

# 2021 March Moderation - Report



Which meeting is this report for?

Ancient History Level 3

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 2 = Overall

Criterion 7 = Overall

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

R1: C2: A- C7: A-

Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

This was regarded as a low level A response on both criteria. Four well-constructed pages under exam conditions clearly addressing the set question and the meeting felt that it was clearly an A on criteria 3 and 4 (which were not under consideration here).

Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Criterion 2 could have been more solid with the addition of more Egypt specific terminology and unpacking of those terms.

Criterion 7 Some members of the meeting felt that there could have been more discussion of human agency although this was not a requirement of the set question. Some would have liked to see more analysis.

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Room 1

C2 A Lots of terms relevant to historical concepts.

C7 B+ Explanation rather than higher order analysis. Solid response. Not a lot of unpacking of certain evidence.

Room 2

A- for both - comprehensive.

Room 3

C2 - B+

C7 - A-

Some consensus with Rm 1 in terms of analysis.

Room 4

C2 - A-

C7 - B+

Good evidence and quotes but there was clear confidence with material but C7 wasn't quite finishing the circle with regard to human agency.

Room 5

C2: B+

C5: A-

Terminology and concepts was solid for C2

Elements in C2 fed into C7

Room 6

C2: clearly in A range - good use of terms mentioning significance contestability etc.

C7: A-/A thinking there needed to be more analysis than description.

Ultimately the student provided a well balanced answer to a high standard.

Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

More analysis for C7 - how have they contextualised the person. Evaluation as opposed to description or narrative is what is required (for all) but certainly C7.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 2 = Overall

Criterion 7 = Overall

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Crit 2 - C-; Crit 7 - C-

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

The sample did not explicitly address the set question and was largely descriptive rather than analytical but there was generally accurate use of proper names and several key concepts such as: ostracism, foresight, cause and effect.

Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

The sample needs to address the elements in the question: social and historical context ( no mention of the development of democracy), motivation (not specifically addressed), shaping of society (needed more detail)

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Room 1 - 2 C-; 7 t+  
Room 2 - 2 C+; 7 C  
Room 3 - 2 C-; 7 C-  
Room 4 - 2 C-; 7 C-  
Room 5 - 2 C-; 7 C-

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Clearly address the elements of the set question. Focus less on description of historical events and more on motivation for and influence of those events.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 2 = Overall  
Criterion 7 = Overall

Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Crit 2 B+, Crit 7 B+

Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

A 5 page answer that appears to have a comprehensive knowledge of Augustus' achievements but less on his historical and social context. The issue with the paper was the almost illegible handwriting that meant meeting participants were unable to clearly discern whether concepts and terms had been used and whether key detail was accurate.

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

It is possible that all that would be required is a more legible script, however, there appeared to be an imbalance towards examining the actions that shaped his society over his motivations to do so.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with

Room 1 - 2 B+; 7 B+

comments to element level if applicable.

Room 2 - 2 B; 7 B  
 Room 3 - 2 B+; 7 B+  
 Room 4 - 2 B; 7 B+  
 Room 5 - 2 B+; 7 A-

Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

More practice in handwriting responses under timed conditions. Advice to perhaps reduce content in favour of clarity. The handwriting of terms and concepts needs particular attention.

### Planning for September Moderation 2021 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

Criterion 4 and Criterion 6

State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for moderation

samples will be sought from the three civilisations. Jenny Jones - Egypt; Rosalind Walker / Sarah Cappelli - Greece; Shane Wolfe or Sally Polanowski - Rome

### Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

There was no time in the 1.5 hour meeting time to discuss resources or strategies.

### Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Years 9 to 12 Learning to consider in relation to this course:

The meeting was informed by Ros and Sarah that there had been a change to the exam specs for 2021. It appeared that very few people were aware of this and that it had not been clearly disseminated by TASC. Mark Allen who had been consulted re the changes expressed his concerns about the gross over simplification of the requirements of Criterion 6 due to the elimination of element 2 which requires students to consider the relationship between structures and features. Others agreed with him and were surprised that such a significant change would take place in the fifth year of the course. The change affects the delivery and content of Module B in a very significant way since students will no longer be required to or be rewarded for considering the impact of structure on feature and vice versa. Could

TASC or Curriculum Services provide some rationale for this big change in what is likely the penultimate year of the course and is there any possibility to revert to the pre-Covid 19 specifications for this year?