VCE First Languages (Units 3 and 4: 2023–2027)

*Chinese First Language, Indonesian First Language, Japanese First Language, Korean First Language, Vietnamese First Language*

School-based Assessment report

This report provides advice for the implementation of the VCE First Language study designs (2022–2026). The respective Advice for teachers for First Language studies provides teaching and learning advice for Units 1 to 4 and assessment advice for school-based assessment in Units 3 and 4. Other support materials for these studies can be found on the relevant study webpage on the [VCAA website](https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/Pages/HomePage.aspx).

General comments

This report is based on the findings from the 2022 School-based Assessment Audit for Units 3 and 4 VCE First Language studies. Schools providing the VCE must deliver the course to the standards established by the VCAA, ensure the integrity of student assessments and ensure compliance with the requirements of the VCAA for the relevant assessment program. For school-based assessment, the standards and requirements are stated in the assessment specifications set out in the relevant VCE study design and the VCE assessment principles. The School-based Assessment Audit checks that the standards and requirements set out in study designs are being followed and that assessment is being carried out in line with the VCE assessment principles.

In 2022, Unit 3 and Unit 4 audits were conducted for four of the five of the VCE First Language studies, the exception being Korean First Language. This report presents the findings from the audits for all four First Language studies that were audited. All of the advice and information in this report applies to all five of the VCE First Language studies.

The audit showed that schools were generally well prepared for the implementation of the reaccredited VCE First Language study designs. Teachers showed a good understanding of the requirements of the study designs and the information provided in Advice for teachers’ resources. On the whole, teachers created tasks that allowed students to demonstrate their achievement of the key knowledge and key skills.

Most schools that were audited indicated that teachers created their own School-assessed Coursework tasks, rather than relying on publicly available materials such as commercial tasks. Schools are to be commended for devising their own unique School-assessed Coursework tasks tailored to their specific cohort of students. This not only provided students with the best possible opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the key knowledge and key skills but also ensured authentication risks were minimised. Teachers consulted a range of resources to develop tasks. These included the Advice for teachers and textbooks, as well as resources developed by teacher networks and relevant subject associations.

However, a small number of audited schools were using examination material to develop School-assessed Coursework tasks. Schools are reminded that when School-assessed Coursework tasks are created using materials available in the public domain, these resources need to be carefully checked against the requirements of the study design, and materials must be modified significantly. Schools must also ensure that School-assessed Coursework tasks used for school-based assessment are significantly different from any publicly available materials to ensure that student work can be authenticated sufficiently. Any materials available in the public domain are potentially accessible to students, and those who access these materials prior to undertaking their School-assessed Coursework tasks may gain an unfair advantage. Teachers are strongly encouraged to create entirely new School-assessed Coursework tasks or to significantly redesign previously used School-assessed Coursework tasks to suit the changes in the study design rather than relying on commercially produced resources.

A small number of audited schools did not have in place appropriate authentication measures to ensure that the work of each student was genuinely their own. Even when tasks are conducted under test conditions, schools must have policies and processes in place to deal with potential and actual breaches of authentication. For schools that have more than one campus, or that have multiple classes that are not taught concurrently, School-assessed Coursework tasks need to be modified for each class, to ensure that each class is given a unique task.

The audit found that schools generally had well-developed procedures to moderate student work, ensuring consistency of assessment between teachers and classes. In most cases, appropriate cross-marking within the same school or with another school took place.

It was also noted that in most cases, schools had strategies in place to provide opportunities for students who received ‘Not Satisfactory’ for either Unit 3 or Unit 4 to redeem the result. A small number of respondents were unclear about the process by which a student could redeem an N result, suggesting the need for closer communication between the VCE Coordinator and the teacher at the school level.

The audit showed that in most cases, assessment timelines were appropriate to enable students to develop the required key knowledge and key skills for each outcome and to receive timely feedback on their performance. Schools spread School-assessed Coursework tasks out evenly over the unit, ensuring students had adequate time to learn, consolidate and expand their knowledge and skills.

Most schools indicated that they were using the VCAA performance descriptors to assess student performance for School-based Assessment tasks. In some cases, these were modified for ease of assessment. Teachers are reminded that they may edit the VCAA performance descriptors to suit their individual assessment tasks.

