

# 2018 September 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

David Lichtendonk

Moderation Leader Email

LichtendonkD@lcs.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Julie Ferguson

Minute Keeper Email

fergusonj@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.

1. Peter Wickham
2. Shanli Perkins
3. Dean Cornwall
4. Richard Walsh
5. Julie Ferguson
6. Rob Gracie
7. David Lichtendonk
8. Brent Colgrave
9. Vic Boyes
10. Ben Luttrell
11. Peter Robinson
12. Brett Wallace
13. Adrian Pearce
14. Don Hinds
15. Alan MacFarlane
16. Anna Broughton
17. Roger Carey
18. Roger Lane
19. Justin Emmerton

Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

20. Stephen Boag  
21. Paul Thomas  
22. Ned Taylor  
23. Andrew Youd

Andrea Sindorff  
Bettina Townsend  
Glenn Wood

## Annotated Sample

Please specify which moderated sample has been selected as being the most appropriate to be the annotated sample, should the meeting choose to do so.

Sample 1

Please list the criteria (and elements if specified) being moderated for this sample

Criterion 1

Please be specific as to why this sample was chosen - provide as much detail as possible relating back to the evidence it contains against the standards

A good satisfactory level sample to moderate

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 1 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

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

C+

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

Sample shows good recording process

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

Needs more examples of planning - needs scope and sequence, dimensions.

No evidence of adjustments

No clear evidence in the sample folio of it actually being completed.

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

plans, design and produces using a range of processes including milestones and targets

NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE

plans and sequences the construction process, making appropriate adjustments as required

NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE

monitors plans during each phase of the project to complete tasks, and makes adjustments to solve problems and meet deadlines

NO EVIDENCE - NEEDS ANNOTATION

Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help

Provide more annotation and measurements/dimensions

Add timelines/sequences

the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Ensure planning is clearly done before construction - wasn't obvious in the sample.  
  
Provide all the relevant planning that was done as these weren't included in the circulated samples.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 1 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

A-

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

Effective presentation  
  
Thorough research  
  
Excellent level of detail  
  
Fantastic project - an exceptional level of skill  
  
Problem-solving great  
  
Logical  
  
costing good and very detailed

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

Some annotation would help  
  
No completed picture of the final project  
  
Needs time plans  
  
The elements weren't obviously fully addressed in the folio  
  
A solution to the brief needed to be clearly stated

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus

plans, design and produces using a range of processes including milestones and targets

at element level  
with comments

MISSING SOME OF THESE DETAILS

plans and sequences the construction process, making appropriate adjustments as required

NEEDED MORE ANNOTATION TO PROVE THIS

monitors plans during each phase of the project to complete tasks, and makes adjustments to solve problems and meet deadlines

WAS PROVIDED

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Teachers need to ensure all 'parts' of the criteria are considered and students clearly include this in their folio and that the samples have this provided too.

We need standardised 'evidence' examples in the folios so that moderation can be effectively done

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 1 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

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

B+

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

Folio was detailed with lots of description and was well researched.

The brief was clearly defined

Some costings provided

Project completed

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in

Folio was missing some measurements

Lacks sketching

order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

No scale drawings

Lacks some pre-planning evidence before the production phase, such as a scope and sequence, materials list

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

plans, design and produces using a range of processes including milestones and targets

LACKS PRIOR PLANNING

plans and sequences the construction process, making appropriate adjustments as required

ANNOTATIONS HELP COMMUNICATE ADJUSTMENTS

monitors plans during each phase of the project to complete tasks, and makes adjustments to solve problems and meet deadlines

ANNOTATION HELPFUL

Sample 3- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Same as before

## Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply

Level 1 or 2

For Level 1 or 2 courses please nominate the criteria for moderation.

Criterion 3

Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:

Brent Colgrave

Email

bcolgrave@lcs.tas.edu.au

## Sharing Resources

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

Google Sketchup Software - free and great for creating working/planning drawings.

Use of Powerpoint to create folios

## Course Support

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

The consensus was that the compulsory focus on assessment elements should change to indicators - it is impractical and difficult to assess all the elements effectively and fairly. The focus shifts to assessing too many elements away from quality skills and knowledge building. The assessment expectations limits creativity and our subject is predominately 'hands on' and we want it to remain an engaging, practical subject that students enjoy. Skills and design are both important.

The Object Design subject, being a great Uni course and a popular option for our students to extend them to a higher level isn't driven by elements for assessment. Teachers believe Design and Production needs to link more effectively to this 'next level' of study.

The criteria and the elements need similar wording. Criterion 1 (PLAN, ORGANISE, COMPLETE) isn't as clearly reflected in the elements as teachers would like.

Only one criteria relates to practical skills. Students who choose the subject due to its practical nature are disadvantaged because of the higher order thinking skills required to succeed. This academic focus seems inconsistent with level 2 subjects.