Shape of ACT Senior Secondary Quality Assurance

System Moderation

Public Consultation

May 2022

Cross sectorial groups of teachers reviewing student presentations at Moderation Day

Table of Contents

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Report acknowledges Margaret Bell, Margaret Rowlands, Rosalind Brown, Kathy Griffiths, Ann Hamer and Ben Marshall for their leadership and significant contribution to the current Moderation Day model.

In addition, this report acknowledges the contribution of all ACT senior secondary teachers over a period of 20 years to the current Moderation Day model.

2. PURPOSE

2.1 This report outlines a multidimensional model to enhance processes to support the quality and comparability of grade judgements across schools and building teacher capacity to develop high quality assessment.

2.2 This report outlines the proposed implementation of recommendations made in the *Final Report: Review of ACT Senior Secondary Assessment and Moderation 2018*.

2.3 The *Shape of ACT Quality Assurance: Moderation Day Report* should be read in conjunction with the *BSSS Review of ACT Assessment and Moderation (2018)* and the *BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines (2019).*

2.4 Feedback on the *Shape of ACT Quality Assurance: Moderation Day* will inform the refurbishment of Moderation Day.

2.5 This report has been endorsed by the *BSSS System Moderation Advisory Group.*

2.6 This report will be revised following public consultation.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The early architects and pioneers of our senior secondary system showed wisdom and insight. They laid the foundations of a highly successful system that is based on sound educational principles.

3.2 A school based continuous assessment model underpins the ACT senior secondary system. In a school-based continuous assessment model, schools are responsible for developing assessment. Students are continually assessed throughout years 11 and 12, with both years contributing equally to senior secondary certification. Assessment data is not obtained from common assessment instruments but derived from judgements based on specified system-wide standards.

3.3 The creators of the system understood the value of education as being beyond a requirement to regurgitate information in an external exam. In the 1976 report, *Secondary Education for Canberra*, they argued that such examinations are generally considered as adverse to quality teaching and learning. They can narrow the curriculum and create a hierarchy where non-examination subjects are treated lightly by students and parents. The most striking argument is how high-stakes examinations bias the cognitive domain over the affective. A school-based continuous assessment model can survey the whole range of a student's accomplishment including cognitive and affective domains.

3.4 The college-based continuous assessment model prepares students for life and work in a technological, information-rich global economy. Recently, the Foundation for Young Australians (fya) published a report, *The New Work Mindset*, which describes portability skills across jobs and workplaces, stated that more employers are demanding enterprise skills among young employees.

> *"Demand for digital skills went up 221 per cent over three years, while critical thinking increased 158 per cent, creativity increased 65 per cent and presentation skills by 25 per cent,"*

The report argues that we need to shift our focus from jobs to portable skills to prepare young people for the future of work. External exams may not measure these portable skills. Our continuous assessment model makes provision for this and does it well. Senior secondary teachers have the flexibility to assess students in a variety of ways. For example, a range of modes including multimedia presentations, simulations, collaborative group work, speeches, and performance and/or practical demonstrations all have their place.

3.5 The early architects and pioneers of our senior secondary context laid the foundations of a highly successful system that continues to meet student needs and values teacher professionalism.

3.6 Young adults in ACT senior secondary colleges have a voice in their education. They have agency to shape a senior secondary certificate that meets their needs and interests. It is not a "one size fits all" model and is sensitive to student growth and preferences.

3.7 School communities have flexibility to select from an extensive range of contemporary Board of Senior Secondary Studies accredited courses to address the needs and interests of diverse learners. Colleges can choose to deliver courses that prepare students for university, vocational, work, or life skills pathways.

3.8 The senior secondary system is based on the premise that teachers are experts in their area – that they know their students and community – and are best-placed to deliver curriculum and assess students according to their needs and interests.

3.9 We have a senior secondary system that is the envy of educators both nationally and internationally. It is important to invest and strengthen current Moderation Day processes and procedures so that the system continues to serve all students in the ACT.

3.10 The integrity of the ACT Senior Secondary Certificate is supported by the reliability and validity of assessment across senior secondary schools. Moderation is undertaken to support quality assurance and improvement. Peer reviewed moderation is the process of calibrating assessments so that there is comparability of grades either internally, within a school, or externally, across all colleges and sectors.

3.11 In contrast to other systems with singular final subject specific examinations, Moderation Day is important in a system which is underpinned by a school based continuous assessment model as a central lever to ensure students are receiving their learning entitlement, check systems and processes, as well as providing guidance on assessment related issues, and to safeguard reliability and comparability of senior secondary assessment across all schools.

