

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

Technologies - Design and Production Level 2

Moderation Leader Name

Robert Gracie

Moderation Leader Email

gracier@lcs.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

David Lichtendonk

Minute Keeper Email

lichtendonkd@lcs.tas.edu.au

Attendance

Please enter the name and school for all attendees. This can be copied and pasted from the registration list sent to the Moderation Leader.

Rob Gracie - Launceston Christian School
Dave Lichtendonk - Launceston Christian School
Luke Everard - St Brendan-Shaw
Richard Walsh - Hellyer
Dean Cornwall - Hellyer
Peter Wickham - Campbell Town
Katherine Dent - Rosebery
Bronwyn Johns - Launceston Christian School
Ian Renolds - Leighland CS
Adrian Pearce - Marist Regional
Rodney Grub - Wynyard High School
Brett Wallace - Leighland CS
Matt Wootton - Deloraine High
Ben Luttrell - Launceston College
Brent Colgrave - Launceston Church Grammar
Shanli Perkins - Don College
Bettina Townsend - Leighland Christian School
Don Hinds - Newstead College
Ben Luttrell - Launceston College
Don Hinds - Newstead College
Vic Boyes - Launceston College
Andrew Youd - St Patricks College
Brent Colgrave - Launceston Church Grammar School

Apologies/absences - please enter

Roger Lane - St Brendan-Shaw

the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

B+

Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

High level of accuracy. Clean joins and finishes. Lots of materials combined successfully, looks attractive. Some testing before construction.

Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Testing didn't solve on slight joining error.

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, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group

Creative, unique, functional design. Range of processes chosen and applied.

has given?

Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Attachment on back of piece could have been recessed and neatened up. Some sanding could have been of a higher standard. Hard to see how functional the piece without the wine bottles in position.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

A-

Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Project construction and processes are quite straight forward but appear to be completed to a high standard over all. Cut, joined, sanded and finished independently and by hand to a high level.

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Some indication of inaccuracy ie some joints appear to be filled with putty. Angle iron used to join shelf appears rudimentary. No solid evidence of practising and testing apart from refining the mitre joints to achieve accuracy.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group

B

assigned this sample?

Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Functional piece but with minimal processes. All metal work completed independently and accurately by student.

Some construction with wood component required teacher intervention. Lack of evidence to support practising and testing strategies.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

Criteria 5

Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

Nil

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course:

Suggested that the course Workshop Techniques should be allowed to be studied twice in a calendar year to allow for students who are practically minded and unable to produce a folio to a satisfactory standard. This could be done in different specialisation areas such as wood, metal, composites etc. In general, staff are happy with the course content and assessment. The consensus is that students are benefiting from the practical and creative nature of Design and Production. Teachers would like the course to continue in the same format. Moderation provides a platform for healthy discussion and consensus on quality of work.

