

**Form Name:** Years 11&12 March Moderation 2018 - Report

**Submission Time:** March 13, 2018 12:22 pm

## Meeting Details

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Meeting Venue:</b>                          | North  |
| <b>AM or PM session?</b>                       | AM   |
| <b>Which Learning Area is this Report for?</b> | Technologies                                 |
| <b>Which AM Meeting is this report for?</b>    | Technologies - Design and Production Level 2 |
| <b>Moderation Leader Name</b>                  | Dave Lichtendonk                             |
| <b>Moderation Leader Email</b>                 | lichtendonkd@lcs.tas.edu.au                  |
| <b>Minute Keeper (if available)</b>            | Julie Ferguson                               |
| <b>Minute Keeper Email</b>                     | fergusonj@lcs.tas.edu.au                     |

## Attendance

**Please enter the Name, school and email address for all attendees - you should be able to copy and paste this from the Attendance list you were sent - removing anyone who didn't attend and adding**

|                |             |
|----------------|-------------|
| Peter          | Wickham     |
| Steven         | Tammens     |
| Richard        | Walsh       |
| David          | Lichtendonk |
| Julie Ferguson |             |
| Robert         | Gracie      |
| Brent          | Colgrave    |
| Ben Luttrell   |             |
| Peter          | Robinson    |
| Andrea         | Sindorff    |
| Bettina        | Townsend    |
| Brett          | Wallace     |

**anyone who was extra on the day**

Adrian Pearce  
Alan MacFarlane  
Stephen Dobson  
Glenn Wood  
Roger Lane  
Justin Emmerton  
Andrew Youd  
Anna Broughton  
Stephen Boag  
Paul Thomas  
Ned Taylor  
Don Hinds  
Shanli Perkins

**Extras - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone extra who wasn't on your attendance list:**

none

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

**Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against**

C6

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

B

**What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given**

Some sound insights given to a good level of understanding of the factors/elements but not enough detail given.

Teachers explained their assessment based on an overall above standard level of evidence with some need for more detail

It is a level 2 subject so this needs consideration.

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

Student needs to more clearly comment on the elements and factors

Context is important and other things do provide evidence - discussion, verbal cues etc

Question from teachers about the necessity of assessing every element - not common practice.

And discussion about the number of ratings when we can only allocate A, B, C s at the end of the year.

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

Use of design language

Checklists for students to use - for lower literacy skills student

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

**Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against**

C6

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

C

**What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given**

Some evidence provided and limited connection to a designer to inform choices

Some problem solving as evidence of the design process/practice

Justified some choices

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p>                   | <p>Not enough discussion or evidence of how the designer mentioned influenced the design work</p> <p>Only vague references, so be more specific</p> <p>Ideas/comments not clearly linked to the student's actual process/practice/decisions</p> <p>Not enough discussion about why choices were made</p>  |
| <p><b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p> | <p>Explicitly teach students to make better connections and links to elements &amp; factors.</p> <p>Improve documentation - teach other ways to communicate evidence for less literate students.</p> <p>Guide students through how to improve - checklists</p> <p>Are the elements more like performance indicators, so therefore not all elements have to be assessed?</p> |

### Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against</b></p>                         | <p>C6</p>   |
| <p><b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b></p> | <p>B+</p>   |
| <p><b>What evidence supports the rating(s) the</b></p>                     | <p>Strong knowledge of professional pathways</p> <p>Strong research about materials</p> |

**group has given**

Referred to material choices in the discussion

Good explanation

Showed how solved problems

Made some connections to design decisions & practice

Language choices good

Elaborates ideas well

Clear goals specified

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

Could be more specific and use more design language & terminology

The context & actual brief is important to know how to assess and is not clear in the sample

The work indicates a high level of understanding but not quite enough evidence in the sample provided to give an 'A'

Was there a word limit?

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

More detailed explanations needed for an 'A'

Language choices or other evidence needs to clearly indicate competency for this criteria

## Summary of any further samples moderated

**Further samples -  
Criteria assessed  
against**

C6

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>What ratings have the group assigned this/these Sample(s)?</b>   | C-   |
| <b>What evidence supports the ratings the group has given</b>   | Some written & basic discussion indicated design ideas were understood<br><br>They used a process but not correct subject specific terminology |
| <b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b>                   | Improved language/terminology  |
| <b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b> | Guided 'forms' & language prompts might help   |

## Planning for September Moderation 2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Are you planning on:</b>  | Small number of same samples for all teachers statewide to assess in advance of the meeting - with the expectation that all teachers bring further work for conferencing |
| <b>Please list the criteria to be moderated:</b>                     | 1  |
| <b>Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:</b>        | Previous year folio example/s to moderate the planning and project management aspect for criterion 1.  |
| <b>Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for</b> | Anna Broughton   |

**the September  
moderation**

**Email**

anna.broughton@oakwood.tas.edu.au

## Sharing Resources

**Please provide details of any resources or teaching or assessment strategies, useful links etc. that were shared in the meeting.**

General sharing of ideas - time ran out.

## Course Support

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

Clarification of the elements - are they actually performance indicators? Are they compulsory? This was new to the staff at our meeting and was considered unrealistic.

Course documentation doesn't specify the need to assess these individually.

## Annotated Exemplars

**Which of the samples you have looked at today along with your meeting notes might be suitable to develop further into an annotated exemplar?**

Sample 1  
Sample 2  
Sample 3  
Sample 4

**Any comments:**

A good range so would be effective as samples