Teachers are reminded to consult the Advice for teachers’ resource for their study, which contains information on developing a learning and assessment program, teaching and learning activities, sample approaches to developing an assessment task, performance descriptors, resource lists, information about writing styles and text types, and employability skills.

When responding to the School-based Assessment Audit, schools should not merely provide the outcome task question as published in the study design. Responses should contain more detailed information. Teachers are also advised to seek the assistance of the VCE Coordinator when completing the audit questionnaire to ensure that information provided aligns with the school’s documented policies.

In other cases, audits did not meet requirements as the VCE assessment principles of validity, equitability and efficiency were not adequately demonstrated. Common issues identified included the following:

* Some of the instructions that were provided to the students about the School-assessed Coursework tasks lacked detail and were not clear. It is important that tasks clearly articulate the topics and the subtopic of the assessment, the task type, the length of the assessment, the assessment criteria and the conditions under which the assessment task is to be conducted.
* Students were being over-assessed on the outcome, the time allocated was not appropriate, or the task may have caused undue stress for students.
* Some task types and terminology used were not in line with the requirements of the current study design.

Specific information

Unit 3

Area of Study 1: Interpersonal communication

Outcome 1

Present and exchange information, opinions and experiences and respond to questions.

**Task type option(s)**

A four- to five-minute evaluative oral presentation, focusing on points for and against an aspect related to texts studied, and a response to questions.

Most audited schools demonstrated that teachers had generated suitable tasks that provided students with opportunities to develop skills and knowledge to evaluate the subject matter in a spoken presentation in the relevant language. For this task, students deliver an evaluative oral presentation of four- to five-minutes’ duration. Straight after the presentation, the teacher must ask several follow-up questions in spoken language, and students will respond.

The strongest responses to the audit included clear instructions for students about the School-assessed Coursework task. The information was given to students well in advance, informing them of the nature of the task, the conditions under which the task would be completed, the key knowledge and the key skills students were expected to demonstrate, the assessment criteria, and that the School-assessed Coursework task would be recorded.

A positive finding from the audit was that schools devised their own unique School-assessed Coursework tasks that were tailored to their specific cohort of students. Schools also indicated that the presentation would be delivered to the teacher, and that the follow-up questions would be asked by the teacher. This ensures authentication of the task as students would not be able to rote-learn a scripted response to the follow-up questions.

The key knowledge and the key skills in the study design should be addressed throughout the preparation for this outcome. For example, students should not only develop skills to present ideas and concepts related to the subtopic, but also to use appropriate language to present ideas both for and against a proposition, and to exchange, negotiate, justify and elaborate upon attitudes, values and ideas.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* Some tasks that were submitted did not include or describe a specific issue for students to evaluate; tasks focused more on simply exchanging relevant information. Care must be taken when designing the task to ensure that it clearly requires students to evaluate an issue, and that the task is not too generic. Students need an opportunity to demonstrate a breadth and depth of grammatical structures and vocabulary.
* Weaker responses indicated that schools were giving students sparse, unclear or contradictory information in the School-assessed Coursework materials, such as incorrect task types or more than one marking scheme. Care must be taken to ensure that students are given clear, correct information, and that the stated marks in the criteria align with the maximum scores for School-assessed Coursework tasks that are published in the study design.
* A small number of schools gave students a task that required them to adopt the viewpoint of an adult expert in a specific field. Adding this requirement is unnecessary and may not be authentic. Assessment should be accessible, should be reasonable to all VCE students and should not cause undue stress.
* A small number of schools indicated that classmates would ask the student the follow-up questions after the evaluative oral presentation. In order to ensure that assessment is fair and equitable for all students, it is the teacher who asks questions, not other students.
* Some audit responses indicated that schools gave students a choice of task but the options covered different topics and subtopics. Schools are reminded that when students are offered a choice of tasks, they should fall under the one theme, topic and subtopic, and they must be comparable in scope and demand. School-assessed Coursework tasks should reflect students’ learning in the unit of work taught, and the topic chosen for the School-assessed Coursework task is required to match the Themes/Topics table listed in the study design. This is to ensure that the assessment tasks are not excessive in their scope and that due consideration is given to student workload.

