

# 2018 September Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Technologies - Housing & Design Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Anthony Hyland
Moderation Leader Email	anthony.hyland@hutchins.tas.edu.au
Minute Keeper	Anthony Hyland
Minute Keeper Email	anthony.hyland@hutchins.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.	Peter MacFarlane zach sonstegaard Richard Clark John Mainsbridge Jesse Wright Michael Dowling Ken Laughlin Anthony hyland
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	All attended

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

Criterion 1 - Element 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

As we wished to focus on an internal criteria and this is significant as it is essentially assessed along with other key criteria in every task undertaken by students in this subject. We wished to attain a greater understanding on what teacher's interpretation of this criterion standards are and how they identify them being met.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 1 = Overall, Element 1

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

T+

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

Limited annotation and proportions not consistent or correct.

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

Requires more visual written information and more care in use of scale and proportion

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

Limited annotation and proportions not consistent or correct.

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

Emphasise to students the importance of annotation and working to scale accurately. More in class tasks to allow students to practice this.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 1 = All elements, Element 1

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

B

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

Evidence supporting rating

Neatly presented drawing and acted on all exam requests and added some more details. Annotation was at a good level, but some people questioned that proportions of furniture layout was not correct, but on closer review, it seemed it was.

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

More in-depth information in the annotations.

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

Evidence supporting rating  
Neatly presented drawing and acted on all exam requests and added some more details. Annotation was at a good level, but some people questioned that proportions of furniture layout was not correct, but on closer review, it seemed it was.

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

Again, emphasise to students the importance of accuracy and elaborating and justifying design features.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 1 = All elements, Element 1

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?

This sample provoked a high degree of rich and relevant discussion as it would seem that when pre-assessing this sample, many teachers were considering evidence that they would see in Criterion 4 as opposed to just the standards and elements being addressed in Criterion 1, so it was hard to separate these two criteria cleanly. Although the sample was rich in discussion, some information provided did not satisfy C4 - hence the "confusion". Also some argued that

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

even though scale was not requested, the sketches should have been done to better proportions. Some did have issues with the layout too.

To achieve a higher rating, it would be expected that an "A" student would also utilise cross-sections and other supplementary sketches to visualise their understanding and justify design decisions. Stay truer to proportions

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

This sample provoked a high degree of rich and relevant discussion as it would seem that when pre-assessing this sample, many teachers were considering evidence that they would see in Criterion 4 as opposed to just the standards and elements being addressed in Criterion 1, so it was hard to separate these two criteria cleanly. Although the sample was rich in discussion, some information provided did not satisfy C4 - hence the "confusion". Also some argued that even though scale was not requested, the sketches should have been done to better proportions. Some did have issues with the layout too.

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

Act on the information provided above.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 1 = All elements, Element 1

Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C+

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

Drawing and information was at satisfactory level

has given?

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

Drawing and information was at satisfactory level

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

Drawing and information was at satisfactory level

Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Again, emphasise to students the importance of accuracy and elaborating and justifying design features.

## 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.

Perhaps a combination of Criteria 1 and 6

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

Anthony Hyland

Email

anthony.hyland@hutchins.tas.edu.au

## Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any

General Discussion

It was initially thought that using exam samples may not be the best tool for moderating Criterion 1 - Element 1. As mentioned above, some people struggled in separated in

**assessment strategies that were discussed.**

what criteria they were assessing - Criterion 1 or Criteria 3 or 4, depending on the context of the question. For example, does a person get a lower mark in C1 because the information they have provided does not meet all the expectations of C3 or C4?

However, a group consensus agreed that this moderation task provoked rich and helpful discussions on what we need to consider for the future, but also recognised that as teachers/markers, we often pick up on particular details that others may overlook - and they are not listed in a concise manner in the standards document, i.e:

- Correct proportions
- Key drawing details
- Movement flow diagrams
- Air flow diagrams.

In improving student outcomes, Mike Dowling offered good advice stating that when giving students tasks we need to be quite explicit:

1. What is it that you want students to do. That is, the "learning intention"
2. What is the actual task? That is, an explicit brief and design limitations to guide the task.
3. What do want students to know how to measure their success. That is the "success criteria" that's sets out the linkage between the task, the criteria and elements expressed as a rubric.

In the second part of the meeting, Heather Rawding attended. As part of her new role, Heather described a review paper she was working on as snapshot of what is happening within Design and Technology education throughout Tasmania, but also observing what offerings there are in other mainland States.

She was also researching on what pathways through Technologies undergraduate or graduate students in architecture had taken with D & T.

An interesting reflection was that Housing and Design is the only course of its type offered in Australia. All teachers within our meeting strongly supported the continuation and further development of this course, even looking at the possibility of introducing a Level 2 Foundation course. Ken Laughlin was happy to offer advice on how this would be structured.

For future moderation meeting tasks, it was suggested that we still focus on internal criteria to help generate more consistency in internal marks outcomes. But whatever we

sample, it should be a State-wide task done by all students if possible, not necessarily an exam response, but a small class-based task.

Unfortunately, we ran out of time to do more refinements to the Draft Marking tool provided for this Moderation task. All teachers have been invited to email suggestions to improve this tool.

## Course Support

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

Look to develop a Level 2 Foundation Course and perhaps create a working group to revise assessment standards to be more concise as there are still some lack of clarity in the element standards in some criteria.