

**Form Name:** Years 11&12 March Moderation 2018 - Report

**Submission Time:** March 13, 2018 11:57 am

## Meeting Details

**Meeting Venue:**

North

**AM or PM session?**

AM

**Which Learning Area is this Report for?**

English

**Which AM Meeting is this report for?**

English - English Level 3

**Moderation Leader Name**

Amelia Diprose

**Moderation Leader Email**

amelia.diprose@education.tas.gov.au

**Minute Keeper (if available)**

Tracey Owers

**Minute Keeper Email**

tracey.owers@stpatricks.tas.edu.au

## Attendance

**Please enter the Name, school and email address for all attendees - you should be able to copy and paste this from the Attendance list you were sent - removing anyone who didn't attend and adding**

Samuel Holmes  
Adele Geard  
Nerissa Snyders  
Philip Cabalzar  
Matt Dawson  
Gail Harris  
Anne Gunn  
Mary Hateley  
Amelia Diprose  
Lucy King  
Joanna Hobman  
Rob Pople

<b>anyone who was extra on the day</b>	Steve van Ommen glenn wyllie Kelly Wilson David Hughes Jim Mayne Rachelle Littler James McGeachy Tracey Owers Gemma O'Halloran Rebecca Hodgkinson
<b>Extras - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone extra who wasn't on your attendance list:</b>	None
<b>Apologies/absences - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone on your attendance list who did not attend</b>	Liane Gordon, Jane Hendriks, Joanne Andriopoulos, Chris Cabalzar

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

<b>Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against</b>	C3
<b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b>	Externally this was given a C- Group agreed in the C range
<b>What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given</b>	Verging on analysis, but more explanatory - wasn't taking the next step to analysis.  (one comment that graded as a B - swayed because hadn't read the text)

Somewhat retelling.

For element 3 - how texts conveys, does not do that well. Is very much needed for anything beyond a C

The balance of elements is a difficult for an overall grading.

The expectations of the module has assisted somewhat in the confusion. Therefore, if not using a an external critical perspective, then many felt they needed to give this piece, the benefit of doubt.

What do we mean by perspective - eg. war is damaging, through a character's perspective, through the author - if that is the same, then does there need to be another perspective. Comment made that the focus is on the plural.

What is a within text perspective, if it isn't a discussion on two characters.

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

To discuss specific details, and dissect and deconstruct a key moment - more specific and exact examination to move into the analysis.

Comment made that it must be more explicit. Metalanguage is the key.

More metalanguage needed in such a discussion that focuses on perspectives within the novel (eg. character) and a focus on the question is required, which would have allowed them to meet that element 3.

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

More explicit teaching of deconstruction/analysis.

Modelling analysis of key passages.

Developing skills in explicitly drawing examiners' attention to the perspectives being discussed.

**Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2**

**Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against**

C3

**What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?**

Externally given an A- Group split between A and B range

**What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given**

Second page, first paragraph - liberal humanist ...

this is moving into analysis and evaluation. While the evaluation isn't explicit but it is implied.

What is the rule of thumb that we are using - question asked - between the minus and the plus. B rating - is looking at what constitutes the analysis. Beginning to but not consistent or sustained.

B range is about the strength of the analysis

A range is the strength of the evaluation

Has the analysis, specific detail, use of quotations. The overall picture is in the way in which they build the argument, weave the analysis together.

Many argued that there are signs of evaluation.

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

Lack of engagement with multiple perspectives

Lack of evaluation to move it into the A range

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

So many different interpretations of what is required within this module.

Papers are being marked by people who have not studied/read the texts. This is an unfortunate reality of the marking of external exams.

Either about perspectives within or outside but not both! This the change that is in this module.

Their discussion in the exam must be outside or within

but not both.

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

**Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against**

C3

**What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?**

Externally given a B. Group mostly agreed that it was in the B range (but a few placed it in the C range)

**What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given**

Huge range of results on this piece. First page - evaluation. Often questioned the role of 'death' Language of evaluation is used throughout the piece. Element 3 there - perhaps implied.

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

The reading of the text is presented as confused. The point that it was too provocative was raised and that elements of the texts appeared to be misread. Another point was that we need to consider the role of the teacher, it was argued, and the way they were taught. However, within the text inbuilt contradiction.

Missing substantial detail that does not support their analysis.

They did not weave a cohesive argument.

Not sufficient justification of their own argument

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

See above.

What would be beneficial is to see some strong samples of A responses. It would be great to have a framework, so that we can teach the various demands of this task.

What are we expecting them to do and how does this impact our teaching.

It was clear, that the grade students received was very dependent on what the teachers were looking for (and this varied considerably)

What weighting are we giving to the various demands of the task and the elements of the criterion?

The A samples were compiled and distributed to some. It would be good for all be given these samples. Section C markers were sent some samples, again, we would request that all be provided this.

It would be great also to have an EA students who received As across the exam and for these responses to be sent. Likewise, the borderline C-/t

We need annotated clear EA, HA, CA, SA student samples. Would also be beneficial for students to see. So important to have other sections of the exam as well.

There is considerable concern over the discrepancy within this group and the implication this has for our students. We are concerned about the action that TASC should take on this. The marking of essays by teachers who haven't studied let alone taught the texts is an issue. This is compounded by the fact that the text list is so long.

NB: The remedy of the change to the module "of the within OR outside" has actually confused the group further that simplified.

We are still seeking clarity.

## Summary of any further samples moderated

**Further samples -  
Criteria assessed  
against**

C1

**What ratings have  
the group  
assigned  
this/these  
Sample(s)?**

No further papers

**What evidence  
supports the  
ratings the group  
has given**

No further papers

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

No further papers

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

No further papers

## Planning for September Moderation 2018

**Are you planning  
on:**

Small number of same samples for all teachers statewide to assess in advance of the meeting - with the expectation that all teachers bring further work for conferencing

**Please list the  
criteria to be**

Criterion 2 and Criterion 4

**moderated:**

**Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:**

One sample from Section B, that is a clear cut example.

**Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for the September moderation**

Amelia Diprose

**Email**

amelia.diprose@education.tas.gov.au

## Sharing Resources

**Please provide details of any resources or teaching or assessment strategies, useful links etc. that were shared in the meeting.**

Discussion has been made (see the notes under the sample discussions)

## Course Support

**Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course:**

See discussion as per previous question.



## Annotated Exemplars

**Which of the samples you have looked at today along with your meeting notes might be suitable to develop further into an annotated exemplar?**

Sample 1

Sample 2

Sample 3