

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

**Submission Time:** March 13, 2018 12:13 pm

## Meeting Details

<b>Meeting Venue:</b>	South
<b>AM or PM session?</b>	AM
<b>Which Learning Area is this Report for?</b>	Humanities and Social Sciences (HASS)
<b>Which AM Meeting is this report for?</b>	HASS - Accounting Level 3
<b>Moderation Leader Name</b>	Neesha-Marie Hartog
<b>Moderation Leader Email</b>	susan.oakden@education.tas.gov.au
<b>Minute Keeper (if available)</b>	Neesha-Marie Hartog
<b>Minute Keeper Email</b>	neeshamarie.hartog@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**

Richard Korn  
Jeremy Dooley  
Neil Goodwin  
Susan Oakden  
Simon Bennett  
Neesha-Marie Hartog

<b>anyone who was extra on the day</b>	
<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>	n/a
<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>	Lyn Tunbridge

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

<b>Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against</b>	C3 C6
<b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b>	Criterion 6 Sample 1: A, A-, B+, B B-, with 4 submissions a 'B+', 8 at 'A'. Half teachers in Tas gave an 'A' and in the External this student got 11/15, but overall an 'A' on communicate across the whole exam.
<b>What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given</b>	86% was an 'A' in the external exam in 2017  12 out of 65 (18%) was a C  Section C Question 7 included both an Inc st/Bal Sh as well as a CFS, which really skewed the marks as many students had obviously not been taught the reconstruction.  General consensus was 'A' for Sample 1 criterion 3  For Sample 2, general consensus was a 'B'

A general discussion about the problems of criterion's marking scheme. 14 marks was not sufficient marks for the CFS, nor 45 marks from the

A discussion around deductions for incorrect subtotals and missing entries versus incorrect number in entries was had.

Decision: 1/2 mark for words, 1/2 for number per line item.

we dont' want to allocate too many marks to incorrect sub-totals. RECOMMENDATION: Proposed 1/2 mark for each calculation sub-total, 1/2 mark deduction for not getting the correct final balance in the CFS.

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

more accuracy in the CFS

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

teach how to reconstruct the accounts (even though the syllabus doesn't require it - 'demonstration or explanation only'.

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

**Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against**

C3  
C6

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

Criterion 3: generally all concurred on a 'B' standard. But criterion 6 results ranged from A to t! Majority (4 teachers) gave it a 'C', 2 teachers each gave 'A', 'B+', 'B' 'B-' C+ and a t. Due to the massive confusion around how to assess it!

**What evidence supports the**

Thoughts on criterion 6 for Inc St/Bal Sh: take 1/2 off for putting 'period' not 'year' ended in heading.

**rating(s) the group has given**

2 marks for naming each item, so double dipping into the criterion 3.

It is important to say if something is an outflow or inflow.

After a lengthy discussion on the meaning of the elements on criterion 6, the consensus was that it is a very challenging criterion to come up with a marking scheme and then calculate. This is an area that must be reviewed to provide more clarity to teachers and markers.

The problems with criterion 6 continue to be identified in moderation assessments as well as what teachers are trying to do in the classroom.

The degree of reliability and validity of results in the external exam assessing criterion 6 on ALL sections, in particular on Section C, is superfluous and leads to data/results that is an unreliable and invalid assessment of criterion 6.

Given that one element out of 6 elements within Criterion 6 is to do with producing reports we suggest this should be removed from the criterion.

After significant discussion, we propose that criterion 6 is removed from Section C in the Exam Specs. This needs to be brought up with CTL and TASC as soon as possible.

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

Too difficult to summarise!

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

Change the criterion 6 assessment and standard element in the criterion! It is very difficult to assess.

ratings)?

### Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

**Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against**

C10

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

n/a

**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**

C10

**What ratings have the group assigned this/these**

n/a

<b>Sample(s)?</b>	
<b>What evidence supports the ratings the group has given</b>	n/a
<b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b>	n/a
<b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b>	n/a

## Planning for September Moderation 2018

<b>Are you planning on:</b>	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
<b>Please list the criteria to be moderated:</b>	Criterion 3
<b>Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:</b>	A modified Income St/Balance sheet question with proposed marking scheme that DOES NOT include criterion 6.  We would like samples on A, B and C borderlines.
<b>Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for the September</b>	Susan Oakden

moderation

Email

susan.oakden@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.**

No time

## Course Support

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

Some time was spent on discussing the Marking Scheme that Steve Allen proposed.

Proposal: we have an ADDITIONAL booklet in Section C: One is called 'Answer Booklet - Section C Part 1' with the Trial Balance where they do the adjustments and add on new accounts, if applicable. We then have another booklet called 'Answer Booklet - Section C Part 2 and 3' with the Inc St and Bal Sh.

Don't get them to do the GJ entries (as it's assessed already in Section B), just update and adjust the Trial Balance.

Suggestion: we mark the mid-year question used in the next Moderation meeting with BOTH marking schemes (old way and proposed way) to see how the new schemes work.

We propose to take out criterion 6 from the Section C.  
This was also agreed by the North meeting people.



## 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