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## Overview

Chief Assessors’ reports give 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, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

## General Comments

There were a number of changes to the 2014 subject outline, including modifications to the assessment design criteria, specific features, forms, and performance standards. Both moderators and markers commented that some teachers were still operating from previous versions of the subject outline. This had a detrimental impact on their students’ capacity to produce evidence of learning at the highest level. Teachers are reminded to note any changes to subject outlines in order to maximise their students’ opportunities for success.

It was generally noted by moderators and assessors that a large number of students and schools value the Research Project and the overall standard has greatly improved. In addition, the variety of questions presented was very broad and there was a greater sense of teachers and students grappling with the inherent complexity of real research.

As in previous years, students tended to achieve at the highest level when they chose topics they were passionate about or that had direct relevance to them.

## School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

Moderators noted that the best folios were logically structured and provided evidence of the student’s achievement in relation to all the specific features.

It was pleasing to observe that students not only used technology to document their research (including screenshots, video evidence, audio evidence, and movie clips with voiceovers in the background commenting on what had been discovered), but also accessed a variety of sources and made contact with others. Contact was made through modes such as online forums, comments on blogs, and correspondence with experts in various institutions.

**Planning**

Consideration and refinement of the research question (P1)

Students are required to show evidence of their consideration and refinement of the research question. Moderators noted that when students considered their question using techniques that were more than just a list of words — such as lotus diagrams or brainstorms— these actually became working documents to which students could return and add information. This was obvious in the work of some students because of the level of detail and even the use of colour coding to indicate their progress.

The most effective evidence of high-level refinement of the question was provided by those students who used clear concise questions that were accessible and ‘do-able’ within the timeframe allowed for a 10-credit subject. Moreover, it was generally noted that students who had thoroughly refined their research area to a succinct and resolvable question had more opportunity to achieve at a higher level in other components of the folio, such as specific features D1 and D2.

On the other hand, moderators commented that in less successful evidence of planning, students saw refinement as starting on one topic and then switching to another. More effective evidence included reflections on the process of refinement, where students addressed how their research contributed to refining, modifying, or validating the focus of their question. These students appeared to understand that research often involves questions being changed or refined.

Overall, moderators noted that while there was a good range of areas chosen for research, there were still a number of students who were hampered by not articulating their research focus as a research question or by devising questions that were either too specific or too long-winded. Students were also restricted in their opportunities for high-level achievement when they submitted extensive evidence of planning for the majority of their 10 pages (for example, six pages of question and planning and then four pages on the development of their research). This significantly affected a student’s final result during the moderation process, which requires evidence detailing achievement against all specific features.

Planning of research processes appropriate to the research question (P2)

Moderators observed some distinctive features in those folios that provided effective evidence of thorough planning of question-appropriate research processes. These folios showed a consideration for, and exploration of, a range of potential research processes and provided a balanced evaluation of how appropriate these processes were for the student’s specific research question. This evidence was located either in the proposal and/or a separate planning table.

Ongoing planning throughout the folio was demonstrated effectively in journal entries or reflections; for example, in the case of a field trip, justifying particular processes and/or detailed preparation for the event. It was also pleasing to see that some students had moved beyond background research, where appropriate, and into their own trials, experiments, observations, and interviews. These research processes had a clear purpose and were closely matched to the research question.

Some folios revealed less effective evidence of planning, with superficial reference to broad research processes such as ‘internet research’ or ‘archival research’ in the proposal and/or brief timelines without supporting details. Other folios identified and undertook processes that were not relevant to the topic — and therefore wasted time — or carried out primary research into their investigation without consideration of its validity (e.g. undertook a survey of limited size or relevance).

**Development**

Development of the research (D1)

Students are expected to provide evidence of the development of their research. Moderators commented that the students who achieved at the highest level were those who provided evidence of how they regularly reflected on the development of their understanding in light of the research question. Rather than simply give a summary of findings, these students engaged explicitly with what they discovered and how this affected the direction of their research and why, described what they needed to do next and why, and explained the challenges and opportunities presented and how they were impacting on their research. They also drew together the threads of what they had already discovered and explored possible implications for the emerging findings.

It was also positive to see that more students are accessing a wide range of sources — such as periodicals, subscriptions, and transcripts — in order to locate and select information that will help to answer their research question.

On the other hand, moderators noted that opportunities for high achievement were restricted when students:

* presented a page of referencesas the only evidence of research development. Even if the list was extensive, it still did not provide explicit examples of how the student’s ideas developed in response to particular pieces of research. If it was the only evidence provided for this specific feature — or just summarised what had already been provided in the 10 pages — it was ineffective
* included multiple pages from the same article, which limited students’ ability to demonstrate the development of their research
* included poorly designed surveys that gave little indication of how the research had developed. Teachers are encouraged to focus on the skills of designing and implementing a survey, especially when considering sample size and range of questions.

*Analysis of information and exploration of ideas to develop the research (D2)*

Students are required to provide evidence of their analysis and exploration of ideas. Analysis involves ‘pulling things apart’; in this case, students pull out ideas, information, and anything relevant to the research question and state why and how they might aid in the development of the research. This requires students to explain how and why a source contributes to the development of key findings of the research (usefulness, validity, and reliability). In this way, they explicitly document the development of ideas about their chosen area. Moderators observed that in successful responses, students:

* linked and cross-referenced sources — rather than seeing each source in isolation — to demonstrate their exploration of ideas while building the research
* included details of the source used and showed an awareness of whether the information obtained was relevant, current, valid, and reliable
* revealed an ongoing exploration of ethical considerations analysed with depth and insight
* exhibited recognition of the impact of their own bias.

At the same time, moderators observed that opportunities for achievement were limited when students:

* presented a ‘collection’ rather than an ‘analysis’ of information. Folios by these students often included copies of articles with no analysis at all, or highlighted sections without any comments
* included ‘throw-away’ lines that paid lip service to ethical considerations without really exploring the issue.

By choosing toinclude their discussion, students who struggled with written analysis could show evidence of learning in their oral discussion.

Development of knowledge and skills specific to the research question (D3)

Students are required to produce evidence of the development of their knowledge and skills specific to the research question.

Moderators observed that the more successful students explicitly documented their increasing knowledge and produced evidence in many ways. Examples included students providing:

* extended critical reflections
* surveys that were annotated to show justification for the types of questions chosen
* evidence of the development of interview questions that have been annotated and reveal knowledge
* documentation of experimentation
* graphs, tables, photographic evidence, and conceptual diagrams.

Evaluating the success of a product and trying to obtain feedback was another way students demonstrated evidence of the growth of their knowledge and skill development.

Understanding and development of one or more capabilities (D4)

This was a new specific feature in 2014, requiring students to demonstrate understanding and development (growth or progress) of the chosen capability or capabilities. In addition, the capabilities were also different from previous years in that they were aligned with the general capabilities of the Australian Curriculum. It was interesting to see variations in how students provided this evidence; for example, using photographic evidence and reflections/experimental research and findings, accompanied by snapshot reflections. The most successful students either provided a few in-depth snapshots as to how their capability had developed over the course of their investigation, or chose to include a detailed page explaining their capability. Other students’ evidence was located in their discussion**.**

Moderators commented that the most effective evidence was produced by students who engaged with their capability overtly and in a ‘real’ manner. This included evidence that demonstrated explicit engagement and reflected an inherent understanding and awareness of the nature of the capability. Conversely, moderators indicated that in too many cases not enough evidence was given of an ‘informed understanding’ of the capability, which resulted in students struggling to show how they had developed the capability. More often than not, the capability was only briefly mentioned in the proposal or elsewhere without any real evidence of engagement. Other ineffective evidence was provided by students who made generic statements with comments such as ‘I will ask permission when I interview someone’(the capability was ethical understanding).

In addition to this, there were some students who simply copied the capability material from the subject outline and did not engage with its nature at all. For other students, the identification of the capability was evident but not how the student’s understanding developed during their research.

Overall, moderators suggested that more evidence of the development and understanding of the capability could have been provided. It was apparent that some students were still reflecting on the SACE capabilities (work/communication) instead of the Australian Curriculum capabilities. Teachers are reminded to clarify this issue with students.

Teachers are also reminded that students do not need to address more than one capability. In most cases, the highest level of evidence was produced when students engaged with only one in capability in depth and demonstrated a consistent application and growth of knowledge and understanding.