Assessment

The majority of schools indicated that they scheduled their Outcome 1 assessment within Weeks 4–6 of Term 1 or early Term 2.

Most schools indicated that they used the VCAA performance descriptors or modified the descriptors in order to allocate marks to the task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate, informing students of the depth, complexity and detail required.

Area of Study 1: Investigation and presentation

Outcome 2

Analyse and use information from spoken and viewed texts.

**Task type option(s)**

Written responses to specific questions or instructions, analysing and using the information provided in the texts.

Outcome 2 requires students to summarise and synthesise information from a range of sources. Teachers are reminded that the spoken and viewed stimulus texts should be on the same selected subtopic so that students are able to analyse elements of spoken and viewed texts, noting their particularities, as well as recognise speakers’ intentions, attitudes and perspectives in the texts. Teachers need to ensure that the selected stimulus texts and the questions provide opportunity for students to summarise and synthesise ideas and information in order to answer specific questions and instructions in the language.

The audit found that the key knowledge and key skills were generally covered in a thorough manner. There was a high level of understanding about how to design this assessment task. Choice of topic is crucial to ensure that students can achieve at their highest possible level. If the topic is very sophisticated, requiring technical vocabulary and expressions, it may not be accessible to students who have a lower ability. The task needs to enable students of all levels to demonstrate their skill.

The audit showed that teachers selected suitable spoken and viewed texts. Teachers selected a range of spoken stimulus texts in varying lengths. The viewed texts included posters, photos, graphs, charts, images with captions, and videos. Teachers are reminded that viewed texts may also include photographs, drawings, maps, films or posters. It is not a requirement that the viewed text be a film or film clip.

The audit showed that, generally, the task questions were designed appropriately. Successful tasks required students to identify and interpret key ideas and detail. Tasks also required students to connect and compare ideas and identify different points of view. Schools are reminded that there should be questions with a range of difficulty to allow students to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the texts and to analyse ideas presented. Many tasks included a variety of questions, including some that required a paragraph response. While it was common for tasks to focus on lower order questions, such as ‘who’, ‘what’ and ‘why’, many tasks also included higher order command terms such as ‘explain’, ‘discuss’ and so on. This provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate their highest level of performance.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* Some schools split the School-assessed Coursework task into two smaller tasks: Listening and Responding; and Viewing and Responding. This approach is not in line with the requirements of the study design. Providing two sets of questions that address each stimulus text separately denies students an opportunity to synthesise information, which is one of the key skills for the outcome.
* In some tasks that were submitted, either no viewed text or no spoken text was included as a stimulus, or a written text was given as a stimulus. This resulted in students being given incomplete or incorrect stimulus materials. Therefore, a significant portion of the key knowledge and key skills were not addressed. Please note that for Unit 3 Outcome 2, teachers are required to provide two or more texts that must include a combination of spoken and viewed texts.
* There were a small number of submissions that designed the Outcome 2 School-assessed Coursework tasks to focus on more than one subtopic rather than requiring students to focus on one subtopic. To reduce student workload in preparation for the task, students should not be required to prepare for multiple subtopics.
* There were some audited schools that did not provide clear enough instructions to students about how they were expected to use the stimulus texts. Students should be explicitly directed to draw on both texts when responding to questions.
* There were a small number of schools that provided a visual stimulus text that did not provide very much scope for interpretation or comprehension. Teachers are advised to select visual texts that offer students adequate opportunity to draw a range of information out and to link it to the information drawn from other texts.
* A small number of audited schools indicated that they used stimulus texts sourced from past examinations. It is recommended that if using stimulus materials from the public domain, that schools significantly modify the materials in order to prevent authentication issues. Teachers are reminded that advice about Authentication is provided in the VCE Administrative Handbook.

Assessment

Most of the audited schools chose to set this School-assessed Coursework task around Week 4 of Term 2. Most schools indicated that they used the VCAA performance descriptors or modified the descriptors in order to allocate marks to the task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate in reflecting the depth, complexity and detail required. It is a requirement that the performance descriptors/modified marking scheme be explained to the students prior to the assessment being undertaken.

