

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Ancient History Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Colin Richards

Moderation Leader Email

colin.richards@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Sarah Farrow

Minute Keeper Email

sfarrow@mrc.tas.edu.au

Attendance

Please enter the name and school for all attendees. This can be copied and pasted from the registration list sent to the Moderation Leader.

Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

Kelly Allen St Brendan-Shaw College
Sarah Farrow Marist Regional College
Sharyn Lawrence Launceston College
Jane McInarlin Geneva Christian College
James McLean Newstead College
Colin Richards Hellyer College
James Steenson Leighland Christian School
Shane Wolfe Don College

nil

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Cr. 3: B ; Cr 7: B-

Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Structured okay but not argumentative enough - too descriptive - including use of quotes...more adding to description rather than analysing the role of Peisistratus.
 Too descriptive - argument posed in conclusion but not reinforced throughout writing

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Cr. 3: B-; Cr. 7: C

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Good expression and structured well - not penalising on Cr. 3 because it will be penalised in Cr. 7 because the argument is under-developed and in Cr. 4 due to no sources. Length meant the argument was not able to be developed strongly enough.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Cr. 3: C-; Cr. 7: t

Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Paragraphs, sentence structure accurate. Too vague and descriptive.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Cr. 3: A; Cr. 7: A

Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Very competent historical writing. Potentially too long - could have been expressed more succinctly but very well written. Very analytical - describes the 'why' of Livia's motivations; context used well. Some assertions too general. Considering exam conditions definitely an A, not an A-.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 5

Sample 5 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

Sample 5 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Cr. 3: C; Cr. 7: C

assigned this sample?

Sample 5 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Paragraphing makes sense; intro and conclusion brief but make sense. Main point avoided (monotheism and legacy), very descriptive - analysis not developed

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

Criteria 4

State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation.

Teachers to provide borderline samples

Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation

colin.richards@education.tas.gov.au

Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

- Prepared essays still an issue - particularly when answering Section B

Course Support

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

- Exam Report has not been published yet - was sent in but not up on website yet. Being investigated.
- 2017 Exam Specs given to setting marker so that was not great
- Section C - opening up all cultures for student choice - the split across the state was about half and half in the marker group had let students choose from across all choices
- Exam specs for future - can we discuss one structure (from a choice of two - an OR question) and one feature to give in-depth examples for the structures.