

19 meetings

63 schools

242 participants

9,700+ data points generated

WHAT WE HEARD

2024 QUALITY ASSURANCE MEETINGS



Teacher representatives involved in the 2024 Quality Assurance Meeting process were invited to give feedback on their experiences by indicating their degree of agreement (or disagreement) with the following statements. Feedback was provided by 96% of participants.

- ✓ ***The meeting was well administered: guidance and instructions were clear, the venue was appropriate, etc.*** **99%**
Agreed
- ✓ ***The small group process worked well, and my understanding of the assessment process was enhanced.*** **98%**
Agreed
- ✓ ***I valued my involvement in the meeting as a meaningful professional learning opportunity.*** **90%**
Agreed
- ✓ ***I was given enough information before and during the meeting to feel informed about the purpose and process.*** **93%**
Agreed
- ✓ ***I was given clear information about the nature of the bodies of student work required and how to complete the Record Sheets.*** **89%**
Agreed
- ✓ ***The post-meeting process was clearly explained.*** **97%**
Agreed

“The social aspect and the jovial interactions [worked best for me]. Lots of learning and plenty of discussions!”

“Good to work with others, and a great chance to sharpen my assessment knowledge.”

“Networking/joint group work and professional discussion of criteria, elements etc [were great].”



The match between the nature of the bodies of student work and the nominated criteria was appropriate and clear.

32%

Undecided/Disagreed

As in past years, a significant number of participants felt that tabled samples of student work did not adequately match the criteria being assessed. For example, individual assessment tasks did not invite students to respond to a nominated criterion, or only a single standard element of a criterion. In some cases, feedback suggested that provider-devised tasks did not allow students to demonstrate 'A' rating standards.

In 2024, 32% of participants expressed concern, down slightly from 35% in 2023. Again, the course most impacted was *General Mathematics Level 2*, especially in the southern region. While TASC will undertake another review of requirements for this course and associated documents, teachers and other interested stakeholders are invited to let us know their thoughts on this issue via email to: QualityAssurance@tasc.tas.gov.au

In 2024 there appeared to be a trend of showcasing student achievement rather than tabling the required number of PA/SA borderline samples. While it is understood that schools with small numbers of students in a class may not have the required number of borderlines, all providers are reminded that the primary purpose of the meetings is to give information and feedback about difficult, high-stakes borderline assessment judgments (see below). Several providers also tabled student work that was far in excess of the scope required – one work sample was over 55 pages of text! TASC's requirement is that each body of work needs to be able to be assessed in a reasonable amount of time (e.g., 15 minutes or so). More than this places unfair burden and unrealistic expectations on meeting participants.

What We Heard About Online Meeting Processes

Participants appreciated:

- time and resources saved (not travelling and parking, cost of fuel)
- 'discussions with people from the other end of the state that I would usually not have an opportunity to meet'
- the mute button that allows for quiet time when reading and marking
- having a choice to preview samples prior to the meeting
- the "calm, professional, friendly, reassuring, warm and accommodating" TASC facilitators. "The smoothest online meeting I've ever been to." "The facilitator ran the group so well I am now converted to online!"

Participants expressed some concerns:

- there is a lack of depth of professional discussions: face to face conversations are much richer and more powerful
- student samples are required earlier than for physical meetings (so as to be checked and uploaded)
- extended screen use and sitting for a long time can cause health issues
- networking and sharing resources are more difficult online.

Suggested improvement actioned:

In 2023 it was suggested that the online meeting process be modified so that participants viewed and discussed one or two samples prior to undertaking individual assessment time. The 2024 trial of this method received very positive feedback. It was noted that the sample should be from the PA/SA borderline to ensure that a shared understanding of minimum evidence for criteria standards was developed prior to individual assessment of the majority of samples.

Feedback on TASC Requirements:

The 2024 Quality Assurance Meetings involved several new courses including: Digital Technologies; English Studio; History; and Studies of Religion. Many participants took the time to give us detailed feedback on issues such as the suitability of criteria selected for assessment in this quality assurance method. We thank those who provided comments, and we will consider them carefully as we design 2025 requirements for these courses.



Some FAQs from the Meeting Feedback Forms:

Why not set a common assessment task so that all the bodies of work were comparable?



The nature of the student work required for Quality Assurance Meetings is detailed within the course-specific requirements published in February each year by TASC. These are based on work requirements in the relevant course document. From this point of view, the work is 'common' (e.g., meeting a work requirement of a course), and authentic. The setting of a specific common task (such as a set essay topic or problem) has the potential to impose work on students that does not address individual needs and interests, and may limit the focus and direction of learning desired by the teacher. There is also a potential risk that assessment judgements might be focused on comparing students' responses to the specific question/problem, rather than making judgements about the evidence of a student's work against the criterion standards of the course.

Why is there such an emphasis on the PA/SA borderline?



Courses selected for Quality Assurance Meetings are Level 2 courses where an SA or higher is taken as evidence that a learner has achieved one or more of the TCE's 'everyday adult' skill set standards. It is at the PA/SA borderline that so-called 'ticks' are determined, and from a TASC point of view decisions made by teachers at the criteria '+ / C-' border when reporting final ratings at the end of the year are critical as they have a direct impact on a student gaining the TCE. The meeting methodology – where course providers are given formal, peer-reviewed feedback on assessment judgments – is specifically designed to inform such professional judgements.

What We Heard

2024 Quality Assurance Meetings (Version 1.0)

Page 2 of 2