3.12 Consensus peer-based moderation upholds comparability and consistency in the allocation of grades, based on the analysis of student work in relation to Achievement Standards. Collaborative moderation allows teachers to explicitly state and share their tacit knowledge and understanding of curriculum and assessment practices. These professional conversations further develop teachers' knowledge and understanding of curriculum and assessment.

3.13 The current moderation model was introduced in 2001. In 2017, moderation systems were integrated into the ACT Certification System (ACS).

The BSSS Moderation and Assessment Vision and Principles were developed as follows:

Moderation

Vision

Moderation will enrich the development of assessment through maintaining and enhancing the quality assurance and validation of assessment, as well as supporting excellence in pedagogy and a professional learning culture to encourage collaboration at school and system levels.

Principles

That moderation will:

- focus on evidence-based professional judgement of assessment
- enrich and refine teacher understanding of quality assessment and its development
- be transparent, informative, objective and lack bias
- enhance professional and public confidence.

Source: *BSSS Policy and Procedures Manual 5.1*

Assessment

Vision

Assessment will provide equitable access to quality, valid, reliable, relevant, and learning-focused assessments that engage and motivate students, enabling them to show what they know and can do.

Principles

That assessment will:

- maintain and articulate standards that describe student achievement
- provide information about the level of students' skill, knowledge, and conceptual understandings
- discriminate between the students
- recognise the social and cultural contexts of students
- support teaching and learning goals through clear alignment with curriculum, pedagogy, and reporting
- involve a range and balance of types of assessment and modes of responding
- enhance professional and public confidence.

Source: *BSSS Policy and Procedures Manual 4.1*

4. INTRODUCTION

4.1 This report outlines a multidimensional draft model to enhance processes for comparability of grade judgements across schools and support teachers to develop high quality assessment. Key features of the draft model include:

- a range of moderation tasks including student portfolio unit grade agreement, moderation of individual assessment tasks, blind moderation of single or multiple assessment tasks, assessment instrument review and evaluation of a program of learning

- targeted and automated moderation processes (i.e. flexible moderation cycle and processes which encompass years 11/12 work across Semester 1-4 including item by item and wholistic moderation)

- provision of annotated assessment tasks and student work informed by the BSSS Achievement Standards and Quality Assessment Guidelines.

5. RATIONALE

5.1 Quality assurance has been the subject of discussion at a national level. Recent reports, *Looking to the Future: Report of the Review of senior secondary pathways into work, further education, and training* (2020), *Redesigning the secondary–tertiary interface: Queensland Review of Senior Assessment and Tertiary Entrance* (2014) and the *Nurturing Wonder and Igniting Passion, Designs for a new school curriculum, NSW Curriculum Review* (2020), provides a lens for analysing Moderation Day processes and procedures. Key themes that emerge from these reports include quality feedback on assessment tasks, standards of achievement, comparability of grades and student learning entitlement (i.e. curriculum delivered in schools as accredited).

5.2 The establishment of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers*, implementation of the *National School Improvement Tool (2012)* and educational research on high performing education systems and quality assessment, reveals opportunities to enhance BSSS Moderation Day processes and procedures and how they support teachers and build their capacity to meet national benchmarks for quality teaching and assessment.

5.3 A key function of the Board, as outlined in the BSSS Act 1997, is to review its own operations. In 2018, the Board endorsed recommendations made by a cross sectorial committee. The purpose of this review was to examine existing BSSS assessment and moderation policies and procedures to determine if changes are required to meet future needs within a continuous school-based assessment and consensus peer-based moderation system. As part of this review, ACT senior secondary teachers were surveyed on their experience of BSSS Moderation Days.

5.4 More than 600 teachers from across all learning areas participated in a survey on BSSS Moderation Days. Survey feedback indicated an appetite for the refurbishment of BSSS Moderation Days. Overall, teachers valued Moderation Day for networking and professional learning. However, feedback also indicated that some teachers were unclear on the rationale underpinning BSSS Moderation Day. Three key themes emerged from the survey data:

a) validity - teachers felt that the quality of feedback on student presentations was inconsistent and often subjective. Some teachers believe that feedback on student presentations was not always informed by BSSS Achievement Standards. Teachers also raised their concerns that only the same two semesters were reviewed.

b) digital capabilities - teachers felt that Moderation Day was 'bureaucratic' rather than focused on student achievement, the standards and quality assessment. The manual preparation of student presentations, coupled with the process of moderating on the day was identified as factors that negatively impacted on teacher experience at Moderation Day. The digitisation of processes and procedures was cited as a key lever to improve teacher experience on Moderation Day.

c) impact of Moderation Day feedback - teachers felt that the impact of Moderation Day feedback on school practices was minimal. The repetition of issues identified in student presentations was cited as a factor that diminished teacher experience at Moderation Day.