Area of Study 3: Presentational communication

Outcome 3

Express ideas through the production of original imaginative written texts.

**Task type option(s)**

A 500–600-character / 350–400-word / 1400–1600 ji / 1000–1200 cha / imaginative written piece

The audit responses indicated that schools addressed most of the key knowledge and key skills in their teaching and learning programs, and that the tasks generally provided students with scope to demonstrate achievement of the outcome. While most schools indicated that they were aware of the requirements of the reaccredited study design, some schools re-used assessment tasks that were based on the previous study design.

Tasks that were submitted covered subtopics such as fairy tales, myths, the environment, artificial intelligence and space travel. Most teachers selected subtopics that suited the development of skills in writing for storytelling, and the text types suitable to these styles of writing.

The strength of successfully designed tasks was evident when there was enough scope in the subtopic for students of all abilities to perform at their highest level. Most of the set tasks that were submitted provided adequate direction to students in defining a suitable text type and an audience for each imaginative writing task prompt. The task should clearly indicate the style of the writing required for the response. Teachers should also indicate the expected word length of the response, which is specified in the study design.

There were different approaches to setting this task. In many cases, teachers provided a number of options for the writing task. However, in other schools, one writing prompt was given to all students. Teachers are reminded that it is not a requirement to offer students a choice of task. If choices are given, it is essential that options are comparable in terms of scope and demand.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* Some of the tasks did not lend themselves well to a response in an imaginative style of writing. Some of the tasks that were submitted may have elicited a response that was persuasive, personal or informative in nature. Imaginative writing tasks need to be less prescriptive and more open in terms of scope. It is recommended that teachers utilise the *Advice for teachers’* *Main characteristics of text types* and *Main characteristics of writing styles,* available on the *Advice for teachers’* webpage for their study, to assist in the development of the required skills for imaginative writing.
* Some tasks offered students choices of options that were drawn from a range of topics and subtopics, and the task options were therefore not equitable in scope and demand. This method of task design requires students to prepare for several subtopics for this outcome, which is not reasonable. Where students are offered a choice of tasks for Outcome 3, they should all focus on the one subtopic that was taught in class in the lead-up to the outcome task. This is to avoid over-assessment. Schools should consider issues of student workload in preparing for School-assessed Coursework tasks. Assessment should not generate undue stress for students that may unduly diminish their performance.
* Some schools were asked to rewrite the tasks for this outcome as they required students to write to a word length that exceeded that published word limit in the study design. Teachers are reminded not to over assess students for School-assessed Coursework tasks.
* There were also schools that were required to review the time allocation for this task. Teachers are reminded that the timeframe of 80 minutes, which is suggested in the *Advice for teachers*, may be an appropriate length of time to set for the completion of this task.
* Some submissions provided instructions for students that were incomplete, contradictory or unclear. Teachers are reminded to provide clear instructions that clearly state the timeframe, any materials allowed into the School-assessed Coursework and that tasks are worded very clearly.
* Some of the audit submissions indicated that schools re-used assessment tasks that had been created for the previous study design and that were therefore incorrect. Schools must be referring to the latest version of the study design when designing School-assessed Coursework tasks.
* Some submissions indicated that schools are running multiple classes that complete the same School-assessed Coursework task at different times. Please note that where there is a time lapse between classes undertaking a School-assessed Coursework task, it is imperative that each class completes a different, comparable task. Schools must ensure that robust processes are in place to ensure tasks are delivered equitably and that student work can be authenticated adequately.

Assessment

Most schools scheduled this School-assessed Coursework task at the end of Term 2, providing students with opportunities to practise the different styles of writing in the different text types and to deepen their understanding of the concepts and ideas embedded in the subtopic.

Most schools indicated that they used the VCAA performance descriptors or modified the descriptors in order to allocate marks to the task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate in reflecting the depth, complexity and detail required.

Specific information

Unit 4

Area of Study 1: Interpretive communication

Outcome 1

Analyse and use information from written and viewed texts.

**Task type option(s)**

Written responses to specific questions or instructions analysing and using information provided from the texts.

