# 2018 Integrated Learning 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.

2018 was the first year of teaching the new Stage 2 Integrated Learning subject outline.

# School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Practical Inquiry (40%)

The Practical Inquiry is an opportunity for students to demonstrate practical application and development of knowledge, concepts and skills related to the program focus. Students often undertook very practical, creative and hands-on tasks, and then evaluated their learning as a result of undertaking the task, with reference to the development of a capability. Moderators noted that most 20-credit programs were designed with three Practical Inquiry tasks, although some were designed with two Practical Inquiry tasks (depending on the number of tasks in Assessment Type 2).

Students often achieved at the high levels of the performance standards where, across the Practical Inquiry tasks, there were multiple opportunities for students to show their development of their capability(ies), as well as multiple opportunities to address the criteria for assessment.

Moderators noted that students should be encouraged to seek feedback for their Practical Inquiry tasks, and reflect on the feedback received. This supports evidence for the assessment criteria IAE3, and also addresses the subject outline specification that students should have the opportunity to receive feedback from others and to participate in self-assessment.

The subject outline also specifies that at least one Practical Inquiry task should include a discussion as a form of evidence. The discussion can take place while a task is in progress, as a task is finalised, or as the set of Practical Inquiry tasks are finalised. Evidence that a discussion has taken place should be provided for moderation – where a discussion was not available, it often contributed to a lack of student evidence and therefore a shift in moderation results. It is recommended that the format of the discussion be dynamic, rather than simple question-and-answer format.

Evidence provided for the Practical Inquiry must be student evidence. Teacher evidence, such as a checklist or report, can only be used as support for student evidence. Evidence can be in a variety of forms, including photographic, video, background research, or reports.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a set of tasks that were designed to cover the assessment criteria more than once, allowing students multiple opportunities to demonstrate their evidence
* used a variety of inquiry and research methods appropriate to the program focus
* provided multiple perspectives from multiple sources
* analysed findings and related them to the program focus
* reflected on their own learning and feedback received from others and/or the teacher
* included photos, drawings, videos and/or images to demonstrate evidence of their development in skills and/or knowledge
* explicitly identified a capability and explored the connections between the program focus and the development of that capability, thereby showing connections to the real world
* contributed to discussions that are mainly run by students rather than by the teacher
* undertook preparation for a discussion, for example practice (formative) discussions, or discussions short in multiple tasks.

The less successful responses commonly:

* responded to tasks that were heavily scaffolded, thereby limiting student opportunity to achieve at the higher levels
* contained very little student evidence, with mostly teacher-supporting evidence or checklists
* had limited or no investigation to back up the practical inquiry activity they had undertaken
* did not reflect on feedback from others as a means of informing their own self-assessment
* did not identify or explain how they had developed their capability/ies
* included no evidence of a discussion
* read from a script during the discussion
* had significant scaffolding and guidance by the teacher during the Discussion, for instance the teacher spoke too much with little student evidence, or had a question-answer lock-stepped format.

Assessment Type 2: Connections (30%)

For the Connections, 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. Moderators noted that most 20-credit programs were designed with one Connections task, although some were designed with two Connections tasks (depending on the number of tasks in Assessment Type 1).

Moderators also noted that students should be encouraged to seek feedback for their Connections tasks, and reflect on the feedback received. This supports evidence for the assessment criteria IAE3, and also addresses the subject outline specification that students should have the opportunity to receive feedback from others and to participate in self-assessment. Students can undertake similar planning and preparation but must respond individually to the process/outcome and add their own annotations and reflections.

Moderators were pleased to see that community involvement was used as a form of collaboration for students at some schools, and recommend that teachers specifically teach how to design tools to gather feedback.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to tasks that allowed for students to collaborate for a sustained period of time, that is there was more collaboration than only a single 20-minute meeting
* identified their individual role in the Connections task and explained what/when/why/how they contributed to the task
* collected feedback from more than one source and used it to shape their work
* discussed the development of their capability in detail.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked evidence of collaboration
* relied on group evidence
* analysed the group efforts instead of their individual learning through the collaborative task
* omitted evidence of a variety of sources (IAE1)
* omitted evidence of different perspectives (IAE2)
* omitted evidence on how their individual efforts contributed to the final outcome
* responded to tasks that only focussed on skills demonstration, and not development.

# External Assessment

## Assessment Type 3: Personal Endeavour (30%)

The Personal Endeavour is the external assessment and is weighted at 30%. Each student’s Personal Endeavour is marked initially by the teacher, then submitted to the SACE Board and marked again by a marker appointed by the SACE Board. The Personal Endeavour assesses Application and Understanding (AU1 & AU3), Inquiry, Analysis and Evaluation (IAE1 & IAE2), Communication and Collaboration (CC2).

The Personal Endeavour is an opportunity for students to explore an area of the program focus that is of interest to them by exploring and analysing relevant information 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.

The subject outline specifies that students in the same class should have a different focus to their personal endeavour, and that students should identify the capability they have selected within their evidence.

Markers noted that most Personal Endeavours were submitted as written reports. Markers recommend encouraging students to submit their evidence in a form that best suits their individual learning style as well as the focus of their Personal Endeavour as this may assist students to achieve at higher grade levels. Other forms include, but are not limited to photo stories, screen castify presentations etc.

The more successful responses commonly:

* had personal significance or relevance to the student
* had a purpose or question rather than a broad topic
* used a variety of sources, referencing these appropriately
* provided evidence of broad research showing a variety of perspectives
* selected the focus of their Personal Endeavour with consideration for a capability, and then thoroughly research and analysed the focus linking to their capability
* dedicated for approximately one quarter to one third of their word count to explicitly discussing the link between their chosen capability and the program focus which identified their transferable and adaptable skills.
* annotated photos, data, tables, images etc to demonstrate capability development and content knowledge

The less successful responses commonly:

* responded to a scaffolded template with all students in the class responding to the same directed Personal Endeavour, or having identical leading sentences.
* were poorly structured and did not have a clear focus
* did not use research from a variety of sources, or exclusively used teacher provided resources which restricted depth and diversity of research and information (IAE1)
* were written as a reflection or description of an event of experience without analysis of concepts, ideas and skills development from different perspectives (IAE2)
* only provided one perspective (IAE2)
* made tenuous links to the capability in the last paragraph (AU3)
* regurgitated researched information without including their own opinion or reflecting on the information (CC2).