**[Leanne Compton]:** Hello, my name is Leanne Compton, and I'm the Curriculum Manager for Design and Technologies at the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. With me in this video is Simon Van Dillen, who is the state reviewer for VCE Product Design and Technology.

This video is one in a series of videos to support Product Design and Technology teachers to moderate student work. This particular video focuses in on moderation for VCE Product Design and Technology.

The copyright of this video is owned by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. I'm now going to hand over to Simon Van Dillen, who is going to take you through this video. So thanks, Simon.

**[Simon Van Dillen]:** Thanks, Leanne. So the School-assessed Coursework Product Design and Technology. There's three SACs across the year. Each of these SACs, through our moderation process, we find that we should be making them different, and different each year as well. So we cannot be using the same SACs between years. It really is a challenge for teachers then to be able to authenticate the work, that it is actually the student's work and the student hasn't somehow obtained a copy of that work previously. And you hear the notion occasionally too of 'I'll just rotate it every couple of years', that still doesn't cut the mustard, so to speak, and it really does need to be new tasks each year. Because also too your tasks have to meet your particular cohort. And between each year, our cohorts change. And we have it, some years, we have stronger cohorts than others of students, and we need to make sure those assessment tasks that we use suit our cohort at the time for them to achieve the best they possibly can.

Our SACs should allow students to show their differentiation as well. You know, with some questions that have been, worth six-eight marks as an example, just so it's about how well the student understands the content when you're trying to rank students. So a SAC or assessment task where all the questions or activities the students got to do are ranked two marks or three marks doesn't really give those students the opportunity to show their understanding well, especially, we're thinking of top end students. But at the same time too, we want want to make sure the assessment task is achievable for our lower end students as well, that they can also be able to get, show their understanding as they work through and the skills and the knowledge.

The SACs should be developed school specific to your particular cohort, like I mentioned earlier, and making sure that it suits a particular year as well. And the use of assessment criteria to make sure that the key skills and knowledge are used across the assessment criteria and only assessed once. So looking at we're only doing it once, we're only assessing them once for efficiency. Also not to put undue stress on the students that at one particular time, the students show that particular skills or key skills and the key knowledge there.

So, as I mentioned earlier, there is three times where we have students do a SAC so to speak or assessed coursework. This is for outcome one in unit three. These snippets are taken straight out of the study design. So that should be familiar to everyone. So outcome one at unit three, we also have an outcome two of unit three. And the two points I want to make here is on the side there, it does talk about assessment tasks and what the assessment tasks should be made up of or could be possibly made up of. And it's really important that that first assessment task for outcome one is a structured and annotated design brief. And it's the same design brief for all students that are using it okay. You may add different elements to it, to contextualise it to your group of students. Or if you have a group of resistant material students doing the same SAC as, and it should be the same SAC as non-resistant materials, you might give them the opportunity and make it contextual for each of those groups, but at the same time too, it's that around the annotating that design brief and that everything then links back to that particular design brief in that assessment task. So their knowledge of the product design factors, their knowledge of the product design process, all link back around to that particular design brief.

Outcome two of unit three. Once again, there's a list there of potential assessment tasks that you might use or what's been found over the last few years is that teachers are really spending time to create some really great assessment tasks for outcome two and are really changing around what they do there and having a lot of different type of assessment tasks, extended responses, short reports, or doing oral presentations, using case studies, things on those lines, doing excursions when possible. There's a lot of really good work out there that teachers have been doing. And it's been great to see that carrying on and taking the time to develop really strong assessment tools that allows all students to show achievement.

And then the final SAC we have is in outcome four unit one. Once again, there's another the assessment task that gives you a list of what you could use. And it's up to the individual teacher to decide, which would be the best appropriate. When I say the individual teacher, sorry, your moderation group, who you’re going to moderate with, when you decide at the start of the year, how are we going to teach this particular outcome, deciding then what's the most appropriate assessment tasks for our cohort of students for this year.

When I look at the School-assessed Task and it's quite a large task, and we now it goes across three outcomes across the year. So unit three outcome three, unit four outcome two, and unit four outcome three. And the one thing I want to emphasise really when it comes to this is a School-assessed Task is really based on how well the students have developed their design brief.

So when we began our moderation at the beginning and we sat looking at, okay, how are we going to teach this and teach the design brief? We really need to make sure that our students, developing a design brief which they can then have good strong responses moving forward. It's a common knowledge or a common feeling across our study that students will come into the classroom at the beginning of the year and say, 'I want to make this' or 'I want to produce that' and they've already got a solution. And then they're writing a design brief with the solution and we need to make sure that our learning activities and our teaching activities really stretch those students to move away from having a solution-based design brief to a design brief which has a problem in it. And it has a need and it has a want, and it's actually how design briefs should be written, where they do not have a solution to begin with.

Because as they go through, there's a need and there's a want or there's a problem that they're answering, as they're doing their research, as they're doing the visualisations, they're doing their design options. Each of these can be really strong and really rich because they are showing how they've been able to develop that solution as they've gone through. And so really need to put a focus into that area, making sure our students, when we're doing our moderation to begin with that we're looking at how we're going to make sure that the students have a really good understanding what's required of the design brief.

Just the same thing, we're coming back to doing our SACs we're looking at just examples of questions and helping us rank students. So I mentioned earlier too, about having six and eight mark answers in your assessment tasks to help with that ranking of students, but also too those particular questions need to be able to show that differentiation.

Just here, you got a couple of examples of what both of them are six mark questions, but the first one was question 12. This is for outcome two of unit three, and the person might write then, student must have the answer, if you were to apply the extended producer responsibility or EPR product stewardship sustainability model to the Nokia mobile phone, analyse the role of manufacturers, retailers, consumers, and the government would play in sharing responsibility to reducing environmental impacts during the phone's life cycle. So it really gives the students an opportunity to show their understanding of EPA, EPR sorry, showing what their understanding of what the effects are through the phone's life cycle or product's life cycle, and those stakeholders that are involved in it. And really showing that depth there. And at the beginning, when you're sitting down and moderating, you'd be looking at what are we expecting for a six mark answer here? What are we expecting for a two mark answer?

The other question that we've written is the poor six mark answer. It just says match the product design factors to their parameters. Well, really at the end of the day, that's a example there of six one mark questions. It doesn't really give the opportunity for students to show the difference in their understanding and their depth of understanding. There's really a little bit here off, oh I know two or three of them, so I can answer those correctly. And then I'll guess the rest are I'll get it. So it really doesn't give us a true understanding. The data we'd get in the end would be a little bit flawed and make it difficult in our ranking of our students.

So back to the School-assessed Task, it provides students, so the way to begin this is provide students with a copy of the assessment criteria and unpack the content with the students. This is really important to begin this at the start of the year. And as part of your moderation process that you at the same time, you're unpacking it with the students. It's also developing your professional learning because of the questions that students may come up with that you haven't even thought about. And yeah, need to look a little bit closer at that. Or we need to create another learning activity for that to really strengthen those students.

Discuss with your moderation group at the beginning of the year, how each criteria will be assessed. And what level of response the moderation group is looking for. And it's to make it fair for each student in the cohort. So we're looking there at the beginning of the year that we have a clear understanding of how we're going to assess this, how we're going to assess each criteria, what are we looking for so that no student, between different groups is being assessed differently, that we're being nice and fair when it comes to that.

Use examples of previous works of students in your teaching learning programs to support student's understanding of levels of responses required and not just your top end, not just the very good responses, but also looking at ones that finished, got a medium in the past, or may have got a low. So students can visually see, because most of our students are visual learners in this particular area. They can visually see what would be expected of them.

Weighting indicators in each criteria to suit your cohort. And what is meant by that is looking at, one of the criteria is where we talk about, we look at research and our ability to research, and then one of the indicators in there is asking students to talk about their efficient and effective referencing, sorry, their referencing and how they go about that. In that particular criteria, when you're marking it, it shouldn't be as much emphasis put on the intellectual property side of it and how students reference as to the research. The research is really the biggest part of that one. So in your moderation group to begin with, discuss, okay how are we going to assess this? How are we going to assess it fairly? Is it a 50 50 split between each indicator? Or are we expecting as long as they've shown the indicator, how is that going to, and make that part of your particular cohort that you're assessing at the time and fair to that particular group.

And then the answer, the SAT is the ranking of your students against each other and not other students against the state. So when you're looking at it, you're only ranking your group of students. And so you don't have to be worried or concerned about what are other schools doing, how they're ranking their students, what are they expecting for this response? What are they, this particular task, what are they expecting them to do? You look at your cohort and say, what do I want, or what do we want out of our particular students and how are we going to rank these students accordingly.

So when should moderation occur? So for Product Design, moderation should occur directly after each specific assessment task for the ranking of the student cohort is completed. So for unit three, outcome one and outcome two and unit four, outcome one, we spoke about earlier. Moderation, the actual meeting should occur directly after the students submit their response for the SAT, for assessment criteria one to three. So the scores for these three SAT criteria are due mid year. We would have all just submitted those recently. And directly after students submit their response for the SAT criteria assessment, assessment criteria four to nine. And it's really important that we do do it directly after. So we've got everything's very clear with where the students are at at the time, how it's all performed, and that there's no chance of there being a, I guess a gap in the why that we've decided as a moderation group to assess and that things change, we're really, really quick on that and efficient as well. And our students deserve to get feedback as well, and it's timely in an efficient manner. And by holding off on moderation postpones the time that we can give that feedback back to our students.

So in relation to the School-assessed Task a couple of key points just wanted to finish off with, around that. When we assess we're assessing the evidence provided by the student okay. So what the student has given us and was submitted on time and the dates and times that we've decided as a moderation group, making sure that we are only assessing that actual evidence that they have provided there and then.

So when we are assessing, we need to be objective in how we apply our assessment criteria to the student's response. We spend a lot of time with these students and get to know them very, very well. And just being this assessment task goes for a long period of the year. We see the work that they are doing, and sometimes work that they're not doing as well.

So when we are assessing, we need to be very objective in the way that we apply this. And just got a couple of notes there, things, examples that we should never really influence a student's score and make sure that it doesn't influence a student's score. So things look, he or she worked so hard and how hard they worked and they probably deserve more. No, they don't deserve more just because they worked hard, they deserve the score they got of what they've shown you.

Their behaviour, maybe some of their behaviour was quite appalling, his or her behaviour was appalling, that should not influence their score at all. That should just, once again, the evidence that they provided is what they get marked on.

He or she hasn't completed the work, but I think they can do it, or I've seen them do it. They just didn't submit it on the day. I know that they've got it. Now, once again, that doesn't influence their scores, you need to assess what they've provided on that particular day.

Things too like their handwriting is so messy or portfolio's out of order. They are another two points that don't influence the score and should never be taken into consideration when we're marking students' work and applying the assessment criteria. And we need to be fair and equitable to our student's responses when we're marking them and also to the rest of the cohort.

So with a particular student, we need to be fair on them and make sure we're not marking them too harshly, or too hard, but at the same time, we need to make sure we're not marking them too easy or giving them the benefit of the doubt sometimes because that's unfair to the rest of the cohort of our students. So we need to make sure we're being fair and consistent. And it's hard, especially when we spend so much time with these students and we get to know them quite well to be, but keep that in mind, am I being fair and equitable to the student? And am I being fair and equitable to the rest of the students that I'm marking at that time?

Finally, who to moderate with? And that's probably the first question everyone has, who am I going to moderate with? And Product Design and Technology studies is relatively small. So many schools only offer one class of this particular study. This means many teachers are teaching the study solo within their school. So we'll have some schools that might teach resistant materials, other schools will teach nonresistant materials. So then that particular educator is working solely and having to work out, who am I going to moderate with. So the final four probably, these four next points, give you some support, hopefully of who to moderate with.

So when you got more than one teacher teaching the study at the school, they should moderate together. Okay. Saying, sounds pretty, makes the most sense, but yeah, but that could also be, you got the resistant materials, woodwork, metal and plastics teacher and the textiles teacher, the nonresistant materials, they should be coming together and moderating together. Those students should be undertaking the same task in that particular school, because it's all one school at the same time. And one school. And beginning at the start of the sitting there together. And part of that moderation group, working out whatever learning activity is going to be, what's our tasks going to and those were spoken about earlier on.

So if there's only one teacher at the school, they could also moderate with another teacher who has taught the study in the past. So you might be lucky enough to have someone else at the school. There's only one particular class, there's only a woodwork class, wood and metal, plastic class, or there's only a textiles class that you've got another teacher there who was taught it in the past and is up to speed with the current study design too. That's really important that their influence and what they're looking at is relevant and current. Someone who's taught it 15 years ago may not have the same insight into what's expected of our students today as what they have in the past. So making sure that that person is up to speed with that current study design and has spent the time, I guess reviewing it and reflecting on it so they can support you.

The other possibility is that if there's only one teacher. You can moderate with another teacher from another school. And the final one. Yeah when you've only got one teacher at a school, who's in a partnership with another school okay. These teachers should moderate together. Okay, ideally, cause they're being considered as one cohort in the stats and in the ranking. So we need to make sure that we are moderating those students similar. So the assessment tasks for those students too, ideally you have the same assessment tasks maybe running at the same time, but if that's not possible, then you have assessment tasks which are similar of nature which are pretty much a reflection of each other. So we know that we're still marking our students fairly, both groups of students have been assessed at the same level and with the same expectations. And then that way our moderation and rankings as to the data is accurate.
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