**Presentation of 10 pages**

The subject operational information states that, for the purposes of moderation, evidence of the folio must meet the following specifications:

* single-sided A4 pages (written) or a maximum of 20 minutes (oral), or the equivalent in multimodal form
* one A4 page is equivalent to 2 minutes of oral evidence.
* students can submit a combination of written and oral evidence
* evidence submitted for moderation must clearly reflect the grade (A+ to E–) for the total folio assessed by the teacher.

Written evidence reduced in size (e.g. A3 pages or two A4 pages reduced in size to A4) is not acceptable.

Teachers should be aware of the following issues regarding the selection of the 10 pages:

* The selection of the 10 pages is a very important part of the process; however, some students selected pages that appear to have been part of their formative work (e.g. how to analyse a text) but had nothing to do with their research question. This type of evidence does not demonstrate achievement against the criteria.
* Multimodal evidence in the folio and the submission of material as evidence for moderation needs to be ‘equivalent’ to 10 pages (i.e. one page is supposed to be equivalent to two minutes of multimodal evidence). Again, teachers are encouraged to spend time with students on the collation of material to meet the specific features at the highest level.
* Students need to ensure that they provide evidence against all the performance standards.
* The use of annotations on sticky notes can be problematic. Notes that are physically stuck on the page can obscure the work underneath, especially if the page has been photocopied.
* It is a requirement to have the 10 pages presented as single-sided sheets.
* Powerpoint was often not a good medium for folio presentations. This presentation of the content limited the student’s ability to provide evidence of the folio and was a disadvantage because each slide lacked the detail to show the student’s learning.
* A number of students submitted more than 10 single-sided A4 pages; teachers are reminded that moderators are instructed to stop reading after the first 10 pages of material.
* Teachers and students need to remember that the discussion is not in addition to the 10 pages. If teachers and students choose to include materials from the discussion, these will be included as part of the 10 pages.
* Teachers should ensure that the grade level assessment decision they have allocated for a student is reflected in the selected 10 pages.

Assessment Type 2: Research Outcome

Moderators were very pleased to note that the quality of research outcomes has improved over the past four years. They also commented favourably that more research outcomes demonstrated consideration of audience and purpose. Some examples included a scientific report following a set format, pamphlets, graphical and visual presentations that suited their message, multimodal pieces, or a letter to someone suffering body image issues. It was reported that students are doing more than just taking the option of presenting a written report, no matter what the research question or intended audience.

There were some issues with word count. It was clear that some schools were still using previous versions of the subject outline where the maximum word count was only 1500 words. Teachers are again reminded to ensure that they keep up to date with the current subject outline. On another note, some students chose to submit work that exceeded the word count(e.g. 2400 words). This disadvantaged them and affected their marks because the conclusion detailing what they had discovered was generally in the last 400 words and was not read.

As in other years, well-refined questions tended to correlate with a better quality research outcome. If the scope of the question was too large, or too convoluted, or too wordy and not specific or refined, the outcome tended to become superficial and present as a screed of generic information and/or facts. Other issues arose with those candidates who chose to present their research outcome as an artefact, with some students sending in a ‘book’ as well as a 2000 word substantiation, presuming that both would be assessed/moderated. Teachers are reminded that the outcome is a maximum of 2000 words in its entirety.

Research outcomes that failed to maintain a high grade given by the teacher were those that veered away from the question and/or failed to answer it. Moderators also stressed that students need to consider the best form for their outcome. For example, a written report does not suit everyone’s outcome and, for some classes, may detract from the potential of the students presenting their key findings. Moderators also requested that schools don’t present all student work on one disc or USB, because each candidate in the sample is required to have their outcome moderated separately.

As a general rule, students who had successful conclusions tended to address findings of all key points, make connections, and answer the actual research question.

Synthesis of knowledge, skills, and ideas to produce a resolution to the research question (S1)

This specific feature was modified in 2014, requiring that the synthesis of knowledge, skills, and ideas lead to a resolution or an answer to the research question. In general, moderators believed that this was often not accomplished successfully because the resolution of the question was only provided in the conclusion, rather than being a consistent focus throughout the outcome.

Moderators observed that the most successful research outcomes:

* were provided by those students who read widely and gained information from a variety of sources, and then were able to articulate what they discovered in their own words. This showed that they had meaningfully engaged with the information and could question or accept information and confirm it with broad research from multiple perspectives
* targeted an appropriate audience in relation to their chosen question
* demonstrated creativity in the presentation of their findings.