Further analysis of feedback indicated a need to cultivate a shared understanding on the key principles that underpin our school-based assessment and consensus peer-based moderation system.

5.5 Our primary task is to work collaboratively to uphold the integrity of the ACT Senior Secondary Certificate for all ACT students. Working in unison, we can continue to strengthen the integrity of the ACT Senior Secondary Certificate into the future by ensuring:
- curriculum is delivered as accredited
- comparability of unit and assessment grades within and across schools
- supporting teachers to develop quality assessment
- assessment aligns with Board endorsed Achievement Standards.

5.6 The draft model for BSSS Moderation Day meets legislative functions as outlined in the BSSS Act 1997 which is designed to ensure that student experience in senior secondary is equitable and of a high quality. Key functions of the Board relating to BSSS Moderation Day are as follows:
- to establish principles and procedures for the assessment of attainments of students and the moderation of assessments
- to identify the minimum resources necessary for the satisfactory provision of the courses that the board decides
- to develop and implement procedures for the moderation of student assessments.

5.7 The draft model for BSSS Moderation Day intersects with the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers,* in turn, integrating Moderation Day with nationally agreed professional standards. Key dimensions relating to BSSS Moderation Day listed in the *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers* include:
- evaluate the effectiveness of teaching programs using research and workplace knowledge about how students learn
- evaluate the effectiveness of learning and teaching programs differentiated for the specific learning needs of students across the full range of abilities
- develop learning and teaching programs using comprehensive knowledge of curriculum, assessment, and reporting requirements
- evaluate moderation activities to ensure consistent and comparable judgements of student learning meet curriculum and school and/or system requirements
- using assessment data to help identify learning needs, comply with curriculum and assessment requirements, and inform the range of assessment strategies.

5.8 The proposed model for BSSS Moderation Day is designed to support ACT schools' continuous improvement strategies such as those outlined in the *National School Improvement Tool*, in particular the analysis and discussion of data, and encourage a culture that promotes learning and systematic curriculum delivery.

6. MULTIDIMENSIONAL STRATEGY FOR BSSS MODERATION DAY

Review Process

- Grades
- Tasks
- Programs of Learning

ACS Digital Functions

- Interactive screens
- Unit outline and task generators
- Comprehensive quality assurance reporting

Organisation of Moderation Day

- Strategic sampling process

Developing System Leaders

- Targeted professional learning
- Opportunities for leadership

Annotations Project

- Annotated tasks
- Annotated samples of student work

In 2018, the Board endorsed recommendations made by the cross-sectoral *Review of ACT Senior Secondary Assessment and Moderation Committee*.

Key recommendations for the 2018 *Review of ACT Senior secondary Assessment and Moderation Committee* include:

1. That the current model for structured consensus-based peer review moderation be reviewed.

2. That a cross-sector working party develops a proposal for enhancing the current structured consensus-based peer review moderation.

The proposal should consider:

   a. communication strategies to increase understanding of the rationale and principles underpinning structured consensus-based peer review moderation including types, significance, and quality of feedback
   b. professional learning strategies to increase system understanding of quality assessment
   c. investigation of a two-year BSSS moderation cycle
   d. evaluation of a cycle for Moderation Day that incorporates review of quality assessment and comparability of grades
   e. building leadership capacity for subject group leaders
   f. requirements for moderation within colleges.

3. That the BSSS facilitate a cross-sector working party to develop quality assessment guidelines.

The quality assessment guidelines should consider:
   a. alignment with vision and principles of assessment
   b. provision of advice on using the BSSS Task Type Table and Achievement Standards
   c. the school-based assessment context of quality assessment in a senior secondary setting
   d. evidence-based research on assessment
   e. provision of advice that supports a learning community within schools focused on quality assessment.

To date, the Office of the Board of Senior Secondary Studies has worked in collaboration with senior secondary teachers to implement these recommendations. The following recommendations have been accomplished:

- development of the BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines
- TQI Accredited SGL/AGL Quality Assurance Workshop
- TQI Accredited Designing a Program of Learning Workshop
- comment bank for Moderation Feedback.

Currently, teachers review presentations of student work from units taught in the previous semester. Teachers review presentations from other colleges and comment on:

- adherence to Board policies and course document requirements
- quality and appropriateness of assessment tasks and marking schemes
- teacher judgements of student grades based on the relevant Achievement Standards.

The system moderation process takes place twice a year in March and August. In March the work from year 11 semester 2 is reviewed and in August the work from year 12 semester 1 is reviewed. The current moderation model was introduced in 2001.

