# SACE Board Logo2023 Workplace Practices Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 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

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct
* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible, all facing up (and all the same way), and removing blank pages, student notes and formula pages
* ensuring that student evidence in the Performance Assessment Type is verified by a credible source such as VET competency statement, a Supervisor’s Report, payslips or time logbook entries, mentor statements, course completion certificates etc. and further verified by the inclusion of the Teacher’s Report on Student Performance (which is available in the Forms section of the Workplace Practices section on the SACE website).

Assessment Type 1: Folio

Folio assessment tasks are an opportunity for students to develop and demonstrate industry and work knowledge related specifically to the Areas of Study topics outlined in the Workplace Practices subject outline. A diverse range of both practical and investigation tasks are completed by students, applying their developing knowledge of workplace issues, cultures and practices to their own industry focus.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* co-designing purposeful Folio inquiry tasks that respond to student interests and skills, and develop their capabilities for future workplace learning
* providing flexible tasks that allow students to focus on an industry of their choice or explore a range of industries to inform future choices
* providing many opportunities for students to meet the performance standards assessed across multiple tasks
* ensuring that scaffolding does not limit student achievement by reducing student voice and/or reducing the depth and detail of authentic student engagement with the learning material
* ensuring that tasks provide opportunity for students to both investigate and analyse the information they find, rather than one or the other.

The more successful responses commonly:

* enabled students to choose and research topics from their industry area with greater flexibility, especially in the industrial relations topic
* were tasks that allowed students to personalise the focus of their tasks, allowing for relevant reflection and evaluation
* were tasks that connected to industry, allowing students to show understanding at a higher level
* allowed students the depth to explore instead of being overly structured or scaffolded
* offered students a range of different options for providing evidence of their learning
* showed strong knowledge and understanding by incorporating the student’s own experience and sources they found
* identified how current experiences and skills could be transferred to find employment.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were over-scaffolded, overly structured, question-answer responses, and did not allow for student voice or individual industry focus
* presented material and answered questions without further research
* had limited or no Reflection and Evaluation
* were limited to one type or style of response
* did not have an identified industry area to provide context.

Assessment Type 2: Performance

The Performance Assessment Type allows students to present genuine evidence of the practical application of their workplace skills in a workplace or simulated training environment and gives context to the theoretical elements of the Workplace Practices course.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring that Workplace Performance is verified by a credible source such as a VET competency statement, a Supervisor’s Report, payslips or time logbook entries, mentor statements, course completion certificates etc
* are verified by the inclusion of the Teacher’s Report on Student Performance, which is available under Forms on the Workplace Practices section of the SACE website
* periodically monitoring work skills development via ongoing conversations, and prompting students to record observations about how they apply their skills over time
* encouraging students to describe their engagement in work related activities, detailing decisions made, and skills applied through relevant examples, rather than simply providing an account or list of activities undertaken.

The more successful responses commonly:

* involved students providing evidence to support their learning experiences and showing Knowledge and Understanding and Application of work skills in context
* demonstrated very clear student voice throughout a range of evidence types, explaining what they were doing and why, and making clear links between theory and practice
* had all required components: student’s voice, Teacher’s Report to Moderator; Supervisor’s Report; or VET evidence of completion (where relevant)
* included specific dates, hours of work, detailed account of thoughts and learning connected to specific activities and duties, reflection on skills developed, photographic evidence and supporting teacher documentation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* for cohorts undertaking a themed approach to the class, used class time to evidence their ‘time’ in the workplace. Subject learning time should not be used for this purpose
* were missing required components: evidence of student voice in Performance showing Knowledge and Understanding, Teacher’s Report to Moderator; Supervisor’s Report; VET evidence of completion (School’s Online printouts are not sufficient evidence)
* used overly scaffolded worksheets or workbooks which limited student voice
* used reflections from a different assessment type for Performance (AT3 being used for AT2, which does not meet requirements)
* were journal entries or short answers to journal questions, or the tasks completed every day – which does not demonstrate KU or Application.

Assessment Type 3: Reflection

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* recognising the distinct difference between the Application assessment criteria (AT2) and the Investigation and Analysis, and Reflection criteria (AT3) and designing distinct assessment tasks accordingly. Knowledge and Understanding are assessed in both AT2 and AT3
* providing opportunities for students to explore work-related issues in local, national and global contexts and to recognise their role or influence as a worker, consumer or citizen in this system
* engaging students in personally relevant investigation and analysis activities that lead to reflections on changing behaviours, adjusting plans, problem solving for a future purpose and/or evaluating personal development of workplace competencies.

