

18
meetings

69
schools

215
participants

11,000+
data points
generated

WHAT WE HEARD

2023 QUALITY ASSURANCE MEETINGS



Teacher representatives involved in the 2023 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 93% of participants.

- ✓ *The meeting was well administered: guidance and instructions were clear, the venue was appropriate, etc.* **97%**
Agreed
- ✓ *The small group process worked well, and my understanding of the assessment process was enhanced.* **97%**
Agreed
- ✓ *I valued my involvement in the meeting as a meaningful professional learning opportunity.* **94%**
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.* **87%**
Agreed

"The process was fair and authentic."

"Working with teachers from other schools and sharing knowledge is great."

"It gave me a chance to see what other schools do and adjust my marking accordingly."



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

35%

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, that individual assessment tasks did not invite students to respond to a nominated criterion, or only a single standard element of a criterion. In 2023, 35% of participants expressed this concern via indicating uncertainty or disagreement with the survey statement, and via additional written comments. This was an 11% increase from 2022 (when undecided/disagree with the statement was 24%). The course most impacted was *General Mathematics* Level 2. Some 53% of participants in the course's meetings were undecided or disagreed with the survey statement. It is noted that 2023 was the first time that this course had TASC Quality Assurance meetings. The apparent lack of match of student work to nominated criteria may be due to a range of potential factors such as:

- provider-error due to a lack of experience and/or limited understanding of the process
- a lack of clarity in TASC's course-specific requirements
- errors in course-specific requirements.

While TASC will undertake a review of requirements 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

What We Heard About Online Meeting Processes

Participants appreciated:

- time and resources saved not travelling
- freedom to choose workplace location
- greater flexibility re-personal and professional responsibilities.

Participants expressed some concerns:

- lack of personal interactions and depth of professional discussions
- students samples were required earlier than for physical meetings (so as to be checked and uploaded)
- extended screen use can have adverse health impacts
- inability to network with other teachers and build relationships.



Suggested improvement:



It has been suggested that the process be modified so that participants view and discuss one or two samples prior to undertaking individual assessment time. This would allow development of shared understanding and inform individual assessments.

Some FAQs from the Meeting Feedback Forms:



Why does the process look at four criteria – why not focus on one or two?

The Quality Assurance Meeting process aims to ensure the validity and reliability of qualifications issued by TASC. The courses selected for meetings are Level 2 courses where an SA award or higher is used as evidence that a student has achieved one or more of the TCE's 'everyday adult' skill set standards. School-based decisions regarding final ratings have a direct impact on awards that TASC confers, and contributions to the TCE. The borderline between PA and SA in such courses is arguably the most significant for the integrity of the TCE. To interrogate this borderline, a minimum of four criteria are needed to apply a meaningful, abridged version of the award algorithm (the 'rules' for generating awards). For example, many courses have eight criteria and allow two 't' ratings in an SA award. A focus on one or two criteria would not allow for consideration of the award borderline.



Why are four students' bodies of work needed – why not one or two?

Just as selecting four criteria for assessment represents the minimum number need to apply an abridged version of the award algorithm, four bodies of work has been considered the minimum number needed to identify possible patterns. If there was a significant discrepancy in – say – the Provider's rating for Criterion 3 and that of the Meeting (e.g., Provider giving A- and Meeting giving C-) this might be considered a one-off anomaly. On the other hand, if a similar pattern was seen across three of the four student samples for Criterion 3, this would be a strong indication to the school that its understanding of the course's Criterion 3 standards and their application to the evidence of student work was significantly at odds with that of other providers of the same course.



If the meeting gives an overall PA, does that mean that the student must get a PA at the end of the year?

Some participants who were new to the QA Meeting process in 2023 expressed concerned that a PA on a body of work tabled at a QA Meeting may mean that the student would have to receive a PA at the end of the year. This is not the case. Meeting outcomes are not predictions of final results/awards – rather they are the assessment judgements made on the selected body of work on the table, on that day. If the Provider's assessments led to – say – an HA award for a given body of work but the Meeting's led to a PA, this is a clear message to the provider that its application of the standards to the evidence of student work was not aligned with that in other schools and colleges around the state (i.e., they were marking 'too easily'). TASC would expect this advice to be considered and actioned when the provider was determining final internal ratings.

Example Scenario A: Provider says PA, Meeting says PA, Final Ratings give SA.

In this case, both the provider and the meeting agree regarding the standard of the tabled body of work. The final SA reflects that more evidence of student attainment than the sample tabled at the meeting was assessed over the year. Because of the alignment of judgements regarding the sample, there can be confidence in the validity of the final result.

Example Scenario B: Provider says HA, Meeting says PA, Final Ratings give HA.

In this case it *seems* that advice of the Meeting (marking is 'too easy') has not been considered. If there were a pattern of this in the data, the school/college will be asked to explain further.

What We Heard

2023 Quality Assurance Meetings (Version 1.0)

Page 2 of 2