2021 Information Processing and Publishing Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2021 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

Assessment Type 1: Practical Skills

Students should complete three assessment tasks for a 10-credit subject and five assessment tasks for a 20-credit subject, where students apply the design process and layout principles to produce text products in two focus units. Students should evaluate a minimum of one assessment task. These tasks as a set are worth 40%.

For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning primarily in relation to the following assessment design criteria: development and application and analysis and evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a highly proficient application of manipulative and organisational skills using a variety of software to create, store, retrieve and edit to complete practical skill tasks
* included sufficient text within this assessment type
* demonstrated the application of the hierarchy of text within each document created
* demonstrated a clear understanding of the design principles resulting in a consistent and thoughtful application of these design principles
* demonstrated the ability to manipulate images
* included images of high quality and resolution
* demonstrated gradual complexity in skill development as students progressed through each task
* demonstrated formatting of business documents according to Australian business practice standards (e.g. business letters)
* evaluated and/or annotated at least one product utilising the design principles, in addition to evaluating the design process.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited understanding and application of the design principles (DA3)
* did not demonstrate the ability to develop and apply a range of manipulative skills, therefore limiting the variety of techniques and skills demonstrated
* were prescriptive assessment tasks that locked students into the layout, text, and images to use, thus limiting the student’s ability to demonstrate their development of practical skills at the higher levels of DA3 (the application of layout and design principles to the production of text-based documents or presentations)
* applied centre alignment to almost all text and avoided the implementation of other forms of alignment
* had insufficient text to demonstrate text hierarchy effectively in each of the practical skills tasks
* included images of low quality and resolution
* did not undertake a spelling or grammar check, and forgetting to turn off hyphenation
* did not demonstrate an evaluation that focusses on the design process and the annotation of at least one product utilising the design principles.

Other general comments

Avoid zipping each individual practical skills task. All practical skills tasks should be zipped together in one folder which would reduce uploading required per student. Therefore, unzipping would be limited to one folder containing all practical skills tasks, labelled Practical Skills 1 to Practical Skills 5.

Electronic Publishing Focus Area

The more successful practical skills tasks:

* selected appropriate software and hardware to create, store, retrieve and edit to complete electronic publishing tasks
* applied the design principles to create effectively designed websites
* were easy to navigate through by providing appropriate links and anchors
* had effective file management including the easily identifiable home page saved as index
* had each webpage labelled for ease of navigation
* demonstrated the integration of a variety of software and included interactive content
* generated content locally and did not rely on HTML-embedded content which needed an Internet connection.

The less successful practical skills tasks:

* did not use layout suitable for the Web, e.g., wrote from left to right across a page instead of using columns
* produced websites that were hard to navigate through due to lack of anchors, functioning links or site map
* had broken links to images
* lacked file management making it difficult to locate the index page
* used templates or online website generators e.g., WIX which limited student’s ability to demonstrate at the higher levels of development and application
* inserting screen shots of images rather than saving and inserting original images
* submitted non-functional websites that could not be verified for file management and functionality.

Assessment Type 2: Issues Analysis

This assessment type comprises one assessment task for a 10-credit subject and two assessment tasks for a 20‑credit subject, where students discuss and analyse the social, legal and ethical issues related to information processing technologies, such as intellectual property, The 20‑credit subject also requires students to complete a technical operations and understandings task discussing, comparing and making a recommendation for information processing technologies. These tasks as a set are worth 30%.

For this assessment type, students provide evidence of their learning primarily in relation to the following assessment design criteria: understanding and analysis and evaluation.

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly addressed the issue, stating the social, legal and/or ethical effects in at least one task within this assessment type
* referred to Australian laws or examples in context
* Included current and relevant data and statistics, related to the location (e.g. SA data for Adelaide)
* included current, real world and local situations
* analysed and evaluated current hardware and software
* used diagrams such as tables and graphs as supporting evidence of the discussion and to give credibility to the analysis provided
* used primary and secondary sources and included the acknowledgement of sources within the tasks
* responded in continuous prose, which could include the use of clear subheadings to delineate the topic of discussion in a report format
* included references from a range of sources.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used a question-and-answer format
* tended to be general with no specific reference to the specific features of the task
* showed little or no evidence of analysis or evaluation of research undertaken
* included little or no data or utilised international data
* listed product specifications which needed to be analysed and evaluated in the technical operations task
* discussed technologies that were not current
* documented hardware/software features but did not compare and analyse
* lacked detail in the conclusion and recommendation
* did not acknowledge sources and utilised a limited range of sources.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly differentiated all sections of the design process using section dividers (Investigating, Devising, Producing, Evaluating)
* discussed the design process in the evaluation summary using the design language as well as annotating their final products using the design language demonstrating AE2
* in the Investigation section of the design process included annotated examples that related to the final product (at least one sample for each page of the product)
* described a clearly defined target audience including their characteristics, age group and interests of the target audience
* had as close as possible to 1,500 words within the final products
* included a text dump in the producing section of the documentation
* kept to the 1,500-word count for the documentation (investigation, devising and evaluation summaries)
* used the design language of contrast, repetition, alignment, and proximity when annotating samples and when discussing the design process in the three summaries
* investigated products that were similar in type to those being devised and produced
* evaluated the success of their design decisions rather than just recounting the actions taken to create the product
* included consideration, then selection and finally the evaluation of the use of hardware and software throughout the documentation
* included in their evaluation analysis of their final products using the design principles
* acknowledged the sources of text and imagery used in a correctly annotated reference list at the end of the Product and Documentation document
* explained choices of hardware and software in the devising summary
* evaluated hardware/software choices in the evaluation summary
* demonstrated the manipulation of graphics in the devising section of the documentation (before and after), demonstrating highly proficient use of software
* discussed in the devising summary their final choices and why they were made
* used continuous prose in investigating, devising and evaluation summaries
* were not restricted in demonstrating at the higher levels of DA1, DA2 and DA3 in producing their own products as they created their own websites/print products using website authoring software such as Adobe Dreamweaver/InDesign/Word instead of using templates or free website building sites such as Wix, Webflow or Canva for print products

The less successful responses commonly

* did not refer to survey responses in evaluation
* used Lorem Ipsum placer text limiting students’ ability to demonstrate the formatting of text
* unnecessarily explained the image manipulation techniques applied to the manipulation of images
* replicated the annotations for each sample and did not specifically analyse each sample using the design principles of CRAP in particular proximity
* had images that were often pixelated or stretched out of proportion
* scanned final products, reducing their size instead of submitting as part of the documentation as a full page
* centre aligned all text within products demonstrating lack of application of DA2
* did not undertake a spelling or grammar check, often leaving on hyphenation
* did not meet all performance standards being assessed in particular AE2 where students commonly discussed the design process in the evaluation but did not go on to annotate their final products
* used template-based software limiting ability to demonstrate DA3 at the higher levels
* final products were well under the suggested word count.

General comments or observations

* The work of some students was still identifiable.
* Combine all files into one PDF file enabling markers to download one file. This file is easier to navigate through the documentation and allows the final products to retain their quality.
* As a pdf document the final products can be seen as originally created. If a native file is included and the marker does not have the fonts used installed on their device, then the computer’s default fonts will be displayed instead of the used fonts.