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To be Covered

- **First Part**
  - Assessment Framework of IES
  - Features of IES
  - Implementation of IES Assessment

- **Second Part**
  - Administration of IES
Independent Enquiry Study

- SBA – Independent Enquiry Study (20%)
  - An independent and self-directed enquiry project
  - Stage-wise design
    - I. Project proposal (title formulation)
    - II. Data collection (enquiry method and data organization)
    - III. Product (data analysis, discussion and reflection)
  - Written and non-written Forms (“Product”)
What is IES?

Enquiry Topic

Respond to

Not too personal, with focusing questions

Data collection

Data and Findings Analysis
General Requirements

- Scope of the topic (manageable, researchable, resources available)
- Enquiry rather than descriptive (social dimension rather than personalized experience)
- Background information search (knowledge and concepts)
- Application of appropriate data collection method(s), e.g. structured interviews, systematic field observation, appropriate questionnaire
- Relationship between the data and the findings
- Quality of the discussion/analysis
- Reflection
# Independent Enquiry Study

## Assessment framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Assessment Items (weighting)</th>
<th>Total Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process (50%)</td>
<td>Task (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Independent thinking</td>
<td>Project Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation Forms (1)

- Written form
- Non-written form
Presentation Forms (2)

- Written form (1,500 – 4,000 words)
- Non-written form accompanied by a short written text (300 – 1,000 words) explaining the main idea of the project and showing the student’s reflection
Non-written Form (1)

Non-written form:

- PowerPoint, Web-page and Movie, etc.
- The main body itself is self-explanatory and assessors should act as passive observer
- The reading sequence of the main body should be clear and well stated
The reading/presentation time of the main body should not be longer than 20 minutes.

The main body should be frozen in time for retrieving.

Candidates should ensure the feasibility of viewing the main body by the assessor.
Basic Principles

- Both of these two forms:
  - Work of the **first two stages** is no different: project proposal and data collection
  - A mode of presentation
  - **One set** of generic marking guidelines
  - Focus at the same set of assessment criteria
Stage 1 Project Proposal – Task Description

- **Focusing questions**, aspects and/or hypothesis raised pertaining to the issue of enquiry
- **Multiple perspectives** identified when exploring the issue concerned
- Relevant **materials and background information** identified
- **Concepts** and knowledge studied
- **Plan and method(s)** proposed for the enquiry, with **foreseeable limitations**
Stage 2  
Data Collection – Task Description

- **Tools** designed/deployed for collecting data
- Implementation of the **plan** for data collection
- **Data quality** in terms of usefulness for the enquiry
- **Record** of data collection process
- **Editing and organisation** of data
Stage 3
Product – Task Description

- Method(s) used and analysis of data
- Communication and analysis of the findings from multiple perspectives
- Ideas, views and/or suggestions with supportive arguments
- Framework of the product for illustrating the enquiry process and results
- Personal reflection on the enquiry
Process Descriptions

- Effort
- Communication
- Independent Thinking
Process Description –
Independent Thinking

- Able to include information which is relevant to the issue concerned and consider its accuracy
- Ability to relate concepts and knowledge to the issue concerned
- Ability to make reasoned argument
- Ability to provide ideas and viewpoints
- Ability to identify and/or compare multiple perspectives of the issue concerned
- Ability to self reflect their own learning progress
Process Description – Communication

- Ability to **exchange ideas** and information with others
- Clarity, coherence, fluency and organization
- Effectiveness of means and form adopted for **bring out ideas** and information conveyed
Process Description – Effort

- Time and resources management
- Eagerness of asking questions, seeking support, references and resources
- Eagerness of exploring different alternatives and possibilities
- Proactiveness in solving problems and making continuous improvement
Within-School Standardization – Why?

- Different backgrounds of teachers
- Different supervision approaches
- Generic nature of the marking guidelines
- Different topics and enquiry approaches
- Different modes of presentation
Within-School Standardization – How?