7.   A DESCRIPTION OF A DRAFT MODEL FOR MODERATION DAY

The description of this draft model is organised under the following headings:

1.   Approaches to Quality Assurance
2.   Annotated Assessment Tasks and Student Work Samples
3.   Organisation of Moderation Days
4.   Developing System Leaders
5.   Automated Processes
6.   Moderation Cycle

7.1   Approaches to Quality Assurance

A key feature of the draft model for Moderation Day are its range of approaches for quality assurance. These approaches include:

- **Student Portfolio Unit Grade Agreement**

  Teachers review portfolios (grades A-E) each consisting of 2-3 tasks (depending on unit value) using the Achievement Standards to affirm the unit grade allocated by the home school (*Attachment 1*).

- **Moderation of individual student assessment tasks and Blind Moderation**

  Teachers review individual student assessments. A variety of student assessments across grade bands may be randomly selected by ACS. Teachers review the elements of the assessment items, the criteria for how a grade has been determined and the suitability of the grade awarded to each item.

  Alternatively, a blind moderation approach may be adopted (i.e., assessment tasks deidentified grade, mark, school, and student ID removed).

- **Assessment Instrument Review**

  Teachers provide feedback on individual, or a suite of assessment tasks informed by the *BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines* (*Attachment 2*). A copy of the guidelines is at: http://www.bsss.act.edu.au/grade_moderation/moderation_information_for_teachers

- **Program of Learning**

  Teachers evaluate the quality of a Program of Learning developed for the implementation of the selected unit, informed by BSSS accredited courses.

The proposed BSSS System Moderation model includes a mix of quality assurance approaches to meet the purpose of system moderation.

A key benefit of a student portfolio grade agreement quality assurance approach is to affirm unit grades against the Achievement Standards. In addition, a student portfolio grade agreement quality assurance approach establishes visibility of the suite of assessment tasks to determine curriculum coverage. It also provides a wholistic perspective on how the suite of tasks work together as a whole to allow students to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and skills as expressed in the Achievement Standards. Finally, this approach provides schools with feedback for continuous improvement.

Moderating individual assessment tasks provides targeted feedback on an assessment task, rubric/marking scheme, and student response. In addition, moderating individual assessment tasks

increases focus on what an assessment item is assessing and links directly how grades are allocated in a school. Finally, moderating individual assessment tasks provides grade comparability on similar assessment tasks across schools.

Blind moderation is a quality assurance approach whereby some or all aspects of a presentation are deidentified (removal of student ID and school information, mark, and grade). A blind moderation approach provides anonymity, in turn reduces instances of bias. In addition, blind moderation encourages feedback based on evidence presented.

An evaluation of a program of learning is designed to establish that BSSS curriculum is delivered as accredited. The rationale for quality assuring a program of learning is to establish that students are receiving their learning entitlement.

Quality assurance for programs of learning provides feedback on the following:

- alignment of assessment with unit goals and content descriptions and Achievement Standards

- strategic programing (i.e., elaborations comprehensively unpack the big ideas/concepts underpinning knowledge, skills, and understandings in the unit)

- teaching and learning strategies and resources selected to support student engagement and learning

- engagement with the big ideas/concepts and the General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities.

The draft model for Moderation Day is flexible, automated, and targeted. It features a variety of approaches to quality assurance including portfolio grade agreement, individual student assessment and blind moderation, assessment task review and an evaluation of programs of learning. The approaches adopted for each Moderation Day may vary according to the needs and interests of the system. For example, a Moderation Day event may focus on review of individual tasks (blind moderation) and the evaluation of programs of learning. Alternatively, a Moderation Day event may focus on student portfolio unit grade agreement and assessment instrument review.

It is envisaged that all approaches are automated (i.e., embedded in ACS). For each component an ACS interface guides the user through a combination of option choices and comment functions. ACS generates a Post Moderation Report. Attachment 1 demonstrates a possible example of a report which includes Unit Grade assessment instrument and Program of Learning feedback.

7.2   Annotated Assessment Tasks and Student Work Samples

Moderation is an effective means of providing feedback to improve the quality of assessment tasks in schools and the accuracy of teachers' judgements on student work.

Achievement Standards describe knowledge, skills and understanding using an A-E scale. Achievement Standards without explanation can be open to different interpretations among teachers, students, and the wider community. Annotated assessment tasks and student work samples are two ways in which teachers can develop shared understanding of quality assessment and Achievement Standards in practice.

Providing opportunities for the collaborative development of a shared understanding of Achievement Standards, through the use of annotations and dialogue, is a way forward for consistency in judgements within the ACT standards-referenced assessment systems.

Annotated quality assessment tasks and annotated student responses make thinking and judgements explicit and visible for teachers. This is an important policy lever that will build capacity in the senior secondary system to develop quality assessments and ensure consistency and accuracy in grade judgements across the system.

