2020 French (continuers) Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2020 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: Folio

The folio should consist of between three and five tasks and include one each of interaction, text production, and text analysis. An increasing number of schools are choosing to include the minimum number of three tasks. Students are not disadvantaged if their folio consists of only three summative tasks.

The more successful responses were similar to those listed in 2019 and commonly:

* were well prepared and could give responses demonstrating their ability to elaborate and express or justify an opinion in a logical and coherent manner
* demonstrated complexity in using vocabulary, tenses, sentence structures and ideas
* used a variety of linking words which allowed for the language to flow naturally and effectively
* attempted to answer all unexpected questions in depth and with few lengthy pauses in the Interaction\*
* used varied sentence structures and vocabulary such as: je pense que; je crois que; je trouve que; bien sûr, il est clair que; il est évident que; évidemment; en fait
* delivered their responses confidently using good pronunciation and intonation
* provided depth of explanation in Text Analysis tasks
* were able to interpret, analyse and reflect effectually
* justified and supported their responses with relevant examples
* demonstrated comprehensive evidence of planning
* created responses that were original, demonstrating depth and breadth in the treatment of the topic
* were structured well according to the text types.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used simple ideas and/or opinions
* needed greater detail and depth in the responses
* included many pauses, silence, hesitations, mistakes and lacked preparation in the Interaction\*
* should have asked for clarification or rewording of questions in French in the Interaction
* needed to use supporting evidence from texts.

\*Special note that the Interaction is to be a conversation rather than an oral presentation.

As stated in previous years, transcripts of audio texts, task sheets and marked performance standards must be provided for moderation.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Students complete an investigation demonstrating research and personal reflection on a cultural or social aspect or issue of a topic or subtopic associated with ‘The French-speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’ themes. Students should complete three tasks: an oral presentation, a written or multimodal response in French and a reflective response in English.

The more successful responses were similar to those listed in 2019 and commonly:

* demonstrated a genuine engagement with the chosen topic
* used original topics that made use of a range of resources to showcase learning
* discussed a contemporary issue with a French-speaking world connection that students could relate to and could easily be compared to one in Australia
* selected topics that allowed for depth of analysis and reflection
* showed confidence in oral presentations, being creative with choice of format.

The less successful responses were similar to those listed in 2019 and commonly:

* presented the chosen topic as a project with a body of facts with description rather than an analysis and reflection of the findings, information and opinions
* provided a narrow field of knowledge and was superficial in breadth and depth due to poor choice of topic
* tended to present repetitive information
* provided little evidence of purpose, audience or context
* lacked originality and interest thus not engaging the audience
* provided limited reflection but a summary of their information.

It should be noted by teachers that oral presentations should be clear and audible without background interference and each presentation copied to a separate USB for moderation.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

The examination consists of two assessments: an oral examination and a written examination.

Oral Examination

The oral examination of 10–15 minutes comprises a general conversation and a discussion of the student’s in-depth study. In the conversation, students converse with the examiners about their personal world. This year the examinations were conducted on-line through Zoom. It seems that many students were very comfortable with this process and for the most part the whole oral examination process flowed smoothly in schools and at the SACE Board.

Section 1: Conversation

The more successful responses commonly:

* were elaborate and extended
* flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively, using a wide range of questions framed flexibly
* were lively and interesting
* were relevant, structured, and detailed
* demonstrated depth of knowledge and the correct use of tenses, agreements and vocabulary

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth of ideas, grammatical correctness, and detail
* were dependent on questions being asked to encourage interaction
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* were dependent on English word order patterns and some anglicised expressions.

Section 2: Discussion

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a depth of research and exploration of the chosen topic that was of obvious interest to the students
* demonstrated a clear and substantial link to the themes of ‘The French-Speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’
* were able to answer a wide range of questions with clear, articulate, and well-referenced responses to aspects of their research highlighted on the in-depth study outline for oral examinations
* involved discussion that flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively and had depth and breadth of knowledge of their research
* involved discussions that were often lively and interesting
* were relevant, structured, and detailed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* misunderstood specific vocabulary and questions relating to the topic
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* demonstrated limited research and knowledge of the topic.

Written Examination

Section 1: Listening and Responding

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the texts
* read and interpreted the questions to provide correct information, in both detail and number of points required
* provided detailed answers to stylistic and language feature questions
* used evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, detail and accuracy of information, including confusing genders and names of speakers, and attributing details to the wrong speaker
* lacked depth, detail and accuracy of stylistic and language features, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* contained limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Text 1

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified the two reasons why Madame Rivière had contacted Monsieur Laforêt.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified only one or no reasons for Madame Rivière’s phone message
* misunderstood that Madame Rivière had contacted Monsieur Laforêt, thinking it was the other way around.

Text 2

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified four reasons why the man was having difficulty selecting a holiday destination
* explained fully how the travel agent’s attitude changed from the beginning, through the middle and at the end of the conversation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified only two reasons why the man was having difficulty
* explained only one or two reasons how the travel agent’s attitude changed.

Text 3

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified and explained four stylistic and linguistic devices used to show the young man’s excitement about his parents buying him a car.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified only one or two stylistic and linguistic devices.

Text 4

The more successful responses commonly:

* understood that the conversation was about changes to school and work conditions over time
* identified the changes that had occurred correctly, attributing them to the right speaker
* identified the advice that the grandfather gave to his granddaughter.

The less successful responses commonly:

* confused ‘work’ with ‘school’
* identified some changes but did not attribute them to the right person
* identified only one piece of advice.

Section 2: Reading and Responding

Part A

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the texts
* provided detailed answers to the questions, including all required details, e.g. providing four reasons when asked to provide four reasons
* made connections between the two texts
* used extensive evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth and detail, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* provided limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Text 5

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified four suggestions to improve young people’s eating habits
* identified and gave examples of three stylistic and linguistic devices.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified stylistic and linguistic devices but did not explain them with reference to the text nor give examples in English
* confused the imperative and the subjunctive.

Text 6

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified and explained four observations about eating habits of French people
* compared the beliefs of Caro and Alexandre.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified a number of observations but confused the details
* identified beliefs of Caro and Alexandre but did not compare them
* identified only one person’s beliefs
* confused the speakers’ genders, thinking that the male speaker was a girl and vice-versa.

Part B

Students are reminded that they should not inadvertently identify themselves, their schools or their teachers when writing about personal topics. The anonymity of the assessment process is paramount.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of how to write a letter of application and address it appropriately
* provided relevant and detailed examples for each criterion of the application
* demonstrated a keen interest in nominating themselves to be an ambassador for the homeless
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors
* were thoughtful, structured, and detailed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* needed to meet the required minimum word count
* demonstrated limited ability to structure a letter of application or provide details and examples for each criterion.

Section 3: Writing in French

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a passion for and interest in the topic selected
* provided a well-written, structured, and interesting response, which engaged the reader
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors
* contained appropriately selected idiomatic expressions and grammatical concepts
* demonstrated evidence of planning
* adhered to the conventions of the text-type, and the stated context, audience and purpose
* contained a few errors, but they did not impede the meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* used Anglicism or invented French expressions to communicate their ideas
* needed to meet the required minimum word count
* needed to consider the context, purpose and audience and the conventions of the text-type
* were superficial in their treatment of the selected topic.