- Consensus reaching through discussion (voting is not desirable)
- Dialogue used for understanding (e.g.)
  - Markers’ expectations, requirements, etc.
  - Pedagogy in teaching, project supervision
  - Candidates’ general ability
- Understanding candidates’ general performance through marking representative samples
- Familiarizing the use of marking guidelines
Suggested Marking Procedures

- Selection of samples
- Study of marking guidelines
- Trial marking of the *first set* of sample projects before the markers’ meeting(s)
- Discussion of trial marked samples for standard setting
- Trial marking of the *second set* of samples for checking (e.g. following the agreed criteria)
- Further discussion for standard alignment if necessary
- Start Marking
- Check-marking
- Mark adjustment, if necessary
Tools for Conducting IES

- Suggested “Product” Forms: one for each stage
  - Suggested items to be filled in
  - Easy to mark
- Suggested Teachers’ Feedback Forms: one for each stage
  - Tailor-made for each stage
  - Convenient for giving feedback (rating and remarks)
- Suggested “Process” Assessment Rubric Forms for various activities, e.g. oral presentation, debate, etc.
Feedback Giving

- Progress and performance record
- In form of feedback form/rubric form
- Justification for marks awarded
- For reporting and improvement
- Illustrating weaknesses and strengths
- Suggestions for improvement
- Portfolio for checking
Authentication

- Built-in stage-wise mechanism
- Development of assessment plan
- Use of class hours for conducting critical works (e.g.):
  - Idea formation
  - Design of work plan
  - Design of data-collection method
- Design of activities for assessment
  - Oral presentation of project proposals/findings
  - Group discussion on relevance of data collection methods
- Declaration Form (Provided)
District Coordinator System

- Experienced LS teachers
- Regional base
- Three modes of interaction:
  - Telephone/e-mail contacts
  - School visits
  - Group meetings
- Experience sharing and giving advice
- Review of progress and students’ work samples
- View exchange on implementation
- Feedback giving for improvement
IES Administration
### Suggested Work Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Project Proposal</td>
<td>S5 Nov – S5 May (April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Data Collection</td>
<td>S5 May – S6 Oct (Sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Report</td>
<td>S6 Oct – S6 Jan (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maintaining students’ morale and motive
- Reducing teachers’ workload

About one year’s time
Mark Submission (1)

- Three times of mark submission
- Marks submitted via on-line system
- 2 scores to be submitted for each time (per student)
- 6 scores to be submitted in total (per student)
- No product/report/form to be submitted
- **Marks submission date ≠ work complete date**
## Mark Submission (2)

### Mark Box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Assessment Item</th>
<th>No. of mark submitted</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mark Submission Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time for Mark Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mid <strong>May</strong> at S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mid <strong>October</strong> at S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mid <strong>January</strong> at S6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repeaters and Private Candidates Arrangements

**Repeaters:**
- Complete Stage III
- Proportion to full 20%

**Private candidates:**
- Only written exam component
- Written exam taking up full 100% of the assessment
Confirmation of Marks

- Queries and technical errors are to be handled before submission
- All marks to be confirmed before submission
- Students are to be informed their marks before submission
- No mark change allowed after mark submission
Handling Queries (1)

- Any queries should be handled before the results of SBA submitted to HKEAA

- Schools should develop a mechanism for handling queries, students and parents are well informed of it

- HKEAA would give advice if necessary
Handling Queries (2)

Suggested Arrangements:
- Setting up of query handling procedures and schedule
- Provision of forms
- Setting up of a school review panel
- Review of existing evidence
- Interview with the student
Why Statistical Moderation

- Teachers know their students well and are best placed to judge their performance but they may not be aware of the standards of performance across all schools.
- One school may be harsher or more lenient in marking and/or use a narrower or wider mark range.
- HKEAA would use statistical moderation for moderating project marks submitted by different schools.
- Statistical moderation is appropriate when there is another related measure of student performance – student examination performance.
Statistical moderation (if the correlation is present)
Statistical moderation (if the correlation is present)
Characteristics of the Moderation Method

- Internal ranking will not be changed
- The impact of examination performance on the moderated project marks depends on the correlation between them
- Suppose that teachers tend to give high marks (uniformly) to their own school students, such an effect would be eliminated when calculating the moderated marks
Thank You!