Annotated quality assessment tasks will support teachers by providing examples for reference. They are not intended to provide an unnecessarily rigid and prescriptive structure that restricts the nature and variety of assessment tasks being developed in schools.

7.3   Organisation of Moderation Materials

The proposed upgrade of ACS will automate the organisation of moderation materials including Years 11 and 12, Semesters 1-4. Teachers will use the ACS platform to develop and store all student assessment tasks. Students may upload their assessment tasks into ACS. Currently, teachers collate student work and clean copies of assessment task to submit for system moderation.

7.4   Developing System Leaders

The BSSS is committed to building the capacity of teachers to lead assessment and system moderation. This is achieved through TQI Accredited professional learning and workshops tailored specifically for Moderation Coordinators and Moderation Day Subject Group Leaders and Assistant Group Leaders.

At system level:

- leadership capacity for SGLs and AGLs
- teacher capacity to moderate assessments
- teacher capacity to develop quality assessment informed by the BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines
- teacher capacity to enhance implementation of BSSS accredited curriculum using Programs of Learning.

7.5   Automated Processes

The proposed automation of Moderation Day processes and procedures will support teachers when providing feedback on student portfolios or individual tasks. For example, the recent implementation of the unit outline generator has ensured unit outlines meet BSSS requirements, in turn, enabling teachers more time to assess student work.

The Moderation cycle for the collection of materials is designed to complement the process on the day to increase the quality of reviews, maximise the time for deep and professional conversations around teaching and learning and the provision high quality, educationally focused feedback.

7.6 Moderation Cycle

An example.

2023	2024
Moderation Day 1 Year 1	**Moderation Day 1 Year 2**
Moderation Tasks: • Student Portfolio Unit Grade Agreement • Assessment Instruments and/or Programs of Learning Review	**Moderation Tasks:** • Moderation of individual student assessment tasks • Assessment Instruments and/or Programs of Learning Review
Moderation Day 2 Year 1	**Moderation Day 2 Year 2**
Moderation Tasks: • Moderation of individual student assessment tasks • Assessment Instruments and/or Programs of Learning Review	**Moderation Tasks:** • Student Portfolio Unit Grade Agreement • Assessment Instruments and/or Programs of Learning Review

Note: All elements reviewed during system moderation will be deidentified.

Outcomes for BSSS Quality Assurance

multi faceted quality assurance process

administrative efficiency

clarity of standards

explicit feedback to support school improvement

targeted professional learning

shared language for professional conversations

The BSSS Quality Assurance model for Moderation Day provides a wrap around service to support senior secondary teachers' professional knowledge, practice, and engagement

8. HOW TO GET INVOLVED IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Public consultation will occur between the period Thursday 5 May - Tuesday 31 May 2022.

You can get involved by:

- providing feedback using the online survey platform

- attending a forum.

Submissions on the draft Shape of Moderation Day will be accepted via Survey Monkey at: https://www.bsss.act.edu.au/news/2022_news_items/shape_of_moderation

Attending an online forum

The Office of the Board of Senior Secondary Studies will facilitate online forums.

Open forums:

Thursday 12 May Online forum (3.30-5.00pm)

Tuesday 17 May Online forum (8.30-10.00am)

Thursday 19 May Online forum (3.30-5.00pm)

Visit the BSSS website to register for a forum at: http://www.bsss.act.edu.au/

Agenda item at scheduled meetings:

Thursday 12 May Moderation Coordinators' Meeting

Tuesday 17 May VET Coordinators' Meeting

Wednesday 18 May Curriculum Coordinators' Meeting

Thursday 19 May Certification Coordinators' Meeting

Tuesday 31 May Board Principals' Meeting

What happens to the feedback that you provide?

The BSSS System Moderation Advisory Group will analyse feedback and make recommendations.

9. ATTACHMENT 1 - ACS REPORT (Sample)

The example below features an ACS report featuring:

- feedback on Tasks 1-3
- Student Portfolio Unit Grade Agreement, Assessment Instrument Review and Program of Learning

Moderation Day 1 2021

College:	College	**College Code:**	DGDC
Framework:	ENGLISH	**Year Level:**	11
Course Title:	ESSENTIAL ENGLISH	**Course Type:**	A
Unit Title:	Unit 1: English Essentials	**Unit Value:**	1.0

Portfolio Grade Evaluation

Portfolio No.	College Grade	Reviewers Grade	Evidence for Reviewers' Judgement	Evidence required to achieve a higher grade
1	A	B	Some student responses *explain* rather than *critically analyse*. Student communicates thoughtful ideas and employs stylistic features.	Further evidence of analysis required, particularly in regard to literacy conventions where the student currently explains.
2	C	C	Student consistently *explains* across all three tasks.	Further evidence of…

