**INTERNAL MODERATION COVER SHEET** 

**NZQA** [***Assessment Rules***](https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/legislation/nzqa-rules/assessment-including-examination-rules-2019/1/)**require that schools must establish an** [**internal moderation process**](https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/assessment-and-moderation-of-standards/managing-national-assessment-in-schools/secondary-moderation/internal-moderation/) **that  meets NZQA's requirements and which is applied each year to every internally assessed standard being assessed, to ensure that judgements are consistent with the Assessment Standard**.

**Faculty/Department: Digital Technology**

**Teacher in Charge of Assessment: Steven Rodkiss and**

**Assessors: Steve Rodkiss and Samuel O’Sullivan**

| **Section A: Complete information on the assessment *before any teaching*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Title:** | GGame Design | | | | | **Standard Number: 91877**  **91878** | | **Version:** | | | | | |
| **Standard Title:** | Develop a proposal for a digital outcome  Develop a design for a digital outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Credits: 3 + 3** | | **NZQF Level: 1** | | | **The school has consent to assess this standard** | | | | | **Yes** | | **~~No~~** | |
| **Source of Materials:** **~~Commercial~~ / Own / ~~TKI / NZQA / Subject Association / Other (specify):~~** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Section B: Critique assessment materials *before any assessing*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **The critiquing process is to ensure that the assessment materials meet the requirements specified in the standard and provide the opportunity for students to present authentic evidence at all grades.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Before use the assessment materials have been checked against:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The current moderator report and clarification of the standard document | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| The conditions of assessment | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Any external moderation feedback | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| The standard is unchanged and the task has been previously critiqued, | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| ***If yes, no further critiquing required.*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The assessment is consistent with the explanatory notes/learning/context/curriculum level | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| The assessment allows students to achieve **all** requirements and grades of the standard | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Assessment schedule is consistent with the standard and clarifications documents | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Instructions are consistent with the standard explanatory notes/range statements | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Judgement/sufficiency statements clearly describe performance levels for each grade, e.g. quality & length | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Evidence statements allow for a range of acceptable answers with specific examples for each grade (A/M/E) | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Student instructions are clear and language is appropriate | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Registered standard number, version, title, level and credits are given. | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| **Critiquers’ Name:** | | | | **School:** | | | | | **Date:** | | | | |
| **Section C: Verify sufficient teacher judgements *before reporting results* PTO** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **The verification process is to ensure that any teacher judgements are consistent with the standard before they are reported to NZQA.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Verifier Name: Steve Rodkiss** | | | **School: Burnside** | | | | **Position: i/c** | | **Date:- 8/6/22** | | | | |
| Evidence of verification is available overleaf, attached or **at location (specify**): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **I have sighted evidence of the critiquing and verification processes completed for this standard.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed: Position:** | | | | | | | | | **Date:** | | | | |
| **Section D: Retain samples and review assessment materials *after results are reported*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Results loaded into student management system: | | | | | | | | | **Date:** | | | | |
| Assessment materials and student work are stored ready for external moderation | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| **Location or file path:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The school’s random selection procedure has been used to select work for external moderation (if required). | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| Assessment materials have been reviewed in response to feedback. | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |
| New benchmark samples have been annotated and/or existing examples of grade boundary decisions have been updated. | | | | | | | | | | | **Yes** | | **No** |

| **SECTION C: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE USING STRATEGIC SELECTION** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic selection of samples of work is based on the experience of the assessor(s), external moderation history, and the previous use of the task. The sample size can be sufficient, purposeful (at grade boundaries) or minimal.** | | | | | |
| **Student’s Name** | **Marker’s**  **Grade** | **Reason selected for verification** | **Verifier’s**  **Grade** | **Summary of discussion comments (or location of these comments)** | **Final Grade** |
| Conor Steltzer | N  N | Enough? | N  N | Not enough | N  N |
| Phoenix Rowling | N  N | Incomplete | N  N | Incomplete document with not enough | N  N |
| Skye Paton | A-Proposal  N-Design | N for Design | A  A | Design is well developed the fact that they had not justified in the conclusion is fine as they have described the appropriateness of the design in the design selection area | A  A |
| Jason Ma | A  A | High Achieved? | A  A | Achieved for both- not really refers to relevant implication in justification | A  A |
| Cheni Kapugama | A  A | Borderline M? | M  M | Merit for both. Includes good feedback and justification of their design decisions | M  M |
| Oliver Huang | M  M |  | M  M | Not quite deep enough in evaluation/justification to get E. Only one because. | M  M |
| Domonic McLauchlan | E  E | Morderline M/E | E  E | Probably a very low E. Could have been M but went with the higher on this occasion. | E  E |
| Monet Mo | M  M | Could be E? | E  E | Justification could do with more evidence (linked to research) but overall in depth and justified and included excellent feedback. | E  E |
| **Briefly justify the total number of pieces in this sample:** | | | | | |
| ***Complete all columns. Add extra rows as required. Where appropriate, it is good practice to indicate a grade’s proximity to a boundary.*** | | | | | |