

Rich Task staff evaluation sheet

TOBERMORY
Departments involved,
Design and Technology, Geography and Art.

A Initial Involvement

1 introduction

Lead teacher approached by head teacher and asked if would like to lead the RT pilot project within Tobermory HS. read literature and researched RT concept and then went to 2 day introductory seminar with teachers from Argyll and North Lanarkshire.

2 resources

Australian literature on New Basics and RT concept and reports. 2 day Seminar introduced speakers who had experienced the Australian New Basics.

3 Knowledge and experience of the topic.

New basic rich tasks

NIL

Cooperative Learning.

NIL

Assessment is For Learning

Regular classroom use

Determined to Succeed.

Very little.

B. Staff Preparation and Training.

1 Involvement in Preparation.

Lead teacher attended 2 day introductory seminar.

Cooperative Learning.

staff completed introductory day specifically for the richtaskers

Interdisciplinary Working.

The rich task work as described

Assessment of pupil's performance.

Regular meetings with ACfE coordinator (Dave Whitelaw)

Regular Rich Task teachers meetings at least once a week

2 Pupils stages

Jan	Pupils have double period in canteen area for RT introduction. Pupils arranged in 'home groups' and then given time to complete project. Groups then complete brainstorming project using Cooperative learning approach with presentation at end.	2hrs
	Brief	1
	Sketching Techniques	2
	Computer modeling	3
	Physical model	3
	Research	4
	Letter writing	2
	Power point presentation skills	3
	Measurements/area/volume/scale	2
	location	1
	climate	2
	planning	1
	transport	1
	Presentation practise	1
	Presentations	2

C. Evaluation

1. How effective do you feel that cooperative Learning was in helping your pupils prepare for the rich task assessment?

Essential. It would have been interesting to have seen the outcome of the RT project without the use of cooperative learning. Cooperative approach every 2 weeks not every lesson.

2. What were the advantages and disadvantages for staff, of the interdisciplinary approach to teaching?

We found it useful to help motivate the pupils to achieving. Also gave an insight into the contents of other courses. Increased cooperation and understanding of each others contribution/style and priorities.

The disadvantage is the time needed for added communication. We were unable to coordinated a specific time where we could meet together and this was not beneficial to the task.

3. How effective do you think you were in highlighting to pupils the link between the subjects and departments involved in the rich tasks.

The 2 period intro at the onset of the RT was useful at communicating the use of cross subject interaction.

Pupils then simply took on board and ran with it. At times, pupils seemed to even forget which subject they were in when doing some of the task activity.

4. Overall, in relation to their 5-14 levels how would you describe pupil performance.

It was sometimes difficult to identify individual assessment areas and that's something that could have been improved, however, overall we believe that pupils attained at least as well if not better than their individual 5-14 attainment would have been. 'Less able' pupils benefited from the pace and the partnership within the groups while 'more able' pupils felt that at times they were carrying the group. In future we would give more scope for individual assessment.

5. How would you describe your experience in using the rich task assessment poles to assess pupil's performance? Explain your feelings.

The assessment poles were used at the beginning of the project to arrive at/set the criteria assessment yet were rarely referred to as the project progressed. They were then returned to when we were looking at the outcomes/assessment of the groups presentations to arrive at assessment criteria. The poles language was at difficult to interpret and we feel the criteria for the presentation skills them selves should have been included.

D. Overall Evaluation.

1. What, in your view, were the strengths and weaknesses of your rich task project?

Strengths

The task motivated and enthused the pupils towards a goal that made pupils eager to get on task at almost all times.

One particular strength was the use of different coloured constructions hats to identify different roles and groups. This approach also followed a De Bono approach.

Pupils based their learning towards a 'real life' situation which gave them a context to aim at.

Group cohesion and social development.

Dynamic aim at public and accountable presentations.

Motivated some 'less able' pupils to achieve as apart of a group and allow them to concentrate on one part of the task that allowed them to contribute and achieve.

The model making allowed the pupils to conceptualise their ideas and research.

Bring members of the community into the learning task.

Allow pupils to be aware of the bigger picture when it comes to their local environment and community.

Give teachers the opportunity to work together and create a task together.

Weakness

Actual real life experience of a project from concept to construction as a way of introducing the whole planning of a built project.

More time for pupils to consolidate their work *ie* one day 'out of class' to totally focus in on project.

More visual material so that groups could see their progress and able to judge their timing (the whole project as a cooperative learning experience).

More time to teacher group introduction. Better communication at the beginning of the task to ensure that teachers know what is required from them and to what contribution they can give and develop within the task.

More support from school senior management particularly with time tabling concerns. This time would emphasis the importance of the task.

More planning with the model making skills.

2 in what ways would you agree or disagree the that Rich task is a viable model which could be used by schools to help embed the four capacities of A Curriculum for Excellence?

Highly agree. We feel that the RT experience was a worth while contribution to the ACoE learning philosophy. It allowed for specific ACoE capacities to be more identifiable and easily assessed/judged. The overwhelming response from pupils was positive towards redoing the RT experience and they recommend that next years year group conduct the same task with the same approach to group activities. The task requires careful planning, time for regular progress meetings and evaluating, and crucial clear task criteria.