2021 Physical Education Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2021 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: Diagnostics

Students participate in one or more physical activities to collect, analyse, and evaluate evidence to demonstrate contextual application of knowledge and understanding of the focus areas and movement concepts and strategies. They provide evidence of their learning in relation to the following assessment design criteria Application and Communication, and Analysis and Evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used evaluation of evidence as the focus for the task, to which knowledge and understanding was applied. This was often facilitated through effective task design
* analysed a range of types of evidence
* evaluated connections, trends and/or comparisons between more than one piece of evidence
* applied fewer key ideas and considerations (from the focus areas), with great depth and accuracy, to both the specific context of the physical activity and to the analysis and evaluation of evidence
* had fewer components/sections within the task to respond to
* incorporated the application of collaboration skills as an integral component to the completion of the task if AC2 was being assessed
* analysed and evaluated evidence collected within their own context (rather than relying only on elite data).

The less successful responses commonly:

* used content or research as the focus of the task, to which evidence was then linked
* provided general descriptions or definitions of knowledge and understanding without links to the physical activity or evidence
* described and/or displayed evidence and/or the evidence collection process without critically analysing or perceptively evaluating it
* analysed pieces of evidence in isolation from each other
* presented tasks as a recount of process rather than evaluative
* utilised task design from the old course which commonly facilitated success in the application and communication assessment design criteria but not as much in the analysis and evaluation assessment design criteria
* had many components/sections
* assessed too many assessment design criteria
* assessed assessment design criteria that were not relevant to the task design.

Assessment Type 2: Improvement Analysis

Students undertake a personal journey of improvement and reflect on their performance to identify an aspect of physical activity for improvement. They collect evidence and/or feedback to monitor improvement and the effectiveness of implemented strategies at regular intervals over a period of time. Students use this evidence and/or feedback to make modifications to the implemented strategies.

The more successful responses commonly:

* focused on using a cycle or process of evaluation informing future implementation
* implemented strategies that were informed by the application of knowledge and understanding from the focus areas
* demonstrated direct links between feedback (in the broadest sense of any information about the performance) received and action taken to implement strategies
* evaluated connections, trends and/or comparisons between more than one piece of evidence
* utilised both qualitative and quantitative forms of evidence
* synthesised multiple pieces of data for visual demonstration that was then critically analysed using annotations and/or audio
* focused on in-depth evaluation of fewer/smaller areas for improvement
* used evidence to support evaluation of performance or implemented strategies
* provided specific examples and applied understanding as reasons to support why strategies were effective or ineffective
* showed regular and ongoing evaluation of performance improvement and implemented strategies
* differentiated between:
* the implemented strategies (such as training programs, practice methodologies, psychological strategies, etc.) that were implemented as a result of applied understanding and enabled improvement, and
* the movement strategies that were tactics used within a game (often utilising these as a measure of performance improvement)
* demonstrated a range of collaboration strategies or skills that were tailored to the specific context (where AC2 was assessed)
* provided students with adequate time for improvement to be achieved and for reflection on and modification to strategies to be implemented
* utilised effective goal setting (SMART/SMARTA/SMARTER) with a specific focus on the ‘measurable’ component and using evidence to evaluate improvement and strategies against the goal. This was particularly effective when a goal was selected based on initial collection of evidence.
* utilised the full (or close to) word count/time limit
* used multimodal formats effectively
* clearly addressed all the specific features being assessed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on providing large amounts of description of implemented strategies
* used general statements about strategies being effective without supporting with evidence or reasons
* evaluations focused on challenges faced rather than strengths/weaknesses or effective/ineffective components of the strategy implemented by the student
* used very few types or amount of evidence throughout the portfolio and/or evaluation
* described their levels of enjoyment of the task throughout.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

Students prepare for and participate in a competition in a selected physical activity, working collaboratively with one or more other people in a group. Students undertake at least one role within the team and evaluate and analyse the impact their role had on the participation and performance of other team member(s).

