

Writing	
Teacher Speak	Student Speak
<p><b>Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading and following the instructions for each question carefully.</li> <li>• Using the suggestions provided for each question as a guideline.</li> <li>• Using the planning spaces to plan and organise their ideas.</li> <li>• Focusing on the questions consistently and not going "off topic".</li> <li>• Providing relevant, credible, and appropriate supporting details to develop their ideas.</li> <li>• Grouping and linking their ideas so they met the writing purpose and audience.</li> <li>• Structuring their response to achieve overall cohesiveness.</li> <li>• Conveying a sense of engagement/authenticity/personal voice with the topic/question.</li> <li>• Selecting appropriate language that had some impact (sentences, phrasing, vocabulary).</li> <li>• Using a variety of sentences (e.g., variation of sentence lengths, beginnings, types).</li> <li>• Using a wide variety of vocabulary, including specific, precise vocabulary as appropriate.</li> <li>• Selecting precise and varied vocabulary that added interest for the reader.</li> <li>• Demonstrating knowledge and control of writing conventions (e.g., full stops, capital letters).</li> <li>• Reviewing, editing, and proofreading their answers (particularly for technical accuracy).</li> <li>• Meeting the text length recommendations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They read and followed the instructions for each question carefully.</li> <li>• They used the suggestions given for each question as a guide.</li> <li>• They used the spaces provided for planning to organise their ideas.</li> <li>• They stayed focused on the questions and didn't stray away from the main topic.</li> <li>• They gave relevant and believable details to back up their ideas.</li> <li>• They grouped their ideas together well, making sure they fit the purpose and who they were writing for.</li> <li>• They organised their writing in a way that made sense and flowed smoothly.</li> <li>• They made their writing sound interesting and personal to the topic.</li> <li>• They chose words that had an impact and sounded good.</li> <li>• They mixed up their sentence lengths and how they started them.</li> <li>• They used lots of different words, including ones that were very specific and clear.</li> <li>• They got the basics right, like using full stops and capital letters.</li> <li>• They checked their work over, fixed any mistakes, and made sure it all made sense.</li> <li>• They wrote enough to meet what was asked for.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting the required standard:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following the assessment instructions (e.g., complete all three sections: two pieces of writing and the multiple choice questions).</li> <li>• Following the instructions and guidelines for each task (e.g., select only one topic, follow the recommended text length).</li> <li>• Planning their answers to avoid going "off topic" (e.g., brainstorming, mind maps, listing ideas).</li> <li>• Grouping their ideas together to form structure (e.g., to avoid "jumping around", repetition).</li> <li>• Linking their ideas to each other and to the specified purpose.</li> <li>• Providing relevant examples and sufficient detail when developing ideas.</li> <li>• Using language appropriate for the audience and purpose as specified in the task (e.g., appropriateness of register and tone).</li> <li>• Using a variety of sentence types (short/long, variation in beginnings and sentence type).</li> <li>• Using appropriate vocabulary for the purpose and audience (e.g., avoidance of slang, using specific and precise words to clarify meaning and for interest).</li> <li>• Editing and proofreading their work for technical accuracy (e.g., runon/incomplete sentences, spelling, punctuation, capital letters).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting the required standard:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some didn't follow all the instructions, like doing all the different parts of the test.</li> <li>• They didn't always stick to what they were told to do, like picking just one topic or keeping their writing to the right length.</li> <li>• They should have planned better to make sure they didn't go off track.</li> <li>• Their ideas weren't always organised well, which made their writing messy and confusing.</li> <li>• They didn't connect their ideas together very well or make sure they fit the purpose.</li> <li>• They didn't give enough good examples or enough details to explain their ideas.</li> <li>• Sometimes, they used the wrong kind of words for who they were writing to or what they were writing about.</li> <li>• Their sentences were a bit boring because they didn't mix them up enough.</li> <li>• They didn't use the best words for what they were trying to say or who they were talking to.</li> <li>• They needed to go back and fix their mistakes, like long sentences or spelling errors.</li> </ul>

## Reading

### Teacher Speak

#### Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:

