

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

Submission Time: March 14, 2018 9:21 am

Meeting Details

Meeting Venue:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which Learning Area is this Report for?	Mathematics
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Maths - Mathematics Methods Foundation Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Josh Dean
Moderation Leader Email	josh.dean@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper (if available)	Colin Peters
Minute Keeper Email	cpeters@lcs.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

Nathan Peterson
Angie Dicker
Melissa Robertson
Dave Coulson
Ashley King
Rebecca Sayer
Mark Lowe
Colin Peters
mike clancy
Paul Gray
Josh Dean
Jane Underhill

anyone who was extra on the day

Ian Britcliffe
Shelley Keightley
Naomi Heaven
Michael Bousfield
Roger Tattersall
Ed Love

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

Aileen Lake

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

C6

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

A

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

Whole group was divided into sub-groups and they achieved consensus according to the standards. Small groups had 3 x A's, A- and B+

What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher

Refer Standards

rating (or ratings)?

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

Strengthening algebraic skills

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against

C6

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

B+

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

Whole group was divided into sub-groups and they achieved consensus according to the standards. Small groups had A-, 2xB+, 3xB

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

Refer to standards

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

As for sample 1

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against	C6
What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?	t
What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given	Whole group was divided into sub-groups and they achieved consensus according to the standards. Small groups had all t ratings.
What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	as for sample 1
What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	as for sample 1

Summary of any further samples moderated

Further samples - Criteria assessed against	C6
What ratings have the group assigned this/these Sample(s)?	t
What evidence supports the ratings the group has given	Whole group was divided into sub-groups and they achieved consensus according to the standards. Small groups had all t ratings except 1 had t+
What evidence would you need	as sample 1

to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

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

as sample

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:

C2 and C7?

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

Investigation and criterion work samples (four)

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

Roger Tattersall

Email

roger.tattersall@stpatricks.tas.edu.au

Sharing Resources

Please provide details of any resources or

Naomi Heaven had investigation idea with Calculus bridge

teaching or assessment strategies, useful links etc. that were shared in the meeting.

Course Support

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

Comments from:

Group 1: Believe that the course is easier than it used to be. An SA from this course is probably not a predictor of an SA or better in Methods 4, which led some to question what the course was trying to achieve.

Group 2: Trig Identity questions were not within the standards of the course. Instructions for questions of 2 marks or more need to be more specific in how much algebra needs to be done before using a calculator.

Group 4: Not happy with the exam elements and their relationship with the standard. Some important content were missed while some work tested was outside the scope of the course. Some thought the marking scheme was too coarse with not enough scope for part marks. Poor performance on one question can have a too great effect on the grade for a section. It was suggested a move away from 'mark-a-minute' construct might give more scope to the marker. This idea was not supported by many in the meeting.

Group 5: Concerned that students are gaining good marks while not being strong enough in algebra. It was felt that this was disadvantaging those who wished to proceed to Methods 4.

Group 6: Thought it was very 'B' heavy paper. Not enough 'A' standard questions. Another thought that, as Algebra skill development was so paramount to the course, 100 marks should be allocated to Section A and 80 to Section B.

Josh Moore (CTL) joined the meeting and talked about looking for Annotated Work Samples as an aid to improving clarity about what constituted an 'A', 'B' etc. This would be a valuable aid in upskilling teachers new to the subject. It was noted that some sections which

would not be worth, say, a 'C' award had gained a 'C' on the external instrument. It was explained that the imposition of cut-offs in the external marking sometimes generated these effects which made external papers not always useful as an Annotated Work Sample.. Josh also raised the availability of course support through Curriculum Resources. Three participants indicated they were accessing this resource.

Process for September

Work Samples

Roger Tattersall (SPV) indicated a possibility of presenting some papers from one of Criteria 4 to 8

Naomi Heaven (HC) indicated a possibility of some Criterion 2 examples.

Josh Dean to work with the above on generating samples for the next meeting.

Other:

C

Contact Alannah.Roach@education.tas.gov.au if you wish to gain access to MME3 on CANVAS.

Some teachers who worked across multiple subject areas found that when they registered for one subject area (which is all you can register for) that then precluded them from accessing the work samples in their other subject area. Josh Moore to follow-up.

Could Moderation samples, in future be numbered? Josh Moore to follow-up.

One teacher, who was supporting a student, in a review noted that not having access to an official marking scheme made for a lot of extra work. Not only for the teacher, but also for TASC.

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 4

Any comments:

Comments from: