ASSESSMENT ATLAS

ASSESSMENT INTELLIGENCE

STUDENTASSESSMENTREPORT

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

STUDENT INTELLIGENCE - 2027

Fictional pilot school

STU-001

15 / 20 marks I 75%

Know where they are. Know where to go next.

ASSESSMENT INTELLIGENCE

Fictional pilot school

STU-001

Your assessment story

15 / 20
Your mark

75%
Your achievement

STU-001 achieved 15 out of 20 (75%). The class average is 13.7 out of 20 (68.3%). Your result is 6.7 percentage points above the class average.



Questions to revisit

Q1(c) | 3 / 5

Q1(a) | 4 / 5

Review these responses with your teacher and use the marking criteria to identify the next step.

Your assessment evidence

Inside this report

The assessment story	2
Your question results	4
Topic comparisons	7
Outcome comparisons	7
Curriculum and source limitations	8
Your next learning step	9

Measured results, teacher-authored observations and Atlas interpretations are labelled separately. Optional feedback follows the export choices for this report.

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

TEACHER-AUTHORED / INDIVIDUAL SUMMARY

Illustrative teacher comment: Develop the explanation after each quotation. Make the connection between the language choice, its effect and your argument clear.

INTERPRETATION / EVIDENCE LIMIT

Question statistics describe the available responses. Review original work against the marking criteria before explaining why marks were lost. Missing outcome links are reported in the curriculum section.

Your question results

Question	Your mark	Achievement	Responses
Q1(a)	4 / 5	80%	12
Q1(b)	4 / 5	80%	12
Q1(c)	3 / 5	60%	11
Q1(d)	4 / 5	80%	12

Q1(a) / 5 available marks

Your result



80%

MEASURED RESULTS

Cohort: 12 responses, 0 missing. Mean 3.6 marks. Median 4. Range 2 to 5. 2 full marks and 0 zero marks.

Class reference 73.3% / cohort 71.7%.

2 marks: 2 students; 3 marks: 3 students; 4 marks: 5 students; 5 marks: 2 students

TASK AND CRITERIA CONTEXT

Topic: Argument
Score type: separately marked rubric criterion
Question: Sustain a clear argument about the text.
Review focus: Compare the thesis with the line of argument across the response.
Pilot mapping: authored fictional example, not verified NESA alignment.

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

CURRICULUM EVIDENCE

Entered outcome links: EAV-12-01.

Q1(b) / 5 available marks

Your result

80%

MEASURED RESULTS

Cohort: 12 responses, 0 missing. Mean 3.6 marks. Median 4. Range 2 to 5. 1 full marks and 0 zero marks.

Class reference 73.3% / cohort 71.7%.

2 marks: 1 students; 3 marks: 4 students; 4 marks: 6 students; 5 marks: 1 students

TASK AND CRITERIA CONTEXT

Topic: Textual evidence
Score type: separately marked rubric criterion
Question: Select and integrate relevant textual evidence.
Review focus: Inspect whether quotations support the claim rather than stand alone.
Pilot mapping: authored fictional example, not verified NESA alignment.

CURRICULUM EVIDENCE

Entered outcome links: EAV-12-01.

Q1© / 5 available marks

Your result

60%

MEASURED RESULTS

Cohort: 11 responses, 1 missing. Mean 2.6 marks. Median 3. Range 1 to 4. 0 full marks and 0 zero marks.

Class reference 50% / cohort 52.7%.

1 marks: 1 students; 2 marks: 4 students; 3 marks: 4 students; 4 marks: 2 students

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

TASK AND CRITERIA CONTEXT

Topic: Analysis of language
Score type: separately marked rubric criterion
Question: Explain how language and context shape meaning.
Review focus: Look for an explanation of effect rather than identification of a technique.
Pilot mapping: authored fictional example, not verified NESA alignment.

CURRICULUM EVIDENCE

Entered outcome links: EAV-12-03.

TEACHER-AUTHORED / YOUR QUESTION FEEDBACK

Use the criteria to review this response. Look for an explanation of effect rather than identification of a technique.

Q1(d) / 5 available marks

Your result

80%

MEASURED RESULTS

Cohort: 12 responses, 0 missing. Mean 3.8 marks. Median 4. Range 3 to 5. 2 full marks and 0 zero marks.

Class reference 76.7% / cohort 76.7%.

3 marks: 4 students; 4 marks: 6 students; 5 marks: 2 students

TASK AND CRITERIA CONTEXT

Topic: Structure and control
Score type: separately marked rubric criterion
Question: Organise and control an analytical response.
Review focus: Compare paragraph sequencing and expression with the supplied descriptors.
Pilot mapping: authored fictional example, not verified NESA alignment.

CURRICULUM EVIDENCE

Entered outcome links: EAV-12-05.

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

Topic comparisons

Analysis of language



60%

Class 50% / cohort 52.7%

Argument



80%

Class 73.3% / cohort 71.7%

Textual evidence



80%

Class 73.3% / cohort 71.7%

Structure and control



80%

Class 76.7% / cohort 76.7%

Only supplied topic labels and available marks contribute.

Outcome comparisons

EAV-12-01



80%

Class 73.3% / cohort 71.7%

EAV-12-03



60%

Class 50% / cohort 52.7%

EAV-12-05



80%

Class 76.7% / cohort 76.7%

Marks are shared across multiple linked outcomes. Suggested links require confirmation. These percentages describe this task rather than independent mastery.

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

Curriculum and source limitations

Selected syllabus: 2024. 4 of 4 questions have entered outcome links. Review the original task, criteria and mapping decisions alongside this report.

CURRICULUM CONTEXT

Course program components: Course knowledge 50%; Responding and communicating across modes 50%. These are program requirements, not target weights for this individual assessment.

NO CONFIRMED QUESTION EVIDENCE

EAV-12-02: Evaluating relationships among texts

NO CONFIRMED QUESTION EVIDENCE

EAV-12-04: Adapting language forms in composition

NO CONFIRMED QUESTION EVIDENCE

EAV-12-06: Evaluating composition choices

An outcome without confirmed evidence is not evidence of low achievement or a gap in the wider teaching program.

SOURCE

english-pilot-task-and-rubric.txt / Authored fictional pilot. All results, question prompts, criterion scores and mapping decisions are authored pilot fixtures. Mappings illustrate the review workflow and are not independently verified syllabus alignment. No real student responses are supplied.

Analytical writing: argument and textual evidence · Fictional pilot

Individual evidence / STU-001

Your next learning step

ATLAS INTERPRETATION / RESULTS-BASED

A question result for response review is Q1(c) (60%). Start the review with a range of responses and the question-specific marking criteria.

SUBJECT TEACHING LENS

Quality of written response

RECOMMENDED ACTION / TEACHER REVIEW REQUIRED

Review Q1(c) (60% result). Look for an explanation of effect rather than identification of a technique.

FOLLOW-UP CHECK

Use a short revised paragraph to check whether the argument and textual evidence work together.

Differentiate support and extension after reviewing actual response evidence. Scores alone cannot establish the reason for difficulty or the intervention a student needs.