Many of the audited schools’ assessment tasks were developed in line with the requirements of the study design, covering the key knowledge and key skills appropriately. Outcome 1 requires students to analyse and use information from written and viewed texts on a selected subtopic that is different from the subtopics studied in Areas of Study 2 and 3. Students provide insights into the chosen texts and respond to specific questions or instructions in writing to develop their analytical skills.

Set tasks involved teachers selecting two stimulus texts that relate to the specific subtopic studied in class. Teachers selected a range of appropriate written and viewed texts as stimulus materials for this outcome task. The selected written stimulus texts included articles, survey reports and diary entries. The selected viewed texts included photographs, graphs, posters, videos and charts. Teachers are reminded that it is not a requirement that the viewed text be a film or film clip.

A variety of question types were used in the questions given to students, to ensure that students of all ability levels were able to demonstrate the key knowledge and key skills. Schools are reminded that there should be questions with a range of difficulty to allow students to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the texts and to analyse ideas presented. Many tasks included a variety of questions, including some that required a paragraph response. While it was common for tasks to focus on lower order questions, such as ‘who’, ‘what’ and ‘why’, many tasks also included higher order command terms such as ‘explain’, ‘discuss’ and so on. This provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate their highest level of performance.

Strong responses included clear instructions for students, informing the students that the task involves written responses to questions based on stimulus texts on a particular subtopic. High-quality tasks also clearly stated the length of the task in minutes, the date of the assessment, the allocated mark/weighting that would contribute to the unit result, and the materials and conditions set for the task.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* In some tasks that were submitted, either no written text or no viewed text was included as a stimulus, or a spoken text was given as a stimulus. This resulted in students being given incomplete or incorrect stimulus materials. Therefore, a significant portion of the key knowledge and key skills were not addressed. Please note that for Unit 4 Outcome 1, teachers are required to provide two or more texts that must include a combination of written and viewed texts.
* A small number of submissions indicated that the Outcome 1 School-assessed Coursework consisted of two sub-tasks: a reading comprehension task and a viewing comprehension task. Designing the task as two separate parts does not meet the requirements of the study design because it does not give students an opportunity to demonstrate the key skill for the outcome ‘summarise and synthesise information from different texts’.
* There were a small number of submissions that designed the Outcome 1 School-assessed Coursework tasks to focus on more than one subtopic rather than requiring students to focus on one subtopic. To reduce student workload in preparation for the task, students should not be required to prepare for multiple subtopics.
* In a small number of submissions students were provided an excessive amount of stimulus materials to comprehend. In other submissions, students were expected to examine a large quantity of stimulus material and then produce an extended response that exceeded that for other Unit 4 outcomes. This approach is unnecessary and risks amounting to an over-assessment of this outcome and compromising the assessment principle of efficiency. While it is possible to set more than the minimum number of tasks as stipulated in the VCE study design, student workload issues should be considered. The panel recommended that the scope of the individual tasks be reduced.
* In several submissions, teachers set extended writing tasks that required students to adopt an adult perspective of a professional or an expert. In these cases, the panel recommended that the wording of the task be revised. It may also not be realistic or achievable for a student to adopt such a perspective when responding, and a revision to these tasks may assist students to develop more relevant responses.
* Some schools were asked to review and resubmit tasks because they lacked instructions to students and did not provide appropriate information about the task type, the length of the task and the conditions of the assessment.
* Some submissions indicated that schools are running multiple classes that complete the same School-assessed Coursework task at different times. Please note that where there is a time lapse between classes undertaking a School-assessed Coursework task, each class must sit a different, comparable task. Schools must ensure that robust processes are in place to ensure tasks are delivered equitably and that student work can be authenticated adequately.

Assessment

While most schools that were audited scheduled the assessment in the first four weeks of Term 3, some schools scheduled it at the end of Term 3.

Most schools indicated that they used the VCAA performance descriptors or modified the descriptors in order to allocate marks to the task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate in reflecting the depth, complexity and detail required.

In some cases, schools indicated that they developed and used their own performance descriptors. In this case, the marking scheme used to assess a student’s level of performance should accurately reflect the key knowledge and key skills as prescribed in the study design for the outcome. They should also be very clear and be explained to students before they commence the task.

