

2018 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	English - English Literature Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Griff Martin
Moderation Leader Email	griffith.martin@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Roie Thomas
Minute Keeper Email	Roie.Thomas@utas.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.	Christine Stocks Don College
	Griffith Martin Hellyer College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation	Marianna Lebiezinska-Hedges Launceston Church
	Fiona Lockwood Launceston Church
	Grammar
	Gillian Pitt Launceston College
	Roie Thomas Launceston College
	Helen Brown Newstead College
	Sharon Beattie Scotch Oakburn College
	Helen Dossa Scotch Oakburn College
	Graeme BrookesSt Brendan-Shaw College
	Ian Murray St Patrick's College
	Kirsty Wilson

leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

Annotated Sample

Please specify which moderated sample has been selected as being the most appropriate to be the annotated sample, should the meeting choose to do so.

Sample 1

Please list the criteria (and elements if specified) being moderated for this sample

C1

Please be specific as to why this sample was chosen - provide as much detail as possible relating back to the evidence it contains against the standards

A- Good as first draft well compared texts, chunked then blended. Compositional features such as dialogue, symbolism (deep, black colour, green).

Sassoon's silencing through being sent to Craiglockart.

- some inaccuracies, such as words attributed to wrong character.

B+ - lack of critical interpretation, terms 'thrown in' such as psychoanalytical analysis were not sufficiently fleshed out as theoretical perspectives. Ideas of others not really responded to.

... the I voice is perfunctory at the end and adds nothing as the statements imply a personal interpretation.

Not really equitable that many papers are marked by examiners who don't know the text; not aware of inaccuracies. Not sure how to rectify this.

Comment (from Ian) - the 'bar' is being raised too high re expectations in a one hour essay and may result in Literature being too elitist.

An erroneous assumption for some examiners is that because historical and social context is a discrete criterion,

that it cannot be considered relevant interpretation for Crit. 1 (E3).

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, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

A-

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

A- Good as first draft well compared texts, chunked then blended. Compositional features such as dialogue, symbolism (deep, black colour, green).

Sassoon's silencing through being sent to Craiglockart.

- some inaccuracies, such as words attributed to wrong character.

B+ - lack of critical interpretation, terms 'thrown in' such as psychoanalytical analysis were not sufficiently fleshed out as theoretical perspectives. Ideas of others not really responded to.

... the I voice is perfunctory at the end and adds nothing as the statements imply a personal interpretation.

Not really equitable that many papers are marked by examiners who don't know the text; not aware of inaccuracies. Not sure how to rectify this.

Comment (from Ian) - the 'bar' is being raised too high re expectations in a one hour essay and may result in Literature being too elitist.

An erroneous assumption for some examiners is that because historical and social context is a discrete criterion, that it cannot be considered relevant interpretation for Crit. 1 (E3).

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 1 = All elements, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

B-

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

Too deliberate about structure - like a grade 7 essay "In this essay I will ..."

Narrative features include symbolism, contrasting characters, irony, characterisation, how is the gender element relevant to the question although is this a Crit. 4 issue. The gender paragraph is, after all, an 'idea'.

- appears to be a pre-prepared response but since we have no evidence of this, we should extend benefit of the doubt.

Textual evidence - not a retelling, but not sufficient analysis.

B- standard overall - but does this make a mockery of level of analysis.

C+- some disagreement about this piece, some people believe it is top of C range.

E3 - some 'big picture' at the end, conceptual understandings such a misogyny and own perspective implied.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 1 = All elements, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group

C-

assigned this sample?

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

Very low C or t?
 Low C -
 Some ideas about Rivers' struggle
 Very short almost 700 words
 Some textual evidence but no narrative features - must have a t for E I.
 Paragraph 4 - ideas in text (relative power) and loyalty (briefly). No real analysis.
 Consensus C-
 Discussion points:
 Weightings within criteria
 Jettison E5? Is it irrelevant for Criterion 1?
 Should E1 and E2 be weighted more heavily than E3 and E4?
 Comment (Graham): Within E1 and E2 all other features subsumed by-/implied within these broader elements.
 Should there be a specific number of compositional features identified and analysed as vehicles for ideas? Not necessarily, as depth rather than number more important.
 Appeal process - very worthwhile pursuing this.

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply

Level 3 or 4

For Level 3 and 4 courses please suggest criteria for consideration by CTL's.

We did not discuss.

Please enter the name and email address of the

Griff Martin

person providing
the samples:

Email

griffith.martin@education.tas.gov.au

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:

Proposed text list for 2020.

Poetry will be the same.

Single text: 19th Century focus - tough on C students!

I.S: Australian focus. Too limiting. What is the point of this?
We as a group oppose any such decisions that limit choice.
Please respond to survey on 11 & 12 website.

We need final word on whether students can split their
comparative texts to write as single texts. Hobart
moderation meeting seems to have had this message.
Sharon to ask Will c/c Lisa

Proposed text list for 2020.

Poetry will be the same or similar in structure

Single text: 19th Century focus - tough on C students!

I.S: Australian focus. Too limiting. What is the point of this?
We as a group oppose any such decisions that limit choice.
Please respond to survey on 11 & 12 website.

We need final word on whether students can split their
comparative texts to write as single texts. Hobart
moderation meeting seems to have had this message.