Project: Modified — school planner, if applicable.

   If any material is missing, the reviewers inform the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment, who will determine how to proceed.

5. The review pair selects sets of evidence across the various subjects provided for review. Reviewers first select, when available, two sets of evidence from each of the following:
   - 'completed' assessment decisions
   - 'borderline not completed' assessment decisions
   - 'not completed' assessment decisions.

6. The review pair reviews the sets of evidence according to the review procedure below.

Review procedure

Independently, Reviewer 1 uses the Review guidelines on page 12 to review one 'completed', and, if available, one 'borderline not completed' and one 'not completed' assessment decision.

Independently, Reviewer 2 uses the Review guidelines on page 12 to review one 'completed, and, if available, one 'borderline not completed' and one 'not completed' assessment decisions.

If both reviewers agree to *support all assessment decisions*, they do not swap sets of evidence, and they recommend that the assessment decisions be confirmed.

If either reviewer *cannot support* an assessment decision, the reviewers swap only the sets of evidence for the assessment decision that they cannot agree with and repeat the review process above.

If, after swapping, both reviewers
- support the assessment decision, the reviewers recommend that the assessment decision is confirmed
- cannot support the assessment decision, they review additional sets of evidence for that assessment decision (i.e. 'completed', 'borderline not completed', or 'not completed') before providing a recommendation to the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment
- agree to recommend an adjustment to the assessment decision, they review an additional set of evidence if available before providing a recommendation to the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment.

7. The review pair identifies samples of student work that may be suitable for future benchmarking and/or as support materials.

8. The review pair provides the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment with an agreed recommendation to either confirm or adjust assessment decisions. The SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment checks the proposed recommendations to ensure that adjustments are based on the substantive evidence viewed from the review sample, personal learning goals, and the specifications of the subject outline.

9. The review pair completes the Stage 1 and Stage 2 review feedback sheet to:
- confirm the assessment decisions assigned in the review sample

and/or
- recommend adjusting assessment decisions in the review sample.

10. The SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment checks and signs the Stage 1 and Stage 2 review feedback sheet.

Reviewer Guidelines

The following guidelines will help reviewers to identify key features of the review sample and to review 'completed' and 'not completed' assessment decisions:

- Focus on the learning that the student has demonstrated in relation to their personal learning goals. Avoid focusing on what is not there (e.g. one incomplete section of a task does not mean that the student has failed to demonstrate evidence of personal learning goals elsewhere).
- Use the learning context recorded on the student description sheet to inform the review of the school's assessment decisions.
- Recognise unexpected evidence (e.g. any evidence of the personal learning goals can be used to inform the reviewer's recommendation to support the school's assessment decisions).
- Scan the set of evidence as a whole and then focus on evidence in specific tasks. It is not necessary for reviewers to read every piece of work in every student folio to identify features in the evidence. A more detailed review is necessary only when doubt is raised about the school's assessment decision.
- Avoid distractors and evidence that is not relevant to the personal learning goals (e.g. effort, incomplete work, perceptions about student potential).
- Make a brief note or attach flags to the student work (without writing on it) to identify dominant features that are inconsistent with the school's assessment decision. Use these notes to support discussion with the SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment. Notes or flags must be removed before student materials are returned to the bags.

Quality Assurance

After review

Checking feedback

The SACE Officer — Curriculum and Assessment signs the written feedback, indicating that it has been quality assured.

Feedback to schools

- The SACE Board provides feedback to schools, via the principal.
- Schools and teachers carefully consider this feedback and ensure that their final results are consistent with it.
- Schools note the feedback and incorporate this in their improving and planning processes.

Appendix 1

STAGE 1 MODERATION CODE OF PRACTICE

CONFIDENTIALITY

As a Stage 1 moderator you will have privileged access to confidential information about students and the work of schools. SACE Board of South Australia assessments are intended to provide fair treatment for all students, regardless of school or personal origin.