- They had a reading vocabulary that included general academic and specialised words.
- They could figure out the meaning of unfamiliar words by understanding word families, prefixes, and suffixes.
- They recognized and understood various language features and text structures such as punctuation, tables, illustrations, etc.
- They could connect the choices made by the writer (vocabulary, text structure) to the purpose and audience.
- They were able to compare, contrast, summarise, and link information from different sources.
- They could identify the writer's point of view or purpose, even if it wasn't explicitly stated.
- They were skilled at locating main points and relevant information.
- They could identify and reject misleading or inaccurate information.
- They used strategies to ensure that the text they were reading matched their purpose, such as using headings and looking for keywords.

#### Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard:

- They needed to expand their reading vocabulary.
- They should work on strategies to understand the meanings of less familiar words, including topic-specific, specialised, and academic vocabulary.
- They needed to develop knowledge of a variety of language features and text structures, along with understanding why they are used.
- They should improve critical thinking skills and awareness, including understanding the writer's purpose and its implications for the reader.
- They needed to improve their close reading strategies to locate, check, and select relevant information effectively.

### Student Speak

#### Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:

- They knew a lot of words, including ones used in school and specific subjects.
- When they found a word they didn't know, they could figure out what it meant by looking at parts of the word.
- They understood things like punctuation and how a text is set up, like with tables or pictures.
- They could see why a writer chose certain words or how they organised their writing based on who they were writing for.
- They were good at comparing different information from different places and putting it together.
- They could tell what the writer was trying to say or what they wanted the reader to think, even if it wasn't obvious.
- They could find the most important parts of a text or find what they needed.
- They were good at spotting wrong information and not believing it.
- They knew how to pick the right things to read based on what they needed, like using titles and important words.

#### Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard:

- They needed to learn more words to understand things better.
- They should practise figuring out what new words mean, especially ones related to certain topics or subjects.
- They needed to learn more about how writing works, like different types of sentences and how paragraphs are put together.
- They should get better at thinking about what a writer is trying to do and how it affects the reader.
- They needed to get better at reading carefully to find the right information.

# Numeracy

## Teacher Speak

### Areas of strength demonstrated by candidates who were clearly at, or above, the required standard:

1. Formulating Mathematical and Statistical Approaches:
  - Candidates demonstrated proficiency in various problem-solving scenarios, such as calculating total pay with hourly rates, probabilities of drawing cards, and finding averages from given data.
  - They effectively applied mathematical operations in real-life contexts, like dividing masses, finding multipliers between units, and estimating dimensions from photographs.
2. Using Mathematical and Statistical Procedures Accurately:
  - Candidates accurately interpreted graphs and diagrams, such as bar graphs and line graphs, to extract relevant information and solve problems.
  - They displayed competence in performing calculations, including percentages, rates, discounts, and area calculations, using appropriate mathematical procedures.
3. Describing and Evaluating Methods and Calculations:
  - Candidates demonstrated critical thinking by justifying the reasonableness of methods and calculations used in various scenarios.
  - They evaluated claims made by others, such as assessing the validity of population data, interpreting graphs to verify assertions, and deciding whether certain actions were correct based on given ratios.

### Areas requiring improvement for candidates who were not at, or were borderline in meeting, the required standard

1. Formulating Mathematical and Statistical Approaches:
  - Some candidates struggled to select appropriate approaches for problem-solving, as evidenced by their inability to create suitable mathematical models for given situations.
  - For example, they might have failed to recognise the correct mathematical operations needed to solve problems or misunderstood the demands of the situation.
2. Using Mathematical and Statistical Procedures Accurately:
  - Candidates who did not meet the standard often misinterpreted questions, resulting in incorrect calculations or procedures.
  - For instance, they might have misapplied percentages, misinterpreted graphs, or used incorrect formulas to solve problems.
3. Describing and Evaluating Methods and Calculations:
  - Some candidates failed to provide clear positions or evidence-based justifications for their evaluations of methods and calculations.
  - For instance, they might have left open response sections blank, restated claims without proper reasoning, or provided their own incorrect solutions without justifying them with evidence.