# 2019 March Moderation - Report

## Meeting Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting took place in: | North |
| AM or PM session? | AM |
| Which AM Meeting is this report for? | English - English Level 3 |
| Moderation Leader Name | Amelia Diprose |
| Moderation Leader Email | amelia.diprose@education.tas.gov.au |
| Minute Keeper | Joanna Hobman |
| Minute Keeper Email | joanna.hobman@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. | Philip Cabalzar Hellyer College<br>Nicki Conn St Patricks<br>Matt Dawson Hellyer College<br>Jacqueline de Jonge Marist<br>Amelia Diprose Launceston College<br>Adele Geard Don College<br>Anne Gunn Launceston Church Grammar<br>Gail Harris Launceston church Grammar<br>Mary Hately Launceston College<br>Jane Hendriks Launceston College<br>Cameron Hindrum Launceston College<br>Joanna Hobman Launceston College<br>Rebecca Hodgkinson Ulverstone High School<br>Samuel Holmes Circular Head Christian School<br>David Hughes Scotch Oakburn<br>Rachelle Littler St Brendan-Shaw<br>Vicki Lovell Tasmanian e-school<br>Jim Mayne Scotch Oakburn<br>James McGeachy Launceston Christian<br>Tracy Moon Hellyer College<br>Tracey Owers St Patricks<br>Jennifer Pollard Mountain Heights<br>Rob Pople Leighlands Christian<br>Lyndon Riggall Launceston<br>Elizabeth Stevens St Pats |

Steve van Ommen Marist
Amanda Williams Prospect State School
Tanya Wilson Newstead College
Glenn Wyllie Newstead College

Jacqueline DeJonge

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

---

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample? | C3 E1 - C-/t+ C3 E2 - C-/t+ C3 E3 - C-/t+ C3 E4 - t+/t |
| Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | Element 1:Some brief explanation of context linking the text's history. A lot of this information is from the book, though, not the play, and therefore cannot be considered for assessment. The student identifies but does not explain links between text and contexts. Is this enough to pass? It should be explaining rather than identifying. Element 2: Minimal exploration of perspectives, values and attitudes. The student uses the terminology but doesn't explain enough, as required for a solid C. Element 3:No evidence of analysis, which counts out the Bs and C+. The student has identified a language technique, but has not explained the effect, even through the Maza perspective they are considering the text through, which mentions this effect. Element 4:There was nothing in the question to remind the student to include their own reasoned interpretation of the text. |
| Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)? | Discussion about what makes a C, what would pass and be reasonable to say that the student has sufficient skills to attend university. Giving individual hints of connection to the text is not enough to pass as a C. Students need to consistently provide evidence. A C needs to show consistency of evidence and understanding. A student needs to demonstrate understanding and complexity - follow through explanation for a C, analysis for a B, etc. Are they using the terminology correctly, in the right context? Are they explaining their understanding of different perspectives of the texts? |

| | |
|---|---|
| Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable. | Element 1:Some brief explanation of context linking the text's history. A lot of this information is from the book, though, not the play, so can only marginally be considered, as it's irrelevant to the play. Identifies but does not explain links between text and contexts. Is this enough to pass? It should be explaining. Element 2: Minimal exploration of perspectives, values and attitudes. The student uses the terminology but doesn't explain enough, as required for a solid C. Element 3:No evidence of analysis, which counts out the Bs and C+. The student has identified a language technique, but has not explained the effect, even through the Maza perspective they are considering the text through, which mentions this effect. Element 4:There was nothing in the question to remind the student to include their own reasoned interpretation of the text. The wording of the question was ambiguous and affected some students' responses, which needs to be taken into consideration, though students need to have a thorough understanding of the criterion elements and the need to address all of them. A C rating does not explicitly ask for a personal opinion, as it's missing 'own' in the element. This allows students to align with a reading, but not explicitly discuss their personal connection to that reading. The student has mentioned various interpretations, but not to a C standard, which means they have not developed a reasoned interpretation of the text. |
| Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)? | The student needs to work on their understanding of perspectives, attitudes and values and to continue to examine literary and dramatic techniques and considering the effect they have on readers' interpretations. |

## 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 |
| Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample? | B or B+ |
| Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | Lack of substance behind the discussion. The student needs to connect the perspective to the text and context more and to convey their understanding of the perspectives more effectively. The student's response is not sustained when it comes to addressing the criterion elements. Teachers who've taught this text commented that the student's understanding of the text itself is poor and they've made some errors in understanding. Element 1 - (B-) The text refers to the context (setting) within the play but does not consider external context - playwright, audience, etc. Element 2 - (B/B+) The student mentions the perspectives but does not hold a detailed, complex discussion. Element 3 - (B) The student has unsustained |

evaluation which is not strong or sustained and tends to skip analysis. Element 4 - (B)The student provides a sense of where they stand in regards to the issues and events in the text. They align themselves with particular perspectives.

The student has written an effective response, endeavouring to discuss two key perspectives. To improve, they would need to focus on element 3 more, explaining how the text conveys perspectives in more detail, considering their understanding of the perspectives more clearly and considering context more widely - playwright, audience.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?** | |
| **Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.** | B or B+ |
| **Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?** | Continue to focus on the 'how' - what literary techniques are used to convey perspectives? What universal meaning can be gained from the perspectives privileged by the text? What different interpretations of the text might readers have, and what evidence can they find to support that interpretation, even if the student doesn't agree with it? |

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

| | |
|---|---|
| **Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion** | Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3 |
| **Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?** | B range. |
| **Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?** | The student structures their response well, introducing the topic, providing evidence and perspectives from both the author and an external perspective. They do try to connect to each element of C3 in each paragraph. The student has demonstrated a closer engagement with the text than the other samples. Element 1 - (B/C) The weakest of the four elements - limited link to context. There is a lot of internal context as well as some author context. Some information needs clarification e.g. what Cutty Sark is. Element 2 - (B/C+) They have explored the author's, external review and their own perspective. Element 3 - (B) The student has explained how they arrived at their understanding of the perspectives through a themes based response. They have linked their own understanding of the text to external analysis quite well. Element 4 - (B/B-) The student needs to expand on their reasoned interpretation more. They have a lot of good, overarching statements that they |

| | |
|---|---|
| | haven't fleshed out. The student's own interpretation has been aligned with the other perspectives discussed and at times challenges the invited interpretation (which they should articulate). |
| Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)? | The student needs to move beyond 'mentioning' or 'hinting' - they need to analyse their evidence rather than jumping straight from evidence to own/others' perspective. |
| Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable. | This is a good example of a B range response. Teachers commented that it is easier to identify this student's personal interpretation, which challenges the invited reading, for those who teach this text. This has implications for how students are assessed at the end of the year. |
| Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)? | Explore how this student can clearly articulate that their perspectives are alternative or resistant; focus more on analysing evidence and not skipping over this. |

## Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

| | |
|---|---|
| For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation. | Criterion 2 |
| State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation. | will request from attendees pending finalised decision on Criterion/a focus for September moderation |
| Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation | various |

## Sharing Resources

Course Support