

Section E Marking Scheme

TASK 1: FAQ handout draft

Maximum marks 15

1. (Call) Megasolutions / Megaboard
2. on 2834 3211 (and ask for) Jae Soon-yoo / Wendy Lok
3. You should use cleaning fluid
4. (Yes, there are.) As soon as contracts are signed
5. You can access the Megaboard / Megasolutions website / www.megaboard.com
6. IT (support) staff / technicians
7. (No,) it will be permanently built into the classroom
8. Blinds should not be necessary if the data projector is bright enough.
9. English

Useful websites (all points from page 4)

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------|---|
| 10. | Megaboard Support page | } |
| 11. | First time users (of Megaboard Whiteboard) / (IWB) | |
| 12. | Techno Tips for the Classroom | } |
| 13. | Teachers | |
| 14. | Opal Business Training Consultants | } |
| 15. | Business people | |

Presentation Marks

Readability

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1	3

This is an overall impression mark of the 'readability' of the candidate's work, i.e. is it difficult or easy to follow? Readability includes:

- General organisation of report.
- The logical organisation of ideas. Are related or similar ideas grouped together logically and presented in a logical order?
- The appropriate use of paragraphing to help the reader follow the organisation.
- The appropriate use of signposts or cohesive devices to link ideas, showing, for example, contrast, similarity, continuation.
- The appropriate use of generality, specifics, and examples to effectively make points.

Language

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1	3

This is an overall impression mark of language used.

The 'language' mark is an overall assessment of vocabulary, spelling, grammatical accuracy, range and variety of structure used (for candidate's own language) and appropriate adaptation (for largely-copied language).

TASK 2a: IWB Report: Section 2 – Context

Paragraph on HK

16. Primary – 5% in 2000
17. – increased to 10% by 2002
18. – increased to 15% by 2004
19. Secondary – 5% in 2000
20. – increased to 15% by 2002
21. – increased to 33% by 2004
22. Tertiary – 10% in 2000
23. – increased to 20% by 2002
24. – increased to 25% by 2004
25. In 2000 and 2002 tertiary institutions most likely to have IWBs
26. In 2004 secondary most likely

Comparison of Osaka and HK

27. Osaka higher over entire period
28. Osaka higher in (all 3) institution types
29. 2000 Osaka – 50% of secondary classrooms compared to 5% in HK
30. 2002 Osaka – 72% of secondary classrooms compared to 15% in HK
31. 2004 Osaka – 90% of secondary classrooms compared to 33% in HK
32. Osaka 2004 – ratio of 9:1 had IWBs
33. Osaka – ratio (much) higher than HK

Presentation Marks

Readability

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1	3

This is an overall impression mark of the ‘readability’ of the candidate’s work, i.e. is it difficult or easy to follow? Readability includes:

- General organisation of report.
- The logical organisation of ideas. Are related or similar ideas grouped together logically and presented in a logical order?
- The appropriate use of paragraphing to help the reader follow the organisation.
- The appropriate use of signposts or cohesive devices to link ideas, showing, for example, contrast, similarity, continuation.
- The appropriate use of generality, specifics, and examples to effectively make points.

Language

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1	3

This is an overall impression mark of language used.

The ‘language’ mark is an overall assessment of vocabulary, spelling, grammatical accuracy, range and variety of structure used (for candidate’s own language) and appropriate adaptation (for largely-copied language).

TASK 2b: IWB report: Sections 3 – 5

Maximum marks 45

3 Equipment and Set-up (Section 3)

- 40. computer, data projector and interactive whiteboard
- 41. the Megaboard/IWB is connected to the computer
- 42. the computer is connected to the data projector
- 43. IWB/Megaboard is connected to power supply
- 44. Internet connection

Safety issues:

- 45. IWB/Megaboard is heavy and needs to be mounted on a solid wall
- 46. cables should be out of the way

4 Key Features and Benefits of IWBs (Section 4)

- 47. can write on IWB/Megaboard using the MEGApencil // can interact directly with IWB using MEGApencil // can use MEGApencil with IWB just as you would with a monitor and mouse (*can also be included in Section 3*)
- 48. adding annotations / notes / comments to website pages / digital image / stills from (digital) video
- 49. saving board work / information on the board
- 50. helps to review / revise // can go back over things // returning to previous boardwork
- 51. able to print off materials for absent students
- 52. no need for students to make notes
- 53. converts handwriting (in English) into typed script
- 54. easier to bring English language world into class
- 55. easier to grasp concepts / follow lessons
- 56. make / keep students (more) interested / enthusiastic // motivate students // more interesting lessons
- 57. more active / involved / ready to watch and respond
- 58. students can give their own presentations // show favourite website
- 59. students can see (teacher's) demonstrations
- 60. teachers can show students how to use the www outside class / at home
- 61. can share teaching materials with teachers / colleagues
- 62. download (professionally produced) lessons from website / Internet

5 Teacher Training Requirements for IWBs (Section 5)

- 63. need a competent trainer // the trainer needs to know what he/she's doing
- 64. relevant training should be subject specific // should have separate sessions for different subjects
- 65. provide different sessions for different levels of IT knowledge
- 66. should not be (just) before exam period / time
- 67. teachers need time / opportunities to find things out for themselves during training session
- 68. post-training practice is essential // need a few weeks to get to know this new technology
- 69. schools should reserve computer room

Presentation Marks

Relevance

Lots of irrelevant material	Some irrelevant material	Hardly any irrelevant material
0	1, 3	5

This award is based on whether or not the candidate has included irrelevant, inappropriate or unnecessary material.

Readability

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1, 3	5

This is an overall impression mark of the 'readability' of the candidate's work, i.e. is it difficult or easy to follow? Readability includes:

- General organisation of report.
- The logical organisation of ideas. Are related or similar ideas grouped together logically and presented in a logical order?
- The appropriate use of paragraphing to help the reader follow the organisation.
- The appropriate use of signposts or cohesive devices to link ideas, showing, for example, contrast, similarity, continuation.
- The appropriate use of generality, specifics, and examples to effectively make points.

Language

Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good
0	1, 3	5

This is an overall impression mark of language used.

The 'language' mark is an overall assessment of vocabulary, spelling, grammatical accuracy, range and variety of structure used (for candidate's own language) and appropriate adaptation (for largely-copied language).