

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

Submission Time: March 15, 2018 12:22 pm

Meeting Details

Meeting Venue:

South

AM or PM session?

AM

Which Learning Area is this Report for?

Humanities and Social Sciences (HASS)

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Ancient History Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Rosalind Walker

Moderation Leader Email

rosalind.walker@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper (if available)

Adam Croser

Minute Keeper Email

ACroser@gyc.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

Rosalind Walker
Sally Polanowski
Laura Russell
Adam Croser

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:

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

none

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against

C3
C4
C5

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

C3 - C; C4 - C+; C5 - C

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

C3 - a 3.5 page response structured in paragraphs with introduction and conclusion, terminology of the area is used and the argument is logical. Several errors of spelling esp in specialist terminology and grammar.

C4 - three pieces of primary source evidence and one secondary that discusses the primary source evidence

C5 - changes over time are acknowledged; some limited

<p>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>geographical understanding; some analysis of source material</p> <p>More content and examples; a clearer line of argument; more written sources.</p>
--	---

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

<p>Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against</p>	<p>C3 C4 C5</p>
<p>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</p>	<p>C3 - B; C4 - B; C5 - C+</p>
<p>What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given</p>	<p>2.5 closely written pages; six pieces of primary source evidence including written and archaeological sources; one secondary source quoted and analysed; a good understanding of the main point of difference within the primary sources; clear but unsophisticated expression with correct spelling and well-structured paragraphs; an absence of geographical understanding which was a requirement of the question and of Criterion 5 and was marked down on that criterion as a result.</p> <p>We acknowledged here that standard 6 of criterion 5 is excluded from the exam specifications but was rather inexplicably a requirement of the set question.</p>
<p>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Set question clearly addressed. Some discussion of geographical context. More analysis of the Peace Treaty.</p>

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against

C3
C4
C5

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

C3 - B-
C4 - C+; C5 - C+

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

Appeared to be nearly 3 pages of apparently well-understood and logically constructed material. We acknowledged that none of us has any expertise in China, and were, therefore, unable to determine whether the range of archaeological evidence offered was correct or whether the arguments were well-chosen. We were concerned about the huge, apparently irreconcilable range of marks for this sample. We note a meeting concern as to how China scripts were marked at the end of 2017. Had the marker participated in any moderation? How is it possible to arrive at a moderation consensus for a topic that is well-understood by only the school that is delivering it?

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

We are unable to make specific suggestions (explanation above).

We noted a vagueness in the use of secondary material with reference to 'historians and scientists' rather than offering any specific examples.

Summary of any further samples moderated

Further samples - Criteria assessed against

C3
C4
C5

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

Sample 4: C3 - C+; C4 - C; C5 - C+

What evidence supports the ratings the group has given	3 sparsely written pages; solid understanding of main issues in historical interpretation; organised into paragraphs; offers generalised evidence - largely archaeological.
What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	more accurate spelling of terminology and clearer grammatical construction; more specific pieces of primary source material including reference to written sources; better specific detail (offers 'a geologist' but does not name him/her)
What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	More detailed analysis of written primary sources. The ability to name sources correctly.

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:	C3; C4; C6
Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:	In discussion with the northern meeting, Sharyn Lawrence is to request six samples from the 2017 exam from TASC. The essays will be from Section B of the exam and will include at least two Greek samples and two Roman samples so that participants can compare within areas of their own expertise. It was agreed that Section B of the exam was the most problematic which also reflects the complexity of Module B of the course. The samples are to include at least one borderline B+/A-essay.
Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for the September	Sharyn Lawrence

moderation

Email

sharyn.lawrence@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.

Adam was consulted as to his map resources. Particularly noted was the Map of the Ancient World - Rand McNally- World History Series.

The group discussed the order in which they taught the modules and what seemed to be the most satisfactory. Most agreed that beginning with Module A was preferable to Module B as the latter was so broad and complex. Module A was felt to give a good basis for an understanding of the primary sources.

Course Support

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

We were disappointed that our recommendations for modifications to the syllabus (particularly Module B) have not resulted in any changes.

The moderation task highlighted for us the lack of equivalency in Section A between sites and practices such as Delphi and the Roman Game that take place over a long period of time with single events (Battle of Kadesh, Destruction of Troy). We noted that the lack of equity might have been addressed by differentiating the demands of the questions in Section A of the exam. The Exam Specifications allow for this but in 2017 all the questions were the same.

We acknowledged the need for PL. How the current course articulates to UTAS might be useful. Trying to gain a shared understanding of how Module B should be taught would be very beneficial. The meeting agreed that leading with the 'feature' was a more satisfying

approach than teaching the elements in isolation and then 'tacking the feature on' at the end. An analysis of the relationship between the feature and the elements was felt to promote 'higher order' thinking and analysis.

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?

Other: We would recommend a solid B answer which was not apparent in these samples.