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided evidence from the three Assessment Design Criteria groups, especially ‘Reflection and Evaluation’
* self-reflected and connected learning to industry practice and their future, rather than recount only
* were written in relation to job-specific skills and employability skills required for a position
* were successful personal reflections featuring extended elaborations on the graduate qualities and/or employability skills and attributes related to future pathways
* included reflection on future aspirations
* allowed students to address the criteria in a variety of ways/formats.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* were descriptive recount tasks
* had Reflection and Evaluation but little evidence of Investigation and Analysis throughout
* used student evidence from a different assessment type (e.g. AT2 Performance as a reflection task, which does not meet the criteria)
* responded to tasks that asked them to reflect on the folio course content, which did not allow the student to address Knowledge and Understanding or Investigation and Analysis
* lacked depth and only discussed some experiences and examples
* were limited to recount only.

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Investigation

For this Assessment Type, students either undertake a practical or issue investigation. Students should be encouraged to choose the investigation type that best suits their career aspirations, industry profile, learning needs and style, rather than a task that the whole class undertakes.

For this assessment type, students are assessed on:

* knowledge and understanding — KU1 and KU2
* investigation and analysis — IA1 and IA2
* reflection and evaluation — RE1.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring that each student in the class has a task that is individual to their needs, their work or career context and to their skills. For example, allowing students to choose a Practical or Issues Investigation, rather than the whole class undertaking a scaffolded task that does not necessarily meet their needs, interests or career trajectory.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used the Investigation Cover Sheet to contextualise the work and the chosen industry
* allowed students to choose their own focus question and investigation in consultation with the teacher
* related to experiences and aspirations of students. For some students the fact that they were very passionate about the industry and what they were investigating came through clearly, which allowed them to achieve at a higher level, particularly in Reflection and Evaluation
* included clear and in-depth self-evaluation of how the learning has changed their thinking or made them consider the impact on their practical or issue
* the final Reflection and Evaluation were both about the product or process, rather than about the writing of the investigation (it should not read like a Research Project Evaluation)
* used a wide range of sources, including primary and secondary; this applied to both the issues investigation and the practical investigation options
* compared and analysed the findings between sources and their own thoughts or experiences
* when interviews or surveys were used, students analysed what this data revealed
* clearly demonstrated an understanding of the difference between presenting information (such as facts, statistics, and graphs) and analysing the information and what it has taught students about their chosen topic
* had numerous examples of Analysis, Reflection and Evaluation embedded throughout the student evidence
* (for the issues investigation) started with a very specific, appropriate research question, worded as an issue, that students could engage with and investigate. Overly general topics limit demonstration of KU or IA at a high level
* (for the practical investigation) enabled students to demonstrate their involvement in a real-world (rather than imagined) activity. Evidence included videos, pictures, and feedback from relevant people on a completed process. This allowed students to reflect on and evaluate their learning throughout in a real, rather than in an imagined, sense
* (for the practical investigation) gained feedback on final product from knowledgeable sources and used this to make changes or to inform the Reflection and Evaluation. Stronger examples incorporated a feedback and redesign step in their work, giving them an opportunity to discuss and reflect on the learning and then self-evaluate and document their redesign or areas of improvement
* (for the practical investigation) the final Reflection and Evaluation was about the product or process, rather than about the writing of the investigation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included recorded interviews where the teacher led the conversation and students provided minimal or short responses
* were based on generic topics without industry focus, such as “Sexual harassment / bullying in the workplace”, “gender pay gap”, limiting the response to KU1 and KU2
* when referencing Covid 19, self-evaluation and reflection was omitted in favour of a formal, third person essay, which meant certain Performance Standards were not addressed
* had scholarly, rather than industry focused research questions, without the industry link, making it difficult to adequately assess KU
* focussed on facts over analysis
* included a single topic for whole class using the same resources
* included Brief answers to highly-scaffolded questions that did not allow students to reflect on or evaluate their learning / performance
* had a template or scaffold that did not relate to the task or allow students to address all the Performance Standards to a sophisticated level
* included a timeline for the completion of the Investigation or Report, rather than demonstrating the investigation or analysis.
* allowed students to work on Investigations in ‘Groups’ without overly similar outcomes and no clear indication of which member was responsible for tasks
* had the research and investigation as implicit, rather than explicit; this was particularly evident in practical investigations where students applied their learning from VET to a real situation (such as ‘How To’ or ‘Safety Guides’), without undertaking any further investigation or analysing their knowledge and understanding. Students undertaking the practical investigation were less likely to meet this performance standard to a high level
* used unreliable evidence, such as anecdotal conversations, surveys conducted with friends, interviews with people not closely associated with their topic, or internet sources from overseas that did not relate to their actual context
* simply listed facts and statistics, included graphs or included verbatim responses to interview questions, rather than analysing the information
* when interviews or surveys were used, students repeated what the information told them
* included only a finished product (practical) with no other supporting evidence to demonstrate investigation, analysis, reflection, or evaluation
* where interviews with teacher were used, there was a reliance on leading questions from the teacher, rather than the student offering information and analysing / reflecting on their knowledge, work or performance
* focussed on a reflection on their personal limitations (such as time management), rather than a Reflection and Self-Evaluation of how the product or issue impacts on their own career decisions.