Quality Assessment Evaluation

	Ranking	Evidence for Judgement
Coverage of BSSS Course/Unit	Satisfactory	Assessments are not too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; nor too small: missing important criteria…
Reliability	Outstanding	Assessment tasks and marking are strategically designed to remove all sources of non-relevant variation in measurements.
Bias Awareness	High	The suite of assessment tasks is designed that promote the diverse needs of gender, socio-economic status, disabilities and/or cultures, and that do not marginalise or favour a student or group of students, or advantage or disadvantage certain background knowledge or ways of thinking.
Levels of Thinking	Satisfactory	Assessment tasks are designed around the thinking progression of the Achievement Standard. The suite of assessments demonstrates that there are some expectations for most learners to extend their thinking at all levels of learning. Assessment demonstrates some assessment modes.
Student Engagement	Minimal	The Oral and Creative tasks appropriately planned and connected to contemporary issues. The Essay task lacks connection to contemporary issues, student lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge.
Academic Integrity	No Academic Integrity	Academic integrity is not mentioned in any documentation. Assessment requires identical responses from students. Expectations in regard to plagiarism and referencing are not addressed.
Validity	Valid (with some modification)	Essay task…

Overall: Satisfactory

ANNOTATED EXPLANATION – ACS REPORT

> This report would be available in ACS for Moderation Coordinators and other school leaders after Moderation Day.

7. Attachment 1 - ACS REPORT

The *Final Report* includes feedback on Tasks 1-3.

Moderation Day 1 2021

B S S S

1. College and course details →

College:	College	College Code:	DGDC
Framework:	ENGLISH	Year Level:	11
Course Title:	ESSENTIAL ENGLISH	Course Type:	A
Unit Title:	Unit 1: English Essentials	Unit Value:	1.0

Portfolio Grade Affirmation Process

2. Results and comments from Stage 1 →

Portfolio No.	College Grade	Reviewers Grade	Evidence for Reviewers' Judgement	Evidence required to achieve a higher grade
1	A	B	Some student responses *explain* rather than *critically analyse*. Student communicates thoughtful ideas and employs stylistic features.	Further evidence of analysis required, particularly in regard to literacy conventions where the student currently explains.
2	C	C	Student consistently *explains* across all three tasks	Further evidence of...

Evaluating Quality Assessment

3. Results and comments from Stage 2 →

	Ranking	Evidence for Judgement
Coverage of BSSS Courses	Satisfactory	Assessments are not too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; nor too small: missing important criteria....
Reliability	Outstanding	Assessment tasks and marking are strategically designed to remove all sources of non-relevant variation in measurements.
Bias Awareness	High	The suite of assessment tasks is designed that promote the diverse needs of gender, socio-economic status, disabilities and/or cultures, and that do not marginalise or favour a student or group of students, or advantage or disadvantage certain background knowledge or ways of thinking.
Levels of Thinking	Satisfactory	Assessment tasks are designed around the thinking progression of the Achievement Standard. The suite of assessments demonstrates that there are some expectations for most learners to extend their thinking at all levels of learning. Assessment demonstrates some assessment modes.
Student Engagement	Minimal	The Oral and Creative tasks appropriately planned and connected to contemporary issues. The Essay task lacks connection to contemporary issues, student lived experiences, interests, or prior knowledge.
Academic Integrity	No Academic Integrity	Academic integrity is not mentioned in any documentation. Assessment requires identical responses from students. Expectations in regard to plagiarism and referencing are not addressed.
Validity	Valid (with some modification)	Essay task ....

Overall: Satisfactory

10. ATTACHMENT 2 - PROCESS FOR EVALUATING GRADES ASSIGNED TO PORTFOLIO (Sample)

+ Student Portfolio 1 - College Grade: A

Achievement Standards for English Courses – Year 12

	A student who achieves an *A* grade typically	A student who achieves a *B* grade typically	A student who achieves a *C* grade typically	A student who achieves a *D* grade typically	A student who achieves an *E* grade typically	Not Evident / Not Applicable
Responding	• critically analyses the relationships between context, purpose, and audience and how successfully they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• analyses the relationships between context, purpose, and audience and how successfully they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• explains the relationships between context, purpose, and audience and how they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• describes the relationships between context, purpose, and audience with reference to meaning, attitudes and values	• identifies aspects of context, purpose and audience and makes some reference to meaning	• work/tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
	• critically analyses how literary conventions, language and stylistic features are integrated in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• analyses how literary conventions language and stylistic features are integrated in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• explains how literary conventions, language and stylistic features are used in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• describes how literary conventions, language or stylistic features are used to position audiences	• identifies language and stylistic features used and makes some reference to meaning	• work/tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
Creating	• communicates insightful ideas, complex concepts and considered perspectives across a range of sustained texts for different purposes, contexts, and audiences	• communicates thoughtful ideas, complex concepts and considered perspectives across a range of sustained texts for different purposes, contexts, and audiences	• communicates ideas and perspectives across a range of texts for different purposes, contexts, and audiences	• communicates perspectives in a range of texts for different purposes, contexts, and audiences	• communicates fragmented perspectives for different purposes, contexts, and audiences	• work/tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
	• communicates fluently and expressively using concise, precise, and nuanced language	• communicates fluently using precise expression	• communicates clearly using accurate expression	• communicates using mainly accurate expression	• communicates using some accurate expression	• work/tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion

Evidence for grade decisions:

The essay contained high levels of critical analysis and demonstrated strong links between their argument and evidence. The oral demonstrated explanations of conventions and language without analysis.

What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher grade?

More consistent demonstration of critical analysis in the oral task. In the creative response, the student needs to show communication of concepts and perspectives.

Summary Page

NOTE: The Achievement Standards published have been edited.

ANNOTATED EXPLANATION – PROCESS FOR AFFIRMING GRADES ASSIGNED TO PORTFOLIO (Sample)

This screen would only be available to reviewers on Moderation Day

TASK 1: PROCESS FOR AFFIRMING GRADES ASSIGNED TO PRESENTATIONS   **Attachment 1**

+ Student Portfolio 1 - College Grade: A

Achievement Standards for English T Courses – Year 12

	A student who achieves an A grade typically	A student who achieves a B grade typically	A student who achieves a C grade typically	A student who achieves a D grade typically	A student who achieves an E grade typically	Not Evident / Not Applicable
Responding	• critically analyses the relationships between context, purpose and audience and how successfully they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• analyses the relationships between context, purpose and audience and how successfully they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• explains the relationships between context, purpose and audience and how they shape meaning, convey attitudes and values, and achieve particular effects	• describes the relationships between context, purpose and audience with reference to meaning, attitudes and values	• identifies aspects of context, purpose and audience and makes some reference to meaning	• Work/Tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
	• critically analyses how literary conventions, language and stylistic features are integrated in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• analyses how literary conventions language and stylistic features are integrated in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• explains how literary conventions, language and stylistic features are used in different modes and mediums to position audiences	• describes how literary conventions, language or stylistic features are used to position audiences	• identifies language and stylistic features used and makes some reference to meaning	• Work/Tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
Creating	• communicates insightful ideas, complex concepts and considered perspectives across a range of sustained texts for different purposes, contexts and audiences	• communicates thoughtful ideas, complex concepts and considered perspectives across a range of sustained texts for different purposes, contexts and audiences	• communicates ideas and perspectives across a range of texts for different purposes, contexts and audiences	• communicates perspectives in a range of texts for different purposes, contexts and audiences	• communicates fragmented perspectives for different purposes, contexts and audiences	• Work/Tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion
	• communicates fluently and expressively using concise, precise and nuanced language	• communicates fluently using precise expression	• communicates clearly using accurate expression	• communicates using mainly accurate expression	• communicates using some accurate expression	• Work/Tasks provided do not include enough evidence to address this criterion

Evidence for grade confirmation decisions:

Some student responses explain rather than critically analyse. Student communicates thoughtful ideas and employs stylistic features.

What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher grade?

Summary Page:

Portfolio No.	College Grade	Proposed Reviewers' Grade	Evidence for grade confirmation decisions	What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher grade?	Reviewers final grade decision	Reason for change from proposed grade
1	A	B	Some student responses explain rather than critically analyse. Student communicates thoughtful ideas and employs stylistic features.		A ⌄	

Annotations (left and bottom):

1. Each student presentation appears as an expandable accordion heading.

2. ACS displays the correct achievement standards for the course.

3. Reviewers select a description that is supported by evidence in the student presentation.

4. Reviewers must select one description in each row.

5. Reviewers provide evidence for grade decision.

6. Reviewers provide evidence required for student to achieve a higher grade.

7. Once reviewers have checked the student presentation against the Achievement Standards, they move to a summary screen which shows the college grade, proposed reviewers' grade based on the descriptions that have been selected, evidence required for a higher grade, and the comments supplying evidence.

8. Reviewers can manually choose the final grade that is appropriate.

9. If the final grade does not match the proposed grade, reviewers must provide a rationale for their decision.

11. ATTACHMENT 3 - EVALUATING QUALITY ASSESSMENT (Sample)

The BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines (QAG) outline a process for evaluating the quality of assessment tasks. It is envisaged that the scale underpinning the fields outlined in the dimensions (i.e. bias, coverage of curriculum, reliability, thinking levels, student engagement, and academic integrity) will be used to generate a report with a diagram and text.

