2018 September Moderation - Report

Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	Both (use this if you are submitting a report on behalf of both regions)
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Technologies - Technical Graphics Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Kaleb Smith
Moderation Leader Email	kaleb.smith@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Philip Goss
Minute Keeper Email	philip.goss@education.tas.gov.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.	Kaleb Smith Claremont College Bill Rostron Launceston Church Grammar School Philip Goss Launceston College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Nil

meeting.

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

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 4
Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	A-
Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Element 1: Student produced accurate and efficient solutions to complex geometrical problems. Element 2: Student produced detailed and accurate geometric drawings as solutions to complex problems. Element 4: Student efficiently solved complex problems by applying appropriate plane and solid geometry problems and transfers related skills and knowledge between concepts.
Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or	Student increased the size of pentagon SIDE when the questions specified increased AREA.

ratings)?	
Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Members of the group were very close in ratings given with minor adjustments required to achieve consensus. This juncture was reached without difficulty once various interpretations of the solutions were discussed.
Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	More careful interpretation of questions so as to avoid incorrect assumptions such as confusion of length and area for example.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 4
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?	Element 1: Student produced accurate and efficient solutions to complex geometrical problems. Element 2: Student produced detailed and accurate geometric drawings as solutions to complex problems. Element 4: Student efficiently solved complex problems by applying appropriate plane and solid geometry problems and transfers related skills and knowledge between concepts.
Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or	Student increased the size of pentagon SIDE when the question specified increased AREA. Completion of questions. Some questions were incomplete.

ratings)?	
Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Members of the group were very close in ratings given with minor adjustments required to achieve consensus. This juncture was reached without difficulty once various interpretations of the solutions were discussed.
Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	This student is a high achieving student. It would appear that they make have run out of time to fully resolve all problems. A class focus on time allocation within the exam paper would be beneficial.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 4
Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	C-
Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Element 1: Student produced minimal solutions to complex geometrical problems with some inaccuracies Element 2: Student produced geometric drawings that partially solved complex problems. Element 4: Student partially resolved complex problems by applying limited plane and solid geometry concepts.
Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Completion of questions that showed higher level understanding of the concepts required. Evidence of time management was also limited.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	The group concluded that this student was barely achieving "C" standard on each of elements 1, 2 and 4.
Sample 3- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Student should attend tutorials. Focus on completing the required number of questions. Focus on ensuring that student is aware of all concepts covered within the paper.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 4
Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	B
Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Element 1: The student produced accurate solutions to complex geometrical problems. Element 2: The student produced accurate geometrical drawings as solutions to complex design problems. Element 4: The student solved complex problems by applying a range of plane and solid geometry concepts, transferring knowledge and skills between related concepts.
Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Overall understanding of orthographic drawing techniques; better understanding of area vs. length concepts. Better understanding of the application of conic curves.

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	The group was very close in their ratings at all element levels with some minor adjustment following discussion of aspects of the sample.
Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Better understanding of First and Third Angle Orthographic projection, especially in the context of drawing layout.

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply	Level 3 or 4
For Level 3 and 4 courses please suggest criteria for consideration by CTL's.	Criterion 7 (Address a brief using the Deign Process and research.) (Externally assessed)
Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:	Not required (CTL) Not required (CTL)
Email	heather.rawding@education.tas.gov.au

Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.	We collaboratively constructed an exam assessment matrix focussed on allocating weighting values on individual questions.

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course:	We are deeply concerned about the future of the course given that it is scheduled for review during 2019. Industry and Tertiary institutions are expressing concern that Technical Graphics has an uncertain future. Anecdotal feedback suggests that students are arriving at courses / apprenticeships with limited ability in this this area. This would be exacerbated by a failure to re-accredit the course beyond 2019.