

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	PM
Which PM Meeting is this report for?	Arts - Music Technology Projects Level 2
Moderation Leader Name	Jon Cavenagh
Moderation Leader Email	jon.cavenagh@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Peter Hicks
Minute Keeper Email	peter.hicks@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.	Yoshi Izumi, Elizabeth College Jean Moore – GYC Greg Souter Claremont College Jon Cavenagh Rosny College Peter Hicks Hobart College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.	NA

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 4 = Element 2

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?

Rubric states 'Explains and uses protocols and etiquettes appropriate to needs of clients 'Jean- Looking at a low B or a C - final decision was for a C. This was because there was a limited description associated with the responses. There was a good idea of skills, but a lack of protocols.

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

To improve the sample needed to address the descriptions of the protocols in more detail. Addressing elements like polar patterns, mic models and DAW specific elements, studio management and WHS concerns.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 3 = Element 1

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

T+

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or

Step 5 (which addresses this element specifically) was very poorly answered and provided little evidence of the standard. At a minimum, the rubric states 'identifies basic balance, dynamics and tone colour requirements across a given range of

ratings) the group has given?

targeted music styles and audio products.' The response was around a specific foley sound, not the overall intended outcome of the project.

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

More discussion around what an animated movie sounds like.

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Consensus was a T+ but no higher.

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

More description within the question though it does ask the student to address Balance, dynamics and tone colour.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 4 = Element 2

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?

Some limited descriptions of the qualities and etiquette needed in the studio setting.

Sample 3 - What evidence would

Responses needed to be expanded more with further discussion around

you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

microphone choices and technical aspects.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

The candidate does describe the protocols and gives some examples but again the responses are a little limited.

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

Potentially ask for more than six qualities.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 3 = Element 1

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

T+

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

The response lacks detail and does not address balance, stereo width or depth as requested in the question. The response is very limited and generic in nature. Describes the room but with insufficient detail.

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

A clear description of an acoustic guitar recording in terms of width and depth. Statements about the balance of components and the placement of the instrument within the stereo image would assist. Also, the response should justify why a particular room would be suited to this style of recording.

**Sample 4 -
Summary of
group consensus
with comments to
element level if
applicable.**

Consensus was that there was a lack of detail provided and the response was very non-descriptive.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criteria 1 - - Creating a product use techniques to shape an audio product Use all the elements
Criteria 2 - Time management - Element 4

Sharing Resources

Course Support

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

Discussion around course re-write needs to occur soon as it is up for review at the end of 2019