Moderators maintain confidentiality of information related to students' results and schools before, during, and after the moderation process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Moderators are not to:
- moderate student work from any school at which they teach, or have a conflict of interest
- contribute to discussion related to the moderation of any school at which they teach or have a conflict of interest
- access information related to the outcome of the moderation process for any school at which they teach or have a conflict of interest.

It is important that any potential Stage 1 conflict of interest be drawn to the attention of the SACE Board. A potential conflict of interest may arise at any time during Stage 1 moderation.

If you identify a potential conflict of interest during moderation you are should notify a SACE Officer at the Stage 1 moderation meeting.

DECLARATION

I have read and agree to be bound by the SACE Board's Stage 1 moderation 'Code of Practice' until 31 December 2019.

I have declared any potential conflict of interest and will advise the SACE Board of South Australia of any change in this status.

Name: _____   School: _____

Signature: _____   Date: ____/____/ 2019

A735820

Manual handling

Manual handling is any activity involving the use of muscular force or effort to:

lift   push   pull   hold
restrain   carry   move   lower.

SMART manual handling

Size up the load
Ask for help or use a trolley if the load is too heavy or large

Move in close
Keep the load as close to your body as possible

Always bend your knees
Relieves the pressure on your hamstrings

Raise your legs
Use your leg muscles so you are not putting strain on your back

Turn using your feet
Avoid twisting at the waist and through your back

Take your time!

Appendix 3

ICAC*: summary of reporting obligations

Left branch:

Do you have a reasonable suspicion of potential corruption?

- YES → REPORT TO OPI†
- NO → NO ACTION

REPORT TO OPI† →

- REPORT TO SACE BOARD as per conditions of employment
- DO NOT disclose the fact that you have reported to OPI† (confidentiality obligations)

Right branch:

Do you have a reasonable suspicion of misconduct and/or maladministration?

- YES → Is the misconduct or maladministration serious or systemic?
- NO → NO ACTION

Is the misconduct or maladministration serious or systemic?

- YES → REPORT TO OPI† → REPORT TO SACE BOARD as per conditions of employment
- NO → REPORT TO SACE BOARD as per conditions of employment

*ICAC — Independent Commissioner Against Corruption

†OPI — Office for Public Integrity

Appendix 4

Procedure flow chart

This flow chart (for each assessment type) should be read in conjunction with Review procedures on page 10.

Reviewers check the review sample for:
- up to three sets of evidence per subject (PLM, EPM, MPM, RPM)
- a completed student description sheet for each set of evidence with an assessment decision
- a copy of the relevant learning and assessment plan(s)
- a copy of the Stage 2 Research Project: Modified – school planner, if applicable.

SOCA [1] allocates reviewers to pairs.

Reviewer 1

From the range of subjects:

Reviewer 1 selects one set of evidence (if available) for each of the following school assessment decisions:
- 'completed'
- 'borderline not completed'
- 'not completed'.

Reviewer 2

From the range of subjects:

Reviewer 2 selects one set of evidence (if available) for each of the following school assessment decisions:
- 'completed'
- 'borderline not completed'
- 'not completed'.

Reviewers independently review the school's assessment decisions.

Reviewers declare their agreement (or otherwise) with the school's 'completed', 'borderline not completed', and 'not completed' assessment decisions.

Reviewers agree on a recommendation to confirm the 'completed', 'borderline not completed', and 'not completed' assessment decision(s). The review pair do **not** swap sets of evidence.

Reviewers cannot agree to confirm one or more of 'completed', 'borderline not completed', and 'not completed' assessment decision(s). The pair swap the sets of evidence that cannot be confirmed and make further notes.

If, after swapping, both *reviewers* cannot support the assessment decision, they review an additional set of evidence (if available).

Reviewers agree on a recommendation to adjust the 'completed', 'borderline not completed', and 'not completed' assessment decision(s). The pair review an additional set of evidence (if available).

The review pair discuss their proposed recommendation with the SOCA.

Reviewers complete the review feedback sheet.

SOCA[1]: SACE Officer – Curriculum and Assessment

19