2019 Information Processing and Publishing Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the previous year’s 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 Skills

This assessment type comprises 2 to 3 assessment tasks per 10-credit subject and at least 5 assessment tasks per 20-credit subject, where students apply the design process and layout principles to produce text products in two focus units. Students should investigate samples of their proposed product, plan their product, produce a product and evaluate the product.

For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning primarily in relation to the following assessment design criteria: development and application and analysis and evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a highly proficient application of manipulative and organisational skills using a variety of software to create, store, retrieve and edit to complete practical skill tasks
* included sufficient text within this assessment type
* demonstrated the application of the hierarchy of text in documents
* demonstrated formatting of business documents according to Australian business practice standards e.g. business letters
* demonstrated a clear understanding of the design principles resulting in a consistent and thoughtful application of these design principles
* demonstrated the ability to manipulate images
* demonstrated gradual complexity in skill development as they progressed through each task
* evaluated and/or annotated at least one product utilising the design principles, in addition to evaluating the design process.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited understanding and application of the design principles (DA3)
* did not demonstrate understanding of AE2 that focusses on the design process and the annotation of final product using the design principles
* were prescriptive tasks, given by the teacher, that locked students into the layout, text and images to use, thus limiting the student’s ability to demonstrate their development and application of practical skills at the higher levels of DA3 (application of layout and design principles to the production of text-based documents or presentations)
* centre-aligned almost all text
* had insufficient text over the practical skills tasks.

Electronic Publishing Focus Area

The more successful practical skills tasks:

* selected appropriate software and hardware to create, store, retrieve and edit to complete electronic publishing tasks
* were easy to navigate through
* had good file management
* demonstrated the integration of a variety of software
* generated content locally and did not rely on HTML-embedded content which needed an Internet connection
* included interactive content.

The less successful practical skills tasks:

* did not use layout suitable for the Web, e.g. wrote from left to right across a page instead of using columns
* had broken links
* produced websites that were hard to navigate through
* used templates, such as Adobe Muse, where students used drop and drag widgets that limited student’s ability to address DA3 at a high level
* used online website generators e.g. Word Press which limited student’s ability to demonstrate at the higher levels of development and application
* did not rename files causing an inability to open websites due to the path being too long
* submitted non-functional websites that could not be verified for file management and functionality.

Assessment Type 2: Issues Analysis

This assessment type comprises 1 assessment task per 10-credit subject and 2 assessment tasks per 20‑credit subject, where students discuss and analyse the social, legal and ethical issues related to information processing technologies, such as intellectual property, The 20-credit subject also requires students to complete a technical operations and understandings task discussing, comparing and making a recommendation information processing technologies, such as printers, digital cameras, USB storage.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly addressed the issue, stating the social/legal and or ethical effects in at *least one task* within this assessment type
* referred to Australian Laws or examples in context
* analysed and evaluated current hardware and software within a similar price range
* used diagrams as evidence in responses
* used primary and secondary sources
* responded in continuous prose
* focussed on a process of analysis — what is the issues? What are the social, legal and ethical effects of the issue? How to prevent and solve the issue?
* used tables and graphs in support of the discussion and to give credibility to the analysis provided
* included references from a range of sources.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used a question and answer format rather than continuous prose
* tended to be general with no specific reference to the specify features of the task
* showed little or no evidence of analysis or evaluation of research undertaken
* listed product specifications which needed to be analysed and evaluated in the Technical Operations task
* documented hardware/software features but did not compare and analyse
* lacked detail in the conclusion and recommendation.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

The more successful responses commonly:

* were given a clear and prescriptive task that had one focal topic, including due dates
* ensured that they met all performance standards being assessed
* showed the documentation of the design process was concise with students using the design language in a meaningful way
* discussed feedback from the target audience in the evaluation summary
* discussed the design process in the evaluation summary using the design language as well as annotating their final products using the design language for AE2
* explained choices of hardware and software in the devising summary and evaluated their performance in the evaluation summary
* clearly indicated word counts at the end of each of the three summaries
* demonstrated the manipulation of graphics, demonstrating highly proficient use of software
* provided specific examples when annotating samples of each of the design principles in each sample annotated
* discussed in the devising summary their final choices and why they were made
* used continuous prose in investigating, devising and evaluation summaries
* submitted final documentation as one PDF document instead of multiple files.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were given an ambiguous task sheet that included multiple focal topics e.g. business card, travel brochure etc.
* replicated the annotations for each sample and did not specifically analyse each sample using the design principles of CRAP
* did not clearly label each section of the design process in the documentation. A section divider or a header/footer stating the section would be helpful
* scanned final products instead of submitting the electronic files
* lacked sufficient text in the final products
* displayed poor file management resulting in missing files in the focus area of Electronic Publishing
* hosted websites for electronic publishing in the Cloud. In the focus area of Electronic Publishing students need to use web authoring software to demonstrate DA1 and DA2. Using templates or cloud based products limits students’ ability to demonstrate proficiency at the higher levels of these performance standards
* used templates which limited student’s ability to address specific design and manipulative requirements of the product and documentation
* submitted design plans that lacked detail.