+ Coverage of BSSS Courses

Outstanding	High	Satisfactory	Minimum	None
• **Outstanding Coverage of BSSS Accredited Courses** – Assessment tasks are strategically planned for alignment with Achievement Standards, unit goals and content descriptors. Assessments are not too big: assessing irrelevant content or criteria; nor too small: missing important content or criteria.	• **High Coverage of BSSS Accredited Courses -** Assessment tasks are thoughtfully planned. Assessments are not too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; nor too small: missing important criteria.	• **Satisfactory Coverage of BSSS Accredited Courses -** Assessment tasks are appropriately planned. Assessments are not too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; nor too small: missing important criteria.	• **Minimum Coverage of BSSS Accredited Courses** – Assessment tasks require refinement. Assessments are uneven. Some tasks are either too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; or too small: missing important criteria.	• **No Coverage of BSSS Accredited Courses** – Assessment tasks are unplanned. Assessments are uneven. Some tasks are either too big: assessing irrelevant criteria; or too small: missing important criteria.

Evidence for Judgement:

+ Reliability

+ Bias Awareness

1. Each element of the QAG appears as an expandable accordion heading.

2. Reviewers select a description that is supported by evidence in the assessment tasks.

3. Reviewers provide evidence to support judgement.

4. Once reviewers have selected a description and provided evidence, they move on the next field from the QAG.

This screen would only be available to reviewers on Moderation Day.

12. ATTACHMENT 4 - FEEDBACK ON THE PROGRAM OF LEARNING (Sample)

	Outstanding	*High*	*Satisfactory*	*Minimum*	*None*
Aligns with the intent of the unit	**Outstanding alignment with the intent of the unit** – the content descriptions are *strategically* programmed, and elaborations comprehensively unpack the big ideas/concepts underpinning knowledge, skills, and understandings in the unit.	• **High alignment with the intent of the unit** – the content descriptions are *thoughtfully* programmed, and elaborations explain the big ideas/concepts underpinning knowledge, skills, and understandings in the unit.	• **Satisfactory alignment with the intent of the unit** – the content descriptions are *appropriately* programmed, and elaborations are coherent with the big ideas/concepts underpinning knowledge, skills, and understandings in the unit.	• **Minimum alignment with the intent of the unit** – Program of Learning requires refinement. Elaborations do not coherently and systematically provide insight into the intent of the unit.	• **No alignment with the intent of the unit** – Program of Learning does not contain elaborations and does not have a program for the teaching and learning of the content descriptions.
Implementation of Curriculum	**Outstanding implementation of curriculum** – The lens for the Program of Learning is *strategically* planned to engage students as active learners. It uses significant and contemporary interpretations and resources. Teaching, learning, and assessment is strategically selected to support engagement with the big ideas/concepts and General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities	• **High quality implementation of curriculum** – The lens for the Program of Learning is *thoughtfully* planned to engage students as active learners. It uses appropriate interpretations and resources. Teaching, learning, and assessment engages with the big ideas/concepts and General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities	• **Satisfactory implementation of curriculum** – The lens for the Program of Learning is *appropriately* planned to engage students as active learners. It uses relevant resources. Teaching, learning, and assessment is intended to support engagement with the big ideas/concepts and General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities	• **Minimum implementation of curriculum** – The lens for the Program of Learning requires refinement. Some evidence of efforts to engage students as active learners. Resources are not suitable to develop student understanding of the big ideas/concepts and General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities	• **No implementation of curriculum** – Program of Learning does not provide evidence of what will be used to engage student understanding of the big ideas/concepts and General Capabilities and Cross Curriculum Priorities
Evidence for Judgement:					

1. Elements for judgement to be determined.

This screen would only be available to reviewers on Moderation Day

2. Reviewers select a description that is supported by evidence in the program of learning.

3. Reviewers provide evidence to support judgements.

13. GLOSSARY

Blind Moderation – refers to a quality assurance approach whereby deidentified (removal of school, student ID, marks, and grades) individual tasks or portfolios are reviewed using the BSSS Achievement Standards.

Moderation Presentation – refers to College presentation containing elements for review.

Portfolio – refers to 2-3 tasks from an individual student.

14. REFERENCES

Australian Professional Standards for Teachers: https://www.aitsl.edu.au/teach/standards

BSSS Policy and Procedures Manual:
http://www.bsss.act.edu.au/The_Board/policy_and_procedures_manual

BSSS Quality Assessment Guidelines 2020
https://www.cms1.ed.act.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/511155/BSSS_Quality_Assessment_Guidelines_FINAL_2020.pdf

Final Report: *Review of ACT Senior Secondary Assessment and Moderation* 2018

Re-assessing assessment, Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation 2015