2023 Physical Education 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.

Across the Assessment Types for this subject, students can present their responses in oral or multimodal form, where 6 minutes is the equivalent of 1000 words. Students **should not speed-up the recording** of their videos excessively **in an attempt to condense more content** into the maximum time limit.

If a video is flagged by markers/moderators as impacted by speed, **schools will be requested to provide a transcript** and markers/moderators will be advised to mark/moderate based on the evidence in the transcript, only considering evidence up to the maximum word limit (e.g. up to 2000 words for AT3).

If the speed of the recording makes the speech incomprehensible, it affects the accuracy of transcriptions and it also impacts the ability of markers/moderators to find evidence of student achievement against the performance standards.

School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Diagnostics

Students participate in one or more physical activities to collect, analyse, and evaluate evidence to demonstrate contextual application of knowledge and understanding of the focus areas and movement concepts and strategies. They provide evidence of their learning in relation to the following assessment design criteria: Application, and Analysis and Evaluation.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* assessing fewer specific features within tasks to allow students to deeply explore concepts
* providing students with opportunities to sufficiently demonstrate evidence of the assessed specific features (particularly evident when A2 and AE3 were assessed)
* ensuring task design is aligned to the current Physical Education course and not the old course.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated sustained contextual application of knowledge and understanding from the focus areas throughout the whole task
* applied fewer key ideas and considerations (from the focus areas) in order to encourage deeper application, analysis, and evaluation
* linked and analysed a range of types of evidence
* understood the difference between analysis and evaluation and how these applied within the task
* used evaluation of evidence through which knowledge and understanding were applied.
* utilised a multimodal/screencast presentation format effectively.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were descriptive, narrative and/or generalised recounts without application of specific knowledge and understanding from the focus areas
* described and/or displayed evidence and/or the evidence collection process without critically analysing or perceptively evaluating it
* had an abundance of evidence/data which was not relevant, used or referred to
* analysed pieces of evidence in isolation from each other.

Assessment Type 2: Improvement Analysis

Students undertake a personal journey of improvement and reflect on their performance to identify an aspect of physical activity for improvement. They collect evidence and/or feedback to monitor improvement and the effectiveness of implemented strategies at regular intervals over a period of time. Students use this evidence and/or feedback to make modifications to the implemented strategies.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly and explicitly identified the strategies they were implementing
* clearly linked the strategies to their specific area of improvement which were informed by the application of knowledge and understanding from the focus areas
* had clear evidence gathered from trainings and games used to inform the implementation of strategies
* provided specific examples and applied understanding as reasons to support why strategies were in/effective
* strategies were informed by research, journal articles or other reputable sources
* focused on using a cycle or process of evaluation as a part of the learning journey
* understood that learning is often multi-dimensional, and that improvement is not always apparent/visible/linear and/or occurs as one may expect (which they then evaluated and explored)
* utilised Key Performance Indicators as evidence of progression towards set goal(s) throughout journey
* utilised effective goal setting (SMART/SMARTA/SMARTER) and used evidence to evaluate improvement and strategies against the initial goal
* used multiple pieces of evidence that were analysed for connections, trends and/or relationships
* used evidence from pre, during and post measures to support analysis and evaluation of improvement and un/successfulness of strategies
* utilised peer reviewed journal articles/sources to support
* utilised a multimodal/screencast presentation format effectively
* analysis was driven by the evidence to which knowledge and understanding from the focus areas was applied
* utilised terminology associated with the movement concepts and strategies to inform analysis/evaluation of their performance (e.g. movement quality, movement execution, spatial awareness, decision making etc.)
* explicitly named and demonstrated a range of collaboration strategies or skills that were tailored to the specific context (where A2 was assessed)
* utilised and applied a framework when referring to and applying collaborative strategies or skills (e.g. ACER Collaboration Framework)
* understood how to evaluate evidence (i.e. for its validity and/or reliability)
* reflected upon and evaluated the whole as well as part of their participation or performance improvement.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included too much time/words which did not demonstrate evidence of the specific features being assessed (i.e. lengthy introductions, player profiles etc.)
* completed 'future recommendations’ as part of the task. This is no longer an assessed part of the course.
* had unclear strategies and therefore were not able to critically or perceptively analyse and/or evaluate their in/effectiveness
* utilised ‘in-game’ strategies (e.g. applying a zone defence after a turn-over in basketball) in order to enhance performance (strategies must be those implemented outside of the game in order to develop in-game performance)
* used general statements about strategies being effective without supporting evidence or reasons
* used description, explanation and/or recount as evaluations of the in/effectiveness of the strategies without supporting evidence
* had an abundance of evidence/data which was not relevant, used or explicitly referred to
* used very few types or amount of evidence throughout the evaluation
* analysed strategies, participation/performance improvement but did not evaluate them
* analysed pieces of evidence in isolation from each other
* had little reference/application to movement concepts and strategies.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

