

# 2018 September Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Technologies - Design and Production Level 2
Moderation Leader Name	Max Cross
Moderation Leader Email	max.cross@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Cam Lynch
Minute Keeper Email	cam.lynch@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.	Simon Boonstra Calvin Max Cross Claremont Patrick Sullivan Claremont Adam Bester Elizabeth Paul Baker GYC Luke Hamilton GYC Rod Larcombe GYC John Miles GYC Ruth Downham Hobart Cam Lynch Hobart Mathu Martin Hobart Rod Webster Hobart Nicole Ottrey Rosny Eric Price Rosny Michael Bannister Sorell School Mary Thomas Collegiate Patrick Twyford Hutchins
Apologies/absences - please enter	-

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

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

Criteria 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

This sample was selected due to a large range of ratings from A-C.

Sequencing of planning in the project was a major point of discussion during the moderation meeting. Emphasis on planning prior, during or after the construction of the object. To address Criterion 1 it is important to see prior planning.

The sample demonstrated a range of processes against element 1, they used Sketchup, Free-hand drawings and Scale Drawings. Drawings are important part of planning.

E1: B

No evidence provided in written form for element 2: E2:T Completion is implied in the evaluation. The sample made an attempt to describe adjustments through correcting joints by using machinery to make them more accurate. E3: C+

What evidence would you need to see to achieve a higher rating:

Planning for dart board - Detailed drawings

For what reasons would you use other tools

Costing Plan

Images of final ratings

The design work was separate to planning - Google sketches weren't the same as the drawings.

Acknowledged that students find it very difficult to plan with limited knowledge coming into the course. Students who are not ready for the level 2 DAP course will find it very difficult to achieve a result against the DAP level 2 criteria.

The importance of a workshop techniques - DAP level 2 pathway from year 11-12 would be beneficial. It was mentioned that Workshop techniques should be given more recognition -for example 15 TCE Points.

## 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?

The sample demonstrated a range of processes against element 1, they used Sketchup, Free-hand drawings and Scale Drawings. Drawings are important part of planning.

E1: B

No evidence provided in written form for element 2: E2:T

Completion is implied in the evaluation. The sample made

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

an attempt to describe adjustments through correcting joints by using machinery to make them more accurate. E3: C+

Sequence of the construction process is important. Working drawings, timelines, costings, safety consideration, appraisal. Clear sequence of what you will do and when you will do it, what processes will you use to complete your project?

Photographic evidence supported by written evidence, adjustments made and outline what they would do differently next time. Annotate photographs in detail.

What evidence would you need to see to achieve a higher rating:

Planning for dart board - Detailed drawings

For what reasons would you use other tools

Costing Plan

Images of final ratings

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

The moderation group came to a consensus of a C rating for Criteria 1. A balanced judgement of Element 1: B-, Element 2: T, Element 3: C

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

Photographic evidence supported by written evidence, adjustments made and outline what they would do differently next time. Annotate photographs in detail.

Design journal could assist in keeping an accurate working log of processes during all stages of a project.

Language used in the Criteria is difficult to use with students. A re-write of the syllabus has been raised as an issue with the moderation group. The syllabus document should be able to be used by teachers, students parents.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

A-C

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

Analysis of design issues and problem solving.  
 Investigation of different methods.  
 Has mentioned costings.  
 Research is a part of the Design and Production phases, the evidence of research is photographic.  
 Plan is a template, no evidence of the actual planning taking place.

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

Rather than an after the fact appraisal, more evidence of planning is required for this criteria.  
 Part of planning should have been safety processes for cutting LPG cylinders.  
 Adjustments are explained well but needs to show a greater range of processes.  
 A greater range of evidence of the range of Design and Production Phases. Drawings, timeline, measurements, sections of a plan for parts of the object (handle, door, chimney etc.)

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

A very thorough discussion of this sample was had as per notes. No consensus due to a range of interpretation of the criteria.

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

Clear expectations on how to achieve at criteria 1 and what is expected.  
 Evidence of planning prior to commencing task - documentation, working drawings, prototypes, measurements on the plan, timeline.

**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**

The Design and Production moderation group present at September 2018 moderation feel that the current criteria standards are not user friendly to Teachers, Students and Parents. In conjunction with the northern moderation group, they would like to use the next Moderation meeting

moderation.

in 2019 or an organised PL session at the end of 2018, as an opportunity create a marking and assessment guide that clearly outlines the evidence required to meet the elements of the Criteria in the Design and Production Level 2 TASC Course. This would also be an opportunity to provide detailed recommendations for the re-design of the DAP Course.

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

Cam Lynch

Email

cam.lynych@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.

Resource sharing with DAP teachers is currently done through Google Drive. However the group would like to investigate the possibility of having a group resource CANVAS page.

Ruth shared a scaffold for students.

Cam shared criteria 6 assessment

## 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 Design and Production moderation group present at September 2018 moderation feel that the current criteria standards are not user friendly to Teachers, Students and Parents. In conjunction with the northern moderation group, they would like to use the next Moderation meeting in 2019 or an organised PL session at the end of 2018, as an opportunity create a marking and assessment guide that clearly outlines the evidence required to meet the elements of the Criteria in the Design and Production Level 2 TASC Course. This would also be an opportunity to provide detailed recommendations for the re-design of the DAP Course.