Area of Study 2: Presentational communication

Outcome 2

Respond critically to spoken, viewed and written texts which reflect aspects of language and culture through the extended study.

**Task type option(s)**

A 500–600-character / 350–400-word / 1400–1600 ji / 1000–1200 cha persuasive or evaluative written response to the extended study.

For the extended study of language and culture, students are required to focus on a subtopic related to language and culture, drawn from one of the prescribed topics of *Literature and the Arts, Stories from the past* or *Youth* *issues* under the theme ‘Tradition and change in Language-speaking communities’ listed in the table of prescribed themes and topics, and suggested subtopics.

Outcome 2 requires students to produce a critical response to spoken, viewed and written texts which reflect aspects of language and culture. Students study the author’s/director’s/composer’s/artist’s intent, as well as the relationship between the context in which the text was produced, the text itself, the author and the audience.

In general, audit responses demonstrated that teachers had read the study design. Most of the tasks that were submitted were in line with the requirements of the study design. In most cases, the instructions to the students were clear about the task type, the length of the assessment and the conditions under which it was to be completed.

The task questions that were provided were generally appropriate and offered adequate opportunity for students to demonstrate the key knowledge and key skills for the outcome. Tasks were designed to give students the opportunity to produce extended responses that drew upon information presented across all the stimulus texts.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* Some schools were asked to redesign their tasks, to ensure that the theme, topic and subtopic that is the focus of the Outcome 2 task was aligned to one of the three prescribed topics stated in the study design for the extended study of Literature and the Arts, stories from the past or youth issue.
* There were also some audit submissions that indicated that students were studying different subtopics for Outcomes 2 and 3. However, as stated in the study design, the extended study is conducted over Areas of Study 2 and 3, and approximately 15 hours of scheduled class time should be devoted to the extended study. These schools were asked to redesign their tasks to ensure that one selected subtopic would form the basis for the teaching and the School-based Assessment for both Outcomes 2 and 3.
* Some audit submissions included no evidence that students were undertaking critical analysis or a study of the author’s/director’s/composer’s/artist’s intent, as well as the relationship between the context in which the text was produced, the text itself, the author and the audience. As this task forms the assessment for the Extended Study of Language and Culture, these schools were asked to revise tasks to ensure that the instructions more clearly directed students to produce a critical response, and to more explicitly instruct them to refer to the written, spoken and viewed texts that they studied during class time.
* In addition, in some audit submissions, the audit panel was not able to determine that the Extended Study was being designed in a way that required students to undertake a critical analysis or a study of the author’s/director’s/composer’s/artist’s intent, as well as the relationship between the context in which the text was produced, the text itself, the author and the audience. For these submissions, teachers were asked to review the information in the First Language Study Design about the Extended Study.
* There were a small number of schools that designed the Outcome 2 task in a way that required students to respond on the School-assessed Coursework day to unseen texts. In these cases, students were expected to respond to a large volume of stimulus materials in a short timeframe. Teachers were reminded that the task can be based on previously read/viewed/heard stimulus texts that were presented during class for the extended study. This also ensures that student workload can be taken into consideration and that over-assessment of the outcome can be avoided. Teachers are advised to refer to the FAQ for guidance. This is available as a download from the relevant VCE study page, under the heading ‘Support Material’.
* Some schools provided task options for Outcome 2 that did not clearly enough specify which style of writing students were required to produce in their responses. These schools were asked to adjust the wording of each task option to more clearly specify whether students needed to produce evaluative or persuasive writing. They were also asked to ensure that the stated purpose of the task more closely aligned with the nominated text type and the style of writing chosen for assessment. A book review, for example, will typically be written in an evaluative (not a persuasive) style. For persuasive tasks, the purpose, audience and context of the task should be aligned to support students to develop relevant persuasive style responses. For information and guidance about the main characteristics of the five different writing styles, teachers should refer to the Word document called ‘Main characteristics of different writing styles’ which is in the ‘Resources’ section of the relevant First Language Advice for teachers:
* A number of schools were asked to re-word the task instructions given to students for Outcome 2, to ensure that the word limit for the student response aligns with the published length in the study design.
* In some cases, the instructions provided to the students lacked detail, such as how much time would be provided to complete the task, whether support materials could be brought into the task, and what kind of response students were expected to produce.

Assessment

Schools indicated that they scheduled this assessment around the middle of Term 3. Most schools indicated that they used the VCAA performance descriptors or modified the descriptors in order to allocate marks to the task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate in reflecting the depth, complexity and detail required.

Area of Study 3: Interpersonal communication

Outcome 3

Exchange information, ideas and opinions in response to spoken, viewed and written texts which reflect aspects of language and culture through the extended study.

**Task type option(s)**

A four- to five-minute interview on an issue related to the texts studied for the extended study.

For the extended study of language and culture, students are required to focus on a subtopic related to language and culture, drawn from one of the prescribed topics of *Literature and the Arts, Stories from the past* or *Youth* *issues* under the theme ‘Tradition and change in Language-speaking communities’ listed in the table of prescribed themes and topics, and suggested subtopics.

Outcome 3 requires students to exchange information, ideas and opinions in response to spoken, viewed and written texts which reflect aspects of language and culture through the extended study. Students justify conclusions or outcomes associated with their interpretation and understanding of the spoken, viewed and written texts studied, and they speak to a particular stance or provide a balanced reflection on an issue.

Many schools chose to upload an Outcome 3 task for feedback from the audit panel. In a number of submissions, materials showed that the key knowledge and key skills were covered well and that schools provided students with relevant information on the assessment well in advance, ensuring that students had time to develop their skills. The strongest audit responses uploaded tasks that appropriately covered the key knowledge and key skills as set out in the study design, and that included a range of question types to ensure students can demonstrate their highest possible level of performance. Strong responses also clearly indicated the instructions for students, clear information about the conditions for the task, and the time allocated.

However, a small number of poorly prepared tasks were also submitted. In these audits, concerns were noted for the following reasons:

* Some schools were asked to redesign their tasks, to ensure that the theme, topic and subtopic that is the focus of the Outcome 3 task was aligned to one of the three prescribed topics stated in the study design for the extended study of *Literature and the Arts, Stories from the past* or *Youth* *issues*.
* There were also some audit submissions that indicated that students were studying different subtopics for Outcomes 2 and 3. However, as stated in the study design, the extended study is conducted over Areas of Study 2 and 3, and approximately 15 hours of scheduled class time should be devoted to the extended study. These schools were asked to redesign their tasks to ensure that one selected subtopic would form the basis for the teaching and the School-based Assessment for both Outcomes 2 and 3.
* Some schools were also asked to clarify the task instructions that were given to students for Outcome 3. As this task forms the assessment for the Extended Study of Language and Culture, they were asked to ensure that the instructions more clearly direct students to focus on an issue related to the texts studied for the extended study.
* In addition, in some audit submissions, the audit panel was not able to determine that the Extended Study was being designed in a way that required students to demonstrate the key knowledge and key skills in the study design; namely to justify conclusions or outcomes associated with their interpretation and understanding of the spoken, viewed and written texts studied for the extended study. For some submissions, teachers were asked to review the information in the First Language Study Design about the Extended Study.
* There were a small number of schools that designed the Outcome 3 task in a way that required students to analyse unseen texts and to use these as the basis of their interview on the School-assessed Coursework day. In these cases, students were expected to respond to a large volume of stimulus materials in a short timeframe. This is not a requirement. Teachers were reminded that the task can be based on previously read/viewed/heard stimulus texts that were presented during class for the extended study. This also ensures that student workload can be taken into consideration and that over-assessment of the outcome can be avoided. Teachers are advised to refer to the FAQ for guidance. This is available as a download from the relevant VCE study page, under the heading ‘Support Material’.
* There were a small number of schools that were asked to redesign Outcome 3 because they had set the task as an oral presentation, rather than an interview of four- to five-minutes as stipulated in the study design. The design of the interview task must align with what is set out in the study design, not mirror the oral exam specifications.

Assessment

Most schools that were audited opted to use the VCAA descriptors in order to allocate marks for this task. The weightings that were applied were appropriate in reflecting the depth, complexity and detail required.