

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

Submission Time: March 13, 2018 9:55 pm

Meeting Details

Meeting Venue:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which Learning Area is this Report for?	English
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	English - English Literature Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Sarah Cupit
Moderation Leader Email	sarah.cupit@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper (if available)	Greta Lucas
Minute Keeper Email	greta.lucas@education.tas.gov.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

Penny	Leder
Greta	Lucas-Kerschbaum
Sarah	Cupit
Anna	Forward
Yvette	Blackwood
Tony	Barrett
Adam	Shaw
Emma	Nathan
Katrina	Haig
Ellen	Rees
Sarah	Geale
Annette	Logan

anyone who was extra on the day

William Simon
Alison Farmer

Charlotte Vickers

Extras - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone extra who wasn't on your attendance list:

none

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

Margaret Boyce, Charlotte Vickers

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against

C6

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

Sample 1 was not moderated due to time constraints

What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given

Sample 1 was not moderated due to time constraints

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

Sample 1 was not moderated due to time constraints

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

Sample 1 was not moderated due to time constraints

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against

C6

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

Sample 2 was not moderated due to time constraints

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

Sample 2 was not moderated due to time constraints

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

Sample 2 was not moderated due to time constraints

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

Sample 2 was not moderated due to time constraints

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against

C6

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

A

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

OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE GROUP:

This is the most difficult criterion to grade because it is requiring so much of the student, contains large concepts, and the nature of the independent study task, with its three different forms of writing does not easily lend itself to allowing the student to demonstrate against the criterion.

The unstated theoretical position behind this criterion is closest to reader response theory

Element 6.2 should alert the marker to where the script should sit

Elements 3, 4 and 5 are often done all together and are hard to separate

Writing an inquiry question using the first person is paramount to addressing C6

Moderators cautioned the sole use of a personal, autobiographical justification for a students' response to the text, however recognised that this is an element of the A rating of 6.5, but still must be highly relevant to the inquiry question and the text.

There is a seeming inconsistency between the Criterion stem and the elements. Future iterations of this syllabus could look at correcting this and review the nature of the Independent Study task.

Moderators agreed that, while 6.2 is essential, where each of the elements might be found across the Reflection Statement, Critical Response and Imaginative Response, and the balance the student strikes between them should be rewarded on merit, rather than penalised if one is privileged over the others.

Assessment of Sample 3

6.1: this was agreed to be the 'pathway' or 'process element'. The way the student arrived at the response

can be assessed here. This could include the other critical interpretations consulted. In Sample 3, the reflective voice and the references to wide reading and close analysis of the text itself demonstrated that the student effectively used tools and methods of reflection to arrive at and analyse her personal position.

6.2: close examination of the composer's ideas was found in the opening sentence to the Reflection Statement and comprised the bulk of the first half of the students' paragraphs in the critical response. The student showed a clear understanding of the perspective taken by Ishiguro on the morality of biotechnology and the analysis of the genre and stylistic features used to present his ideas and values.

6.3: evidence for this criterion was found in the analysis that followed the numerous quotations from the text that explicitly analysed the influence of the text and language on the student's response. For example, on page 5, "Kath's direct reference to the reader through the second person "you" (279) implies that they are a clone as well, and invites the reader to imagine themselves in Kath's place." Further evidence was found in the explicit reference to the effect on the students' ideas in the Reflection Statement.

6.4: Moderators found it difficult to separate 6.4 from 6.5 and 6.3 and suggested that, again this is a global element. The student was able to clearly articulate her struggle with the tension between ethics and science in the Reflection Statement, as well as discuss her perspective in some detail towards the end of the introduction and paragraphs. The requirement 'justifies' was found in the complexity of her argument on the issue of biotechnology and morality.

6.5: The student uses the collective first person effectively, along with multiple references to aspects of twenty-first century biotechnology and a range of philosophical and scientific arguments, to analyse the influences of wider socio-cultural features of context, while the well-placed 'I' at the beginning of the Reflection Statement and the end of the Critical

Response indicated a personal position.

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

It was agreed that the student met all requirements for the A criteria across all the elements.

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

It was recognised that an Independent Study of this standard is difficult to achieve in a five week block, positioned, for the most part, after mid-year exams. Teachers may choose to organise the Independent Study in two or more blocks and start students thinking about and working on the study early.

Summary of any further samples moderated

Further samples - Criteria assessed against

C6

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

A-

What evidence supports the ratings the group has given

Moderation of Sample 4: All that I am

6.1: This student was explicit and articulate about his or her pathway towards a personal response in the Reflection statement, explaining the research conducted in some detail.

6.2: moderators agreed this was the criterion element most featured in the Critical Response. This is to be rewarded, rather than penalised (for not making as much of 6.4 and 6.5, specifically). Of great merit was the student's close analysis of the language of the text and recognition of the composer's ideas and perspective.

While lots of individual astute claims were made about the text, this did not translate into a clear statement of what Funder's position is on the events she is writing about. The Imaginative response was so strong, however, in establishing that students' understanding of the historical period through Funder's perspective. This highlights the important role a good Imaginative Response can have in showing evidence against the elements of C6.

6.3: the student's reflection on the effects of the composer's language choices on the student's own understanding and ideas was woven throughout the Critical Response and directly stated in the Reflection statement.

6.4: The student clearly expressed and justified his or her own perspective on the text.

6.5: The student's choice to use a personal experience of a friend from Maoist China's parallel experiences in the Reflection Statement was a good attempt at bringing in the "own life experiences" named in the A rating descriptor, however moderators felt that the effect and relevance of this experience was vague. it was agreed that this personal position was more suited to the Reflection Statement.

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

The student needed consolidate his or her argument about the text in the critical response. The comments about the author's ideas, values and perspectives were interesting but lacked cohesion into an overarching thesis that recognised the author's purpose in using the genre of historical fiction.

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

Rewriting the question with a strong personal I voice would give the study focus.

ratings)?

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 moderated:

Criterion 1 and Criterion 4

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

A Section B exam script

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

Alison Farmer

Email

alison.farmer@hutchins.tas.edu.au

Sharing Resources

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

Sarah Cupit shared her Love Poetry resource with teachers.

There is an excellent piece on teaching Richard Flanagan's *The Narrow Road to the Deep North* in Reading Australia, written by Ellen Rees

Teachers are reminded that Dr Naomi Milthorpe has presented lectures on "Whoso list to hunt" and "Ode to Autumn" on the DoE year 11 and 12 site.

Sarah Cupit has a copy of the proper Neruda translation and can be emailed for it.

Course Support

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

A review of the criteria for this course and the external assessment mechanism is timely now that teachers have spent time teaching the course and moderating the criteria in the moderation sessions.

Some focus questions might include:

- Could criterion stems and criterion elements have a closer relationship with one another?
- Could each criterion be simplified and made more distinct from other criteria to ensure greater consistency of interpretation and assessment?
- is the assessment mechanism (eg. the Independent Study) the most appropriate form (Reflective, Critical and Imaginative Response) for assessing against the criteria?
- are the criteria chosen for external folio assessment the most appropriate ones for the nature of the external assessment task (eg. the independent Study)?
- Does criterion 6 reward students for the close critical examination of literary texts?

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 3