2020 March Moderation - Report

Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	Statewide
Which meeting is this report for?	Technologies - Engineering Design Level 2

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 3 = Overall
Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	2B+, 2B-, C+
Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	E2: Problem solving process at least at B level. E3: Presentation of ideas good, consensus on annotations that they need to be on the pictures, rather than summary below. E5: B level. E1 & E4 not addressed perhaps by the task
Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	E2: Need some mention to the success criteria at the beginning and then link to these at the end when it comes to their modifications and whether they meet the criteria. E3: Clear annotations needed. E5: Appraisals at end were more aesethetic based than functional, and very brief. Need to be more functional. Should include documentation of the programming that must have occured
Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.	B in E2, 3, 5. E1 and 4 not addressed.

Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	As above.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 3 = Overall
Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	1C+, 2C, 2C-
Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	E2: A modification was made and documented, some evaluation of the modification against success criteria needed for B or above. (Unlike sample 1 where there was a mention of the first failure and then changes).

E3: Did present some graphics to show process. Increased documentation needed.

E5: Summary line only given. Lacks evaluation to suitable detail and against the criteria, rather than just 'with trial and error'. Need to know about the trial and error overall for improvement in C3.

E1 & E4 not assessed. |
Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	As above.
Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.	C for E2, 3 and 5.
Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher	As above.

rating (or ratings)?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 3 = Overall
Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	2C+, 2C and t
Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	C2: Process documentation missing, evaluation. C3: Process documentation regarding evolution of design and decision making is missing. Needed for higher rating. No annotations at all. C5: Noted that it succeeded but no clear success indicators given and evaluated against.
Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Improved documentation, similar to comments for sample 2.
Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.	C-, as noted above.
Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Good Design appears to be being conflated with 'pretty' aesethetics. May need to be supported to develop success criteria as a way of evaluating their designs in future.

Planning for September Moderation 2020 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for	C6 - Task will make clear elements being assessed

| moderation. | |

| State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for March moderation. | Stephen Dodge, Ashleigh Snigg |

Sharing Resources

| Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed. | Email chain of resources being circulated between participants and other known teachers of the course. |

Course Support

| Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course: | Discussion needs to take place around Level 1-2-3-4 pathway for the course, how it might also be modified in future to ensure that current course is only at level 2, not closer to a level 3 in work requirements. |