2021 Integrated Learning 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: Practical Inquiry (40%)

Practical Inquiry tasks are an opportunity for students to demonstrate practical application and development of knowledge, concepts and skills related to the program focus. A diverse range of both practical and creative tasks are completed by students, who then evaluate their learning referring to the development of a chosen SACE capability(ies) The subject outline requires that at least one Practical Inquiry task should include a discussion as a form of evidence.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included a discussion which was used to support and enhance student evidence
* allowed students to use their strengths when considering how to present evidence
* used clearly labelled and annotated video and/or images, drawings, and diagrams to assist in evidencing application and learning
* showed a depth of understanding and knowledge related to the program focus coupled with an analysis of the student’s own learning
* demonstrated the development of skills for a purpose related to the program focus
* evaluated feedback from others to help inform self-assessment
* accessed and acknowledged a broad range of relevant sources to evidence in-depth Inquiry, Analysis and Investigation
* clearly articulated their development of a chosen capability alongside increased knowledge and understanding relating to the program focus
* utilised opportunities across multiple tasks to address assessment criteria
* considered and discussed a range of perspectives when analysing concepts, ideas, and skills development
* included a clear analysis of their findings and related them to the program focus.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were highly scaffolded, restricting students’ ability to select the most appropriate mode of evidence for their skill set/choice of topic
* did not include evidence of a discussion where students had the opportunity to support and enhance evidence relating to the specific features of the assessment design criteria, particularly self-assessment, capabilities and skills development
* were recounts of events/activities with little evidence of application, analysis, or self-assessment
* demonstrated minimal understanding and development of their chosen Capability
* included limited student evidence, rather focused on teacher feedback (e.g. checklists)
* feedback from others only included as an appendix rather than discussed in-text to inform self‑assessment

Assessment Type 2: Connections (30%)

For Connections tasks, 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.

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed explicit and clear evidence of collaboration, with specific examples of the individual contribution to the task/ activity/ group outcome
* presented collaboration that displayed clear evidence of the growth of the individual within the team
* were based on tasks that were engaging and provided students with the opportunity for sustained, productive, and authentic collaboration
* used a variety of modalities to present their information, catering to the individual strengths of students
* used a variety of sources for feedback from others including peers, teachers, mentors, other school staff, youth workers, younger students for whom activities were created, and/or community members (e.g. coaches/chefs)
* analysed the feedback from others in conjunction with assessing their own development of skills and learning
* made use of self-assessment and feedback sheets annotated to explain how it was utilised to assist student’s learning
* provided variety of authentic evidence of individual learning including photos, graphs, forms, surveys, and data to demonstrate inquiry, application, collaboration etc.
* connected their understanding and development of a chosen capability to the program focus
* analysed and acknowledged a variety of relevant, respected sources, demonstrating evidence of broad and discerning Inquiry to support Application and Understanding
* evaluated the goal/learning outcome/purposeful application of knowledge concepts and/or skills for themselves and their group, drawing on self-assessment and feedback from others

The less successful responses commonly:

* defined a chosen capability(ies) in general terms rather than explaining their own understanding or application of the capability(ies)
* provided description-based responses rather than analysis and evaluation
* only provided opportunities for incidental collaboration or for students to work in parallel towards a common goal rather than working with a group of people with equal responsibility over a period of time to design and deliver an outcome
* presented the same evidence for each student within a group, without clearly identifying the contribution of individual students or including personal reflections (e.g. self-assessment of learning, development of Capability(ies) etc.)
* were scaffolded, limiting students’ opportunity for in-depth and insightful analysis
* showed student evidence was not clearly distinguishable from teacher directed activities
* showed limited evidence of self-assessment and/or feedback from others.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Personal Endeavour (30%)

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 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. Students in the same class must each have a different Personal Endeavour.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were topics individually chosen by students on the basis of personal interest, which increased engagement and learning
* had a clearly designed purpose or question which provided clarity and direction for the inquiry
* used and acknowledged a variety of relevant sources to support understanding and development of knowledge, concepts, and skills
* considered a range of perspectives when analysing concepts, ideas, and skill development
* showed a thorough, contextual understanding of the chosen SACE capability and explicitly discussed examples of how the student had developed this capability throughout their Personal Endeavour
* evidenced capability development evident throughout, not just in the capability section
* included annotated/captioned photos, data, tables, images etc. to evidence understanding and development of skills, knowledge, concepts and capability
* used a mode of presentation appropriate to the task and the students’ own strengths.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were highly scaffolded
* required all students within a class to undertake the same topic/question
* provided little or no evidence of inquiry or analysis of a variety of sources
* were recounts of experiences or events with limited analysis of concepts, ideas, and skills development
* only provided one perspective
* showed limited personal understanding of their chosen capability and instead quoted the SACE definitions of each capability
* were over the word limit.