Students prepare for and participate in a selected sport or physical activity, working collaboratively with one or more other people in a group. Students undertake at least one coaching role within the group (Technical, Tactical, Motivational or Fitness), where through the creation of targeted strategies which are implemented outside the performance environment aim to improve team performance.

Through an analysis and evaluation of implemented strategies and team or individual performance, students evaluate and analyse the impact their role had on the participation and performance of other group member(s).

Students provide evidence of their learning in relation to the following assessment design criteria: A1, A2, A4, AE1, AE2 and AE3.

**Response structure:**

The more successful responses commonly:

* ensured all required specific features were addressed throughout the task
* clearly identified which specific feature they were addressing throughout the task
* refined (or narrowed) the focus of their coaching roles for team improvement, e.g. exploiting front court space in badminton or muscular power of the legs in volleyball
* clearly defined goals using the SMART principle for performance improvement
* avoided lengthy introductions and used multimodal formats effectively (e.g. within time limit and not sped up)
* allocated a greater portion of the word count/time limit to evaluating the effectiveness of strategies and reflecting on performance improvement
* use of A1, A4 and AE1 flowed through A2, AE2 and AE3.

The less successful responses commonly:

* had students undertaking roles that were not specified in the subject outline or multiple roles
* response was a recount of the competition in which they participated, rather than addressing the specific features
* demonstrated limited or no links to a key focus area to support evaluation of strategies or performance/participation improvement (or lack of)
* spent large amounts of words/time explaining/introducing the task, their role and/or the roles of others
* did not have clear goals/aims for strategies or improvement
* when voice overs were used it was sped up too fast, making it hard to identify evidence of specific features
* included large amounts of evidence of either strategies or performance in the appendix and did not use key information to support judgements
* drew on knowledge and understanding from a focus area that did not relate to their role e.g. application of training principles when evaluating types of practice or fitness coach using types of practice e.g. CLA as strategy for improvement
* described the process of collecting evidence.

Evaluation of Implemented Strategies

The more successful responses commonly:

* included implemented strategies that were informed by KU from a specific focus area e.g. training methods or types of practice and based on evidence, which then set them up to better evaluate whether their strategies were effective or not in achieving their intended purpose and design
* strategies focussed on a narrow range of focus areas throughout which encouraged deep, refined and accurate contextual application to movement concepts and strategies e.g. ecological learning theory applied to constraint led approaches to learning or energy, fitness factors and training principles applied to training methods
* implemented strategies for improvement were implemented outside the performance environment (e.g. student evaluated the strategies they implemented in training sessions to improve performance e.g. the design on practice environments to improve team application of zone defence in Basketball)
* evaluation of strategies contextually applied knowledge and understanding from a focus area and used multiple forms of quantitative and qualitative evidence from both performance and the strategy. Heavily supported by A1, A4 and AE1
* provided specific examples and applied understanding as reasons to justify whether they were effective or ineffective.

The less successful responses commonly:

* described implemented strategies rather than evaluating their effectiveness towards improvements in performance/participation
* implemented or evaluated strategies that were not connected to their role and/or not informed by the application of relevant KU and evidence e.g. a fitness coach implementing strategies based on KU associated with types of practice instead of training methods and principles
* strategies were not clear, or response focussed on the strategies implemented by other students
* evaluated the implementation of tactics e.g. zone defence (performance measures) rather than strategies employed (outside performance) to improve performance of the selected tactics e.g. response evaluated the effectiveness of applying a zone defence within performance not the implemented strategies used to improve teams ability to apply a zone defence
* displayed limited evidence from either strategies or performance to evaluate effectiveness of implemented strategies
* included too many strategies, which led to minimal or surface level evaluation of their effectiveness
* provided students with limited numbers of opportunities for coaching through which to implement and evaluate strategies

Evaluation of Improvement in Performance and/or participation

The more successful responses commonly:

* made clear judgements about performance improvement (or lack of) and examined parts or components of performance or participation improvement (or lack of)
* displayed a narrow coaching focus, which allowed for insightful reflection of performance or participation improvement e.g. effective use of three hits in volleyball
* reflected on performance improvement (or lack of) from different perspectives, giving consideration to various factors that may have influenced improvement outcomes
* made judgements about performance improvement with support from multiple forms of evidence and correctly linked to a focus area e.g. ecological dynamics
* reflected on improvement which demonstrated an appreciation for the complex, multidimensional nature of performance or participation improvement
* made judgments about the value or level of improvement which were supported with multiple forms of evidence
* utilised more than one measure for evaluating performance and/or participation improvement, specifically examining components of improvement beyond game/match results.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on their own participation and/or performance
* described levels of enjoyment of the task throughout
* made superficial judgements about improvement in performance/participation (or lack of) which were based on limited evidence e.g. statistics or fitness testing results at the end of competition
* provided one-dimensional reflections on performance and participation and did not examine the multidimensional aspects of performance improvement e.g. team improvement was solely based on fitness test results.

Application of collaborative skills

The more successful responses commonly:

* integrated collaboration skills and their intended outcome throughout the response as a core component of their coaching role, rather than collaboration being an ‘add-on’. e.g. collaboration was evident in initial performance analysis to define goals for improvement and/or in the co- design of strategies aimed at improving performance
* applied a range of collaborative skills throughout that were tailored to an intended outcome aimed at improving performance/participation
* evidence of student collaboration was clear and focussed on the individual rather than describing the collective collaboration process of the team group
* effectively utilised a framework or supporting information source (for example the ACER Collaboration Framework) to guide the application of collaborative skills, supported with specific examples from their coaching role.

The less successful responses commonly:

* made general statements about collaboration, such as “we collaborated well” and did not focus on their collaborative skills
* displayed some evidence (often at the end of the task) of collaboration (such as email or group messages) as their demonstration of A2, however, did not elaborate on their collaborative skills within the evidence
* displayed groups talking, without being able to hear what was being said
* included evidence of collaboration that was staged or scripted
* displayed no evidence of A2 throughout the task at all
* described their team/group collaborative journey (e.g. storming to norming rather than their applied collaborative skills e.g. questioning techniques).

General comments about all forms of assessment

* Ensure learning and assessment requirements for tasks are updated according to the current subject outline rather than relying on previous tasks informed by earlier and outdated subject outlines e.g. numerous tasks included specific feature of future recommendations removed for 2023.
* Upload of material to Schools Online should include all relevant evidence for viewing that can be considered within the word count/time limit. Be aware of students referencing evidence or links that require access to the school IT network as these cannot be accessed.
* Where possible, teachers are encouraged to reduce/condense file sizes of documents/videos to facilitate access (see [Handbrake instructions](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https:/www.sace.sa.edu.au/documents/652891/f086d711-c6b9-fa4f-d4fb-3a696764097d) for assistance).
* Ensure when students are using a combination of multimodal and words on PowerPoints the combined total does not exceed the word count.
* When utilising multimodal formats, consideration should be given to ensuring visual and auditory information can be received/processed simultaneously when task is being viewed.
* Multimodal formats requiring no extra input from the marker (e.g. a video that plays through or a PowerPoint that plays and transitions automatically) better ensured students met the maximum word count/time limit. Students who utilised PowerPoint with combinations of text to be read and videos/sound to be played often exceeded limits when consideration had to be given to the word count + video length combinations.
* Students should be provided with learning opportunities explicitly focused on demonstrating competencies of analysis and evaluation, with a link to A3, AE1, AE2 and AE3. Students need to understand and demonstrate how reflection, analysis and evaluation are different to description.
* Utilise the tools available on the [SACE website](https://www.sace.sa.edu.au/web/physical-education/support-materials/advice-and-strategies) that provide support for learning and assessment.