Students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the following assessment design criteria: AC1, AC2, AC4, AE1, AE2 and AE3.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used evaluation of evidence, improvement, and strategies as the focus for the task, to which knowledge and understanding was applied
* evaluated connections, trends and/or comparisons between more than one piece of evidence
* critically analysed different types of evidence
* synthesised multiple pieces of data for visual demonstration that was then critically analysed using annotations and/or audio
* used evidence to support evaluation of implemented strategies and performance and/or participation
* utilised more than one measure for evaluating performance and/or participation improvement, specifically examining components of improvement beyond game/match results
* provided specific examples and applied understanding as reasons to justify why strategies were chosen and whether they were effective or ineffective
* evaluated the effectiveness of strategies by examining links/transfer back to the game/activity context
* differentiated between:
* the implemented strategies (such as training programs, practice methodologies, psychological strategies, etc.) that were implemented as a result of applied understanding and enabled improvement, and
* the movement strategies that were tactics used within a game (often utilising these as a measure of performance improvement).
* demonstrated, and named, specific collaboration strategies or skills that were tailored to the specific context
* provided evidence of the outcomes achieved through successful collaboration processes
* integrated communication and collaboration throughout AT3 as a core requirement for being able to complete their coaching role, rather than collaboration being an ‘add-on’
* effectively utilised a framework or supporting information source (for example the ACER Collaboration Framework) to guide the application of collaborative skills, supported with specific examples from their coaching role
* applied knowledge and understanding to the specific context of the physical activity, their role and evidence that was collected
* focused on applying fewer concepts from the focus areas in depth and contextually. Understanding was demonstrated through the application of the knowledge to the specific physical activity context
* utilised effective goal setting (SMART/SMARTA/SMARTER) with a specific focus on the ‘measurable’ component and using evidence to evaluate improvement and strategies against the goal
* this was most effective when a goal was selected based on initial collection of evidence, specifically objective evidence.
* focused solely on how they impacted the participation and/or performance of others
* focused on evaluating one of their roles rather than both
* used multimodal formats effectively
* clearly addressed all the specific features being assessed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* had students undertaking roles that were not specified in the subject outline
* focused on their own participation and/or performance
* implemented ‘tactics’ as their strategies that were then evaluated
* described strategies
* implied the application of communication and collaboration skills through group photos or videos of groups talking, without being able to hear what was being said
* made only general statements about communication and collaboration, such as “we collaborated well”
* solely gave some evidence of types of communication (such as email or group messages) as their demonstration of AC2
* included evidence of collaboration that was staged or scripted
* provided students with limited numbers of opportunities for coaching through which to implement and evaluate strategies
* allocated too much word count or time to the introduction or to description of player profiles without linking using this to inform application or evaluation
* focused on descriptions about the sport
* described the process of collecting evidence
* referenced evidence or content in a portfolio, appendix, or external link, that could not be accessed or considered by the marker
* were recounts of the weeks and competition
* described levels of enjoyment of the task throughout
* only collected evidence at the end of the process
* relied on subjective evidence (i.e. surveys of their team) without supporting objective evidence
* explained what all the other coaches did rather than focusing on their own role
* played video footage without analysis, evaluation, or links to how it informs evaluation of improvement or strategies
* discussed how the student was feeling throughout the process
* implemented or evaluated strategies that were not connected to their role and/or not informed by the application of relevant KU and evidence.

General comments about all forms of assessment

* Ensure learning and assessment requirements for tasks are updated according to the current subject outline rather than relying on previous tasks informed by earlier and outdated subject outlines.
* Upload of material to Schools Online should include all relevant evidence for viewing that can be considered within the word count/time limit. Be aware of students referencing evidence or links that require access to the school IT network as these cannot be accessed.
* Where possible, teachers are encouraged to reduce/condense file sizes of documents to facilitate access.
* Task formats from external sources (such as websites), which have been ‘screen-recorded’ are encouraged to be screen recorded at reading pace and/or with voiceover up to the allowed time limit and should include all relevant reading material and evidence for viewing within that time limit.
* When utilising multimodal formats, consideration should be given to ensuring visual and auditory information can be received/processed simultaneously when task is being viewed.
* Multimodal formats requiring no extra input from the marker (e.g. a video that plays through or a PowerPoint that plays and transitions automatically) better ensured students met the maximum word count/time limit. Students who utilised PowerPoint with combinations of text to be read and videos/sound to be played often exceeded limits when consideration had to be given to the word count + video length combinations.
* Ensure adequate time is allocated to the completion of cycles of implementation of strategies > evaluation > performance improvement within Assessment Types 2 and 3.
* Students should be provided with learning opportunities explicitly focused on demonstrating competencies of analysis and evaluation, with a link to AC3, AE1, AE2 and AE3. Students need to understand and demonstrate how reflection, analysis and evaluation are different to description.
* Utilise the tools available on the SACE website that provide support for learning and assessment.