In less successful responses, students:

* outlined a set of facts with little critique, insight, or synthesis
* included a very general introduction — often in the format of their proposal or evaluation — and, as a result, wasted some of their word count
* did not conclude their outcome and therefore did not explicitly attempt a resolution to the research question
* included many irrelevant details or failed to answer the question fully. These students often presented quoted information that was not used effectively to answer the question.

Substantiation of key findings relevant to the research outcome (S2)

This specific feature invites students to support their key findings with evidence from their research. Moderators remarked that the more effective responses:

* used an extensive range of both primary and secondary sources
* showed a clear link between their key ideas/findings and sources of information
* used in-text referencing or footnoting to reference the sources
* provided explicit substantiation for their pamphlet or product, if this was the chosen mode. Some students chose to present their outcomes in a multimodal/oral presentation (e.g. photostories, videos, prezi, powerpoints, google slides, glogster etc.), or used the notes section. These students clearly substantiated their key findings when they incorporated their sources or embedded them within the presentation (e.g. source reference on a powerpoint). This demonstrated that students can achieve at a very high level even when choosing a different mode of presentation for their outcome.

While students presented many outstanding products, the substantiation of the development of the product was not always clearly articulated; in many cases it was implied rather than being overtly explained. Moderators noted some issues to be addressed:

* When the outcome is a substantiation of a product, the elements of that product — the findings, or what has been learnt — need to be explained and supported by evidence.
* Less effective responses provided little evidence of substantiation, apart from a bibliography. Using a limited range of sources affected several students, because their key findings were based on only a few sources. This was also a problem in some research outcomes that included a product (e.g. a film, brief novel, photo-story, PowerPoint etc.) without any explicit evidence of substantiation or synthesis.

Expression of ideas (S3)

On the whole, moderators thought that students’ communication skills were good. A student being able to clearly articulate their findings showed that they had a good understanding of the ideas behind their work. This clarity of expression also meant that the reader did not need to question or query the focus and/or findings of the research.

Teachers are reminded, however, that expression of ideas is more than just correct grammar and punctuation. The use of sub-headings, graphs, and diagrams all helps with the clarity of a piece.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Evaluation

Markers reported that the quality of the evaluation has continued to improve.

Concerns were raised, however, regarding the number of teachers that appeared to be unaware that there had been changes in the subject outline since 2013. Too many teachers were still operating with pre-2014 versions, with some still reflecting on out-of-date capabilities. This meant that students’ opportunities for high achievement were significantly compromised, particularly when they failed to provide evidence in relation to evaluating the decisions made in response to challenges and opportunities (E2).

It was easier for markers to assess the evidence of student learning in cases where the evaluation had a clear structure, with headings for the written summary and each specific feature. Use of the terminology of the specific feature in opening sentences of a new paragraph was also helpful. However, many evaluations had no headings or appropriate terminology to determine what they were discussing, which made it extremely difficult to find evidence matching the specific features.

It was still possible to achieve at the highest level when students integrated evidence of all three specific features, but used the terminology of the specific features to make this clear. This worked most effectively when students included their evaluation of the decisions made in response to challenges related to the research processes used. They then based their judgment on the effect this had on the quality of the research outcome.

Markers drew attention to issues regarding word count. Teachers are reminded that in addition to the 150 word written summary, there is a 1500 word maximum for the evaluation. The majority of students wrote between 1400 and 1500 words and included an appropriate summary. However, at times word count was difficult to judge, especially if the work was over the word limit and a word count for the summary was not provided. It would be helpful for a word count to be included after the written summary, or if students provided two separate word counts — one for the written summary and one for the evaluation. Some students did not provide a
150 word summary, or it was indistinguishable from the body of the evaluation. For others, it was unclear whether the word count on the cover sheet included the summary. Markers commented that a great number of students spent an overly large proportion (up to two-thirds) of the evaluation addressing specific feature E1, one-third addressing E2, and very little or nothing on addressing E3. This reduced their opportunities to achieve at the highest level.

Evaluation of the research processes used, specific to the research question (E1)

In 2014 there was a minor change to this specific feature, which required students to evaluate their research processes in the context of their specific research question. Students then needed to tailor their evaluation of a particular process to the specific question they had formulated, rather than resorting to generic judgments about the research processes.

