

Assessment Schedule – 2025

Materials and Processing Technology: Demonstrate understanding of techniques selected for a feasible Materials and Processing Technology outcome (92015)

Assessment Criteria

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Demonstrate understanding of techniques selected for a feasible Materials and Processing Technology outcome involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trialling to select appropriate techniques in the development of a feasible outcome • describing the most appropriate techniques for the feasible outcome. 	<p><i>Explain techniques selected for a feasible Materials and Processing Technology outcome involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comparing the most appropriate techniques to make informed decisions for the feasible outcome • applying stakeholder feedback to improve decisions for the feasible outcome. 	<p><i>Evaluate techniques selected for a feasible Materials and Processing Technology outcome involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analysing how trialling, appropriate techniques, and stakeholder feedback connect to improve the feasibility of the outcome.

Sufficiency Statement

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
The response shows limited understanding of the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome.	The response shows some attempt at understanding the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome.	The response shows understanding of the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome, although some aspects may be partial or weak.	The response clearly shows understanding of the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome.	The response explains the refined selection of techniques for a feasible outcome, including the role, although some parts of the explanation may be partial or weak.	The response clearly explains the refined selection of techniques for a feasible outcome.	The response evaluates the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome, although some parts of the discussion may be partial or weak.	The response clearly evaluates the selection of techniques for a feasible outcome.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0–2	3–4	5–6	7–8

Evidence Statement

Part	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
(a) and (b)	<p>The candidate describes techniques selected for a feasible outcome.</p> <p>Evidence could include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describing the design and its intended environment • identifying an end user • listing the functional attributes of the feasible outcome • listing and describing the techniques trialled in relation to at least two functional attributes • describing techniques selected for use in the feasible outcome. 	<p>The candidate explains techniques selected for a feasible outcome.</p> <p>Evidence could include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • examining the results from the techniques trialled in relation to at least two functional attributes • explaining the selection of trialled techniques for use in the feasible outcome. 	<p>The candidate evaluates selected techniques for a feasible outcome.</p> <p>Evidence could include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluating the results from the techniques trialled in relation to at least two functional attributes • evaluating the selection of techniques from trialling for use in the feasible outcome.
(c)		<p>The candidate explains how feedback from relevant stakeholders (experts or end users) improved decisions for a feasible outcome.</p> <p>Evidence could include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explaining how feedback from stakeholders was considered when making decisions for the feasible outcome. 	<p>The candidate evaluates how feedback from relevant stakeholders (experts or end users) improved decisions for a feasible outcome.</p> <p>Evidence could include, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflecting on feedback from stakeholders to improve the feasibility of the outcome.

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p>I am designing a messenger bag for my cousin who is a postie and rides a scooter. The functional attributes the bag needs are: easy closure, portability, durability, and ease of access. I trialled two types of closure for ease of access – these were a zip and domes. The results from the trials were that it was easier to get the domes open than the zip. So I chose domes.</p>	<p>I am designing a messenger bag for my cousin who is a postie and rides a scooter. The functional attributes the bag needs are: easy open / closure, portability, durability, ease of access, and length of strap in relation to the user for comfort.</p> <p>I decided to trial two types of closures (zip and domes) for the messenger bag because I wanted to find out which would be quickest for my cousin to open and close.</p> <p>The results from the trials were that it was easier to get the domes open than the zip. However, domes won't keep the contents secure, so I decided to ask my cousin (stakeholder).</p> <p>My cousin said that the domes were quick to open but were fiddly and hard to close. His feedback was that I could increase the dome size to close the bag more easily. He thought this was better than a zip because a zip can jam.</p> <p>As a result of the feedback and trialling, I decided to use bigger domes for the closure of the bag.</p>	<p>My cousin is a postie for NZ Post and delivers parcels. I am designing a messenger bag for him. My cousin needs to be able to quickly access the contents of the messenger bag. The functional attributes the bag needs are: easy open / closure, portability, durable, ease of access, length of strap in relation to the user for comfort, and easily replaceable components.</p> <p>I decided to trial several types of closures (zip and domes in the first instance) for the messenger bag because I wanted to find out which would be quickest for my cousin to open and close. The results from the trials were that it was easier to get the domes open than the zip. However, domes won't keep the contents secure so I decided to ask my cousin (stakeholder) what he thinks will work for his needs while on his scooter.</p> <p>My cousin said that the domes were quick to open but were fiddly and hard to close. His feedback was that I could increase the dome size to close the bag more easily. He thought this was better than a zip because a zip can jam. However, my cousin doesn't really like the look of the domes so has asked me to research other closures such as Velcro or a flap that is easy to tuck in to the bag.</p> <p>As a result of the feedback and trialling, I carried out some research and trialled the flap-tucking idea. I decided the Velcro would get fluffy too fast so disregarded that option. I will take the flap trial back to my cousin to get his final approval for use in the design.</p>

NB: This standard does **not** require the design to be developed into a physical outcome.

Appendix: Authenticity of candidate work

To assess whether a candidate's evidence is genuine, the marker uses their professional judgement, considering all the evidence provided. Where the marker believes there is a possibility the work is inauthentic, they must raise a 'malpractice exception', flagging the issue for further review.

Evidence might be considered inauthentic if:

- large portions of the text are identical to other candidates' work
- the evidence does not match the assessment prompt or task
- the response shows evidence of someone else's input other than the candidate's (e.g., teacher feedback)
- the style or voice of the writing is inconsistent with the rest of the candidate's work
- complex pieces of evidence are copied from other sources but are presented as the candidate's own work, or the evidence is deemed significantly unnatural.

Properly referenced, relevant, and integrated information is acceptable. Uncertainty about the authenticity of evidence should be resolved in favour of the candidate.