

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 Literature Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Griff Martin

Moderation Leader Email

griffith.martin@education.tas.edu

Minute Keeper

Kate McCulloch

Minute Keeper Email

kate.mcculloch@stpatricks.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.

Sharon Beattie Scotch Oakburn College
Helen Brown Newstead College
Helen Dossaer Scotch Oakburn College
Carrie Dunham Scotch Oakburn College
Lucy King Launceston College
Marianna Lebidziniska-Frost Launceston Church Grammar School
Fiona Lockwood Launceston Church Grammar School
Griff Martin Hellyer College
Kate McCulloch St Patrick's College
Jen Mertes Marist Regional College
Jenna Squire Leighland Christian School
Christine Stocks Don College
roie thomas Launceston College
Kirsty Wilson Launceston College
Graeme Brookes St Brendan-Shaw College

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 4 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

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

C + range. C on 1 & 2 and C+ holistically.

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

The student tends to describe rather than analