# 2019 French Continuers 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.

# School Assessment

This year the quality of the responses tended to be quite varied; the students who had a better command of the language were able to use sophisticated language in complex structures with accurate grammar and tenses. This does not mean that there were not errors but the standard was impressive. Less successful responses tended to include short, accurate sentence structures but these lacked depth and detail to fully excite and engage the reader.

Teachers should provide students with examples of past work as an illustration of what is A grade standard. Reference to the benchmarked samples available in Plato would also be of benefit to discuss with students, and allow teachers to be more aware of how to grade more accurately to the performance standards.

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The folio should consist of between three and five tasks and include one each of interaction, text production, and text analysis. An increasing number of schools are choosing to include the minimum number of three tasks. Students are not disadvantaged if their folio consists of only three summative tasks.

Interaction

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided a detailed and accurate interaction
* included sophisticated language and structures that flowed due to the use of a range of cohesive devices
* used a range of vocabulary and expressions including idioms / colloquialisms
* went beyond the rehearsed, where conversation ran liberally over a range of topics
* included accurate pronunciation and enunciation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* struggled to answer quite basic questions indicating that this task was ill-prepared
* were unable to expand on the topics covered
* lacked depth in their ideas
* were hesitant and used Anglicisms when vocabulary was forgotten
* used inaccurate grammar i.e. tenses or incorrect use of object or emphatic pronouns.

Text Production

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided students with ample guidance to perform well against the performance standards due to effective and clear task design
* allowed for a range of responses to be made e.g. blog, diary entry or article for the same topic
* showed breadth and depth in the treatment of their responses
* presented imaginative/thoughtful ideas to support their response
* used a range of expressive language that was varied and grammatically and structurally correct
* followed the requirements of the text type
* could communicate effectively by using logical and accurate structures that flowed impeccably from one idea to the next.

The less successful responses commonly:

* disregarded the “context, purpose and audience” requirement of the task
* used simplistic structures and vocabulary that imparted limited information
* did not provide enough detail and depth to given task criteria.

Text Analysis

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided accurate and detailed answers
* could readily describe the stylistic features of the texts and provide relevant examples as justification
* included tasks that allowed for higher order thinking and challenged the student
* indicated an understanding in how to analyse and provided judgement in the reflection.

The less successful responses commonly:

* ignored the tone, register, stylistic and language features expected for this task
* indicated that students had not read the question fully and so responses were brief and lacked depth in understanding
* did not include sufficient analysis and reflection - or was ignored completely
* provided translated sections from the text without providing reasoning / reference for its inclusion.

Teachers need to be mindful of the texts they choose for their students as some do not include questions to encourage analysis and reflection. Furthermore, questions in some past exam papers do not include any reference to “tone, register, stylistic and language features” that students are required to address in their responses. These are required criteria in this section and are included in the performance standards.

Similarly, teachers are reminded that the two texts chosen should have some common theme, as dissimilar texts cannot allow students to make relevant and insightful comparisons, placing them at a disadvantage against other students when graded to the performance standards.

As stated in previous years,transcripts of audio texts, task sheets and marked performance standards must be provided for moderation.

Assessment Type 2: In-depth Study

Students complete an investigation demonstrating research and personal reflection on a cultural or social aspect or issue of a topic or subtopic associated with ‘The French-speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’ themes. Students should complete three tasks: an oral presentation, a written or multimodal response in French and a reflective response in English.

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed real evidence of research
* showed a variety of tasks on their topic
* were original and accurately expressed
* discussed a contemporary issue with a French-speaking world connection that students could relate to and could easily be compared to one in Australia
* provided detail, breadth and depth to the chosen topic and included critical reflection
* recordings of oral presentations are clear, detailed and logically presented with a high degree of sophisticated language used.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a narrow field of knowledge and was superficial in breadth and depth due to poor choice of topic
* tended to present repetitive information
* provided little evidence of purpose, audience or context
* lacked originality and interest thus not engaging the audience
* provided limited reflection but a summary of their information.

It should be noted by teachers that oral presentations should be clear and audible without background interference and copied to USB for moderation. Additionally, questions must not be asked at the end of the oral presentation.

# External Assessment

## Assessment Type 3: Examination

The examination consists of two assessments: an oral examination and a written examination.

Oral Examination

The oral examination of 10–15 minutes comprises a general conversation and a discussion of the student’s in-depth study. In the conversation, students converse with the examiners about their personal world.

Section 1: Conversation

The more successful responses commonly:

* were elaborate and extended
* flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively, using a wide range of questions framed flexibly
* were lively and interesting
* were relevant, structured, and detailed
* demonstrated depth of knowledge and the correct use of tenses, agreements and vocabulary
* used common expressions, such as ‘Terminale’ for Year 12/Stage 2, ‘matière’ for school subject, ‘bien, bon, mal, mauvais,’ étudier, ajouter.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* were dependent on questions being asked to encourage interaction
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* were dependent on English word order patterns and some anglicised expressions.

Section 2: Discussion

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a depth of research and exploration of the chosen topic that was of obvious interest to the students
* demonstrated a clear and substantial link to the themes of ‘The French-Speaking Communities’ or ‘The Changing World’
* were able to answer a wide range of questions with clear, articulate, and well-referenced responses to aspects of their research highlighted on the in-depth study outline for oral examinations
* involved discussion that flowed smoothly, demonstrating that students had practised extensively and had depth and breadth of knowledge of their research
* involved discussions that were often lively and interesting
* were relevant, structured, and detailed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* demonstrated limited ability to maintain interaction
* demonstrated limited research and knowledge of the topic.

Written Examination

Section 1: Listening and Responding

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the texts
* read and interpreted the questions to provide correct information
* provided detailed answers to stylistic and language feature questions
* used evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, detail and accuracy of information, including confusing genders and names of speakers, and attributing details to the wrong speaker
* lacked depth, detail and accuracy of stylistic and language features, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* contained limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part A

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of the texts
* provided detailed answers to the questions, including all required details, e.g. providing four reasons when asked to provide 4 reasons
* made connections between the two texts
* used extensive evidence from the texts paraphrased into English to support their answers
* provided thoughtful reflection where required.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth and detail, often providing incorrect or untranslated evidence to support their answers
* provided limited evidence from the texts to support their answers.

Section 2: Reading and Responding, Part B

Students are reminded that they should not inadvertently identify themselves, their schools or their teachers when writing about personal topics. The anonymity of the assessment process is paramount.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an understanding of how to write a letter/email and address it appropriately to the local mayor
* provided relevant and detailed examples for each criterion for the award
* demonstrated a keen interest in nominating the person for the award
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors
* were thoughtful, structured, and detailed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* needed to meet the required minimum word count
* demonstrated limited ability to structure a letter/email or provide details and examples for each criterion.

Section 3: Writing in French

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a passion for and interest in the topic selected
* provided a well-written, structured, and interesting response, which engaged the reader
* demonstrated an excellent knowledge of grammatical concepts, tense, and connectors
* contained appropriately selected idiomatic expressions and grammatical concepts
* demonstrated evidence of planning
* contained a few errors, but they did not impede the meaning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth, grammatical correctness, and detail
* used Anglicism or invented French expressions to communicate their ideas
* needed to meet the required minimum word count
* were superficial in their treatment of the selected topic.