Markers observed that in the most successful responses, students:

* gave a general overview of a process and then talked specifically about a source, providing concrete examples of reliability, credibility, and bias
* used a range of qualifiers to differentiate between the levels of usefulness
* used and named specific research sources and provided balanced judgments comprising both strengths and limitations of the usefulness, value, and reliability of the process, particularly in relation to their research question. In doing so, they showed understanding of how the usefulness of a process may vary, according to what question it is being employed to help answer
* provided reasons as to why a process was valid, reliable, or credible
* made clear links between the research process and its value to the research (valuable and credible information) and how it contributed to the increase in the student’s knowledge and/or the quality of the outcome
* clearly distinguished between the terms credible and reliable and did not use them together as though they were one word.

Less effective responses:

* demonstrated a misunderstanding of what is meant by research processes. Many students still used examples such as mind maps, visits to the library, journals, how they referenced, and how they used pens to highlight important information. As this has been a recurring issue in this subject, teachers are encouraged to provide explicit definitions of research processes that are more helpful; for example, that research processes are the activities undertaken that provide a student with evidence or data for their research
* provided very little about the validity of site or author, and made simplistic judgments about how findings were valid because they came from an expert, rather than linking this process to answering their research question
* made brief references to how useful the research processes were for them without explaining how or why
* named the research process, but focussed on what the student did, rather than how useful the process was to the research or what evidence or data the process provided
* relied on recount and diary-like discussion, often reflecting on how enjoyable it was for them, and how it helped them with their other subjects, rather than actual evaluation
* discussed why they did not choose a certain process — for example, a survey — rather than discussing the processes they had used.

Evaluation of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities (E2)

This specific feature was new in 2014. It invites students to engage in a complex level of thought, forming judgments about the decisions they made in response to challenges and/or opportunities they faced. This proved to be very challenging for most students.

Markers observed that successful responses:

* identified a problem that arose, but mostly focused on the decision they made regarding the problem/challenge and based their judgment around the consequences of the decision in light of how well they progressed in their research as a result
* focused their evaluation primarily on the decisions made and their consequences, rather than just describing the problem or challenge
* critically weighed up the consequences of the decisions made and how these impacted on their research outcome; for example, whether the decision had a negative or positive impact on their research
* evaluated rather than recounted their challenges, and recognised the fact that when something goes wrong it can open up other (often better) avenues
* did not consider ‘time management’ as a challenge, unless time limitations particularly impacted on the research process
* focused on only a few challenges and decisions in detail
* used specific evidence to support assertions.

On the other hand, markers noted that the least effective responses:

* described or listed problems but ignored the decisions they made
* identified challenges and described what they did as a result, without identifying the ‘decision’ they made or weighing up whether it was good or bad
* discussed what went wrong or not to plan, often relating to time management or lack of motivation with no link to the decisions made
* contained lots of ‘could have, should have, and would have’ statements
* made judgments but did not provide reasons as to why these decisions/opportunities/challenges were useful/limiting to the research
* restricted their ‘challenges’ to issues such as poor time management, lack of motivation, wasting time, not doing homework outside of class, lack of responses to emails requesting information, losing USBs, catching up on missed lessons
* named the problem and then stated what they could have done, rather than showing the link between the decision and how this impacted on the outcome or led to another challenge
* for the most part did not even mention the words ‘decisions’, ‘challenges’, or ‘opportunities’. At best, they suggested other things they could have done, without examining consequences or implications
* stated that ‘this went wrong, this went right’, but made no explicit judgments about why and how this affected their research and outcome
* provided explanatory lists of what could not be done, usually in terms of lack of time or personal organisation
* shifted the blame, by complaining that requests for information or interviews were ignored or tardy.

Evaluation of the quality of the research outcome (E3)

This specific feature was changed to an evaluation of the quality of the research outcome, rather than a reflection on its value to the student and/or others, as in previous years. This required a shift in focus to the *quality* of the research outcome. When the research outcome was defined as the resolution to the student’s research question, this led to far greater insight and recognition of the student’s research in the context of the field of knowledge. However, when students focused on the quality of the mode — for example, the PowerPoint presentation or their spelling and grammar if written — their evaluation tended to be superficial and generic rather than providing an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and understanding about research as an intellectual activity.

In general, markers noted that in successful responses, students:

* provided a realistic rather than an exaggerated evaluation of the quality of the outcome
* made it clear how the question was answered and how well, discussing strengths/weaknesses/limitations etc.
* provided several reasons for their judgments about the outcome’s quality, including its value to self and others. They then made balanced comments on the value of outcome to self but did not overestimate its importance to others, showing awareness that their research is not the greatest work on that subject ever undertaken
* provided specific discussion of how quality could be improved, linking this to processes rather than time management
* discussed how a range of sources backed up their key findings or discussed how some credible sources conflicted, therefore showing different views on the question
* based their judgment about the overall quality of the outcome after assessing the success in meeting the set objective/goal and critically evaluated the usefulness of the outcome
* gave a balanced view as to the quality of the outcome, including evidence produced, conclusions reached, and if they were able to produce new evidence.

Conversely, markers noted that the less effective responses tended to:

* exaggerate the work’s quality and impact, making claims such as ‘the world will benefit from my research’
* describe what form their outcome had taken
* make reference to the Research Project as a whole rather than the particular outcome, generically discussing how they benefited from completing the whole Research Project
* talk about how the outcome was written, what it looked like, and give general terms such as ‘it was great’ rather than a balanced assessment of strengths and limitations
* make little or no mention of the word quality; rather, many talked about how enjoyable it all was
* focus on the format rather than the findings; some research questions did not indicate the chosen format but then decided to evaluate the format — for example, a brochure
* make general statements about what they learned or repeat some of the issues already covered in specific feature E1.

Expression of ideas (S3)

This specific feature assesses students’ ability to express their ideas.

Generally this has been very well done over the years. Markers noted that students were most successful in this area when they:

* provided a generally sophisticated, coherently written document that tried to target the criteria holistically rather than in specific chunks; however, the use of subheadings worked well for some as well as key words
* were set out in a clear logical manner and clearly structured according to the three specific features
* made good use of vocabulary specific to the question, research processes, and outcome; also appropriately used terminology such as credibility, reliability, validity, and accuracy
* were logical, and had an easy-to-follow paragraph and sentence structure
* used headings that related to the current subject outline.

Features of the least effective evidence included:

* failing to separate the summary from the rest of the evaluation
* failing to use section headings, correct terminology, or new paragraphs to discuss a new point
* repeating information to reach the word count
* exhibiting poor organisation, repetition of material, lack of paragraphs, poor proof-reading, spelling errors, and excessively long and poorly constructed sentences
* using informal language with no clear structure or logical order
* revealing poor flow which made the meaning difficult to ascertain
* using incorrect words and expressions, suggesting poor understanding of some concepts such as validity
* applying incorrect headings or not using them at all
* utilising inconsistent syntax and sentence structure
* missing paragraphs
* repeating work — either retelling or explaining what was done rather than evaluating
* providing a very low word count.

## Operational Advice

**Assessment Groups**

Moderators noticed that some schools had maximised every opportunity to ensure the successful assessment of their students’ work. It appeared that more schools, especially with multiple classes, are attending clarifying forums, completing some form of ‘in-house’ moderation, accessing SACE Board materials, and then working collaboratively in order to ensure the most accurate assessment of their students’ work.

**Presentation of Material**

Moderators and markers remarked that:

* teachers need to check that the SACE number of the student is written correctly and that the marks entered electronically match those on the actual student sample
* all materials submitted for moderation need to be clearly labelled and teachers should ensure that work submitted in a digital format can be easily accessed
* teachers are also encouraged to put SACE Board front cover sheets on student work in order to make identification easier
* for both the folio and research outcome, it is beneficial for moderation if teachers include the school assessment sheet with the performance standards clearly highlighted to help moderators understand the rationale for the assigned grade.

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. Teachers’ assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. Teacher grades/marks should be evident on all student school assessment work.

Teachers are further advised to use official SACE performance standards and not mark sheets devised by the school. At times these appeared to hinder the accuracy of teacher judgments and consistent application of the criteria due to the way they had been created; for example, giving numerical marks per section and then calculating a grade. When this occurred, grading was frequently inaccurate and less reflective of the performance standard of the task.
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