

# 2019 March Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Arts - Art Theory and Criticism Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Scott Cunningham
Moderation Leader Email	scott.cunningham@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Scott Cunningham
Minute Keeper Email	scott.cunningham@education.tas.gov.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.	Clair Farrell Shane Wolfe Patrick Grieve Joanna Hobma Lisa Gipton
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.	nil

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 1 = Overall  
 Criterion 3 = Overall

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

1 and 3

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

Criteria 1 There is a significant state-wide differential ranging from A to C- Collectively the group in the North ranged between from C+ - B-Very descriptive so cannot be an A standard. Criteria 2Statewide t to A ( very broad discrepancies statewide )

**Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?**

It was thought the student needed to address the question. The student didn't communicate the argument using visual art language. No structure in the bibliography and a mostly web based.

**Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.**

C++ for criteria 1 C for criteria 3

**Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

Criteria 1 Good strong personal voice and a high level of historical information but little development of idea. Complete full reference. Incorporate more art language. Explore an idea further. Pose a question to answer to formulate and idea. The paper appeared to be rushed towards the end...not refined Irrelevant use of first person. Criteria 3The content was dull and lacked specific art terms and relevance. Artworks, in the paper, are not discussed until the final section. Too broad a context. Very little or no analysis of artworks.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 1 = Overall  
 Criterion 3 = Overall

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

Criteria 1 statewide C to A+ (extremely broad) Criteria 3 t to A (extremely broad)

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

The group thought this was an A paper. All of the evidence is supported in the standards document and matches the A standard.

**Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?**

Some typos within the paper. Flawless use of language but this may be beyond an A student.

**Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.**

Criteria 1 A rating of an A to B++ was the consensus of the group. Criteria 3A

**Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

The group found the a strong standard on this criteria so very little required to extent this student.

---

## Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Art Theory : Recommended..... A major paper from 2018 criteria 2 and 4

## Sharing Resources

## Course Support

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

Given there was such a disparity in the statewide result, that the moderation process and assessment may be flawed. To have confidence in the results (both staff and students) we propose a statewide moderation and or "Double Marking" for external papers. It would be nice to know how many people are marking the final paper? Is it only the one person?