

18
meetings

64
schools

229
participants

10,000+
data points
generated

WHAT WE HEARD

2022 QUALITY ASSURANCE MEETINGS



Teacher representatives involved in the 2022 Quality Assurance Meeting process were invited to give feedback on their experiences by indicating their degree of agreement (or disagreement) with the following statements. The return rate was 92%.

- ✓ *I was given enough information before and during the meeting to feel informed about the purpose and process.* **95%**
Agreed
- ✓ *I was given clear information about the nature of the bodies of student work required and how to complete the Record Sheets.* **94%**
Agreed
- ✓ *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.* **96%**
Agreed
- ✓ *I valued my involvement in the meeting as a meaningful professional learning opportunity.* **94%**
Agreed

"The entire day has been exceptionally valuable, and it has been a great day for networking."

"Great activity. Our own professional understanding grows organically in the focused, collaborative environment."

"Communication with other teachers of the course was rewarding and helpful."



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

24%
Disagreed

Common issues raised by 2022 survey respondents included:

- individual assessment tasks did not invite students to respond to a nominated criterion, or only a single standard element of a criterion
- bodies of student work far exceeded the scale noted in TASC's course-specific requirements
- some providers seemed to table four bodies of work that 'showcased' their learners' achievement, rather than meeting TASC's requirements for borderline PA/SA samples (when available).

These concerns have been raised in the past, and TASC has responded by clarifying requirements and drawing attention to important points. This has included the use of bold text and increased font size on the course-specific requirements, restating key requirements on each course's 'QA Meeting Checklist', and by noting such issues in communications sent to individual course providers. We will continue to communicate with providers and their representatives to ensure that bodies of student work to be tabled at Quality Assurance Meetings meet the stated requirements.



An opportunity for TASC to improve...

The post-meeting process was clearly explained.

While 87% of respondents agreed with this statement, 13% were unsure or did not agree. Based on this feedback TASC will develop a clear information sheet that explains the process and have these available for teacher reference at 2023 meetings.

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 task/s required for Quality Assurance Meetings are detailed within the course-specific requirements published early 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.



The meeting process was really useful and will help me in making future assessment judgements. Why not have them earlier in the year?

We have explored possible changes to the timing of the Quality Assurance Meetings, most recently in 2021. At that time 57% of respondents said they were happy with the present timing (early September each year). Holding the meetings early in the year could mean that student work is not ready, or that the tabled samples reflect very early achievement in a course. While earlier in Term 3 might be possible, TASC is keenly aware that schools and colleges have very busy periods at this time (with activities such as mid-year exams, exam marking, report writing and interview processes), and that different schools hold these at different points in the term.



What criteria do TASC use in determining whether a course has a physical or on-line meeting?

When considering whether a course will have a physical or on-line meeting two key factors are considered: the number of providers of the course; and their geographic location. For a full process using a physical meeting, at least eight (8) providers in the same region are required. In courses with a low number of providers, and where they are spread geographically (for example, five providers in the South, two in the North, and four on the North-West Coast) an on-line meeting method would be selected.