

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

Submission Time: March 23, 2018 1:06 pm

Meeting Details

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

Greta Lucas
Sarah Cupit
Alice Wild
Elizabeth Delaney
Ellen Rees
Jayde Zeitzen
Jennifer Miller
Adam Shaw
Hannah Powell
Leonie Witte
James McCloud

anyone who was extra on the day

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

Angela, Lily Petkovic, Sarah Day, Naomi Colbeck

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

Jay Wheeler, Margaret Boyce

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against

C1

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

A

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

Group 1

A: It was very good! Any issues with its delivery would be addressed in the other criteria. Looking past the stem, for a 7000 word folio there were a couple of errors that might have jarred a little.

Group 2

A: Perfectly formatted and edited, no typos, punctuation and spelling errors, references and bibliography were perfect. A little turgid in descriptive writing, but that is

not a concern for this criterion.

Group 3

A-: Referencing: works consulted and works cited at the end of the final page for all pieces and used some footnoting.

This is a polished, confident and competent writer. It was not perfect; there were some flaws.

Group 4

A- Came from E4: communicates ideas using nuanced language with precision, subtlety and originality. It was overwritten in parts, had quite a few clichés and was overly adjectival at times.

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

See above

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

This folio is polished overall.

Referencing is important. There are three elements associated with referencing, so it can be penalised. This was referenced well.

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against

C1

What rating (or ratings) has the

t

**group assigned
this Sample?**

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

Group 1

C-/t+: The folio does not benefit from a second or third reading.

Group 2

C- Was the consensus of this group as there was a degree of consistency. While the layout of the dialogue was incorrect, the student has done the same thing all the way through. The spelling is basically right.

Group 3

t: The student did not pass the minimum word requirements. Given a C rating this would need to be taken down a full mark. It was not a straight C regardless because there were missing full stops, therefore without the word count penalty, it would be a C-.

Group 4

t+:

Consensus: t (due to not meeting required word length) and C- (stand alone without the word count penalty).

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

Teachers agreed that the standards for this criterion are many and varied, with elements addressing audience and purpose; punctuation, spelling and grammatical conventions; sophisticated vocabulary and syntax; and referencing requirements.

Elements 3 and 4 add to the rigor of the standards for this criterion, with nuanced and sophisticated language in the delivery of ideas, concepts and characters. Otherwise a student who uses simple, yet accurate English could achieve an A.

This piece lacked sophisticated vocabulary and nuanced language choices.

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

This criterion can be penalised by one rating for not meeting referencing, word length and formatting requirements.

New teachers should know that markers refer to the Writing Project as the most substantial work for any borderline cases.

The student would need to workshop this further and adhere to the requirements set out in the folio guidelines.

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against

C1

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

No Sample 3

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Summary of any further samples moderated

Further samples - Criteria assessed against	C1
What ratings have the group assigned this/these Sample(s)?	N/A
What evidence supports the ratings the group has given	N/A
What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	N/A
What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	N/A

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:	3

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

English Writing 3 folio samples - preferably an A rating and a borderline B/C rating

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

Greta Lucas

Email

greta.lucas@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.

We are expecting students to meet publishing standards.

New teachers should look at the Examiner's Report for information not explicit in the folio guidelines and the syllabus.

Course Support

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

One issue with the criterion is that the stem doesn't reflect/match the elements. Criterion 1 elements require students to produce work that meets publishing standards/requirements. The stem, 'Create written texts in a range of types' is not mentioned in the elements, even though its meaning is explained below the standards.

Discussion point: Could recommendations made by an English Writing 3 LAG in 2016 be revisited prior to reaccreditation? And a request was made for a copy of the 2016 amendments to be made available to English Writing teachers for review with the possibility of it being presented to TASC before the reaccreditation process.

One teacher proposed that criterion 1 is the 'nuts and bolts' and that language usage, vocab and control all belong with Criterion 2? However, more sophisticated sentence structure affects grammar and punctuation. It was agreed that there is a lot of crossover.

It was suggested that 'publication standards' should be in the title of the stem (eg. Meeting presentation standards and the conventions of published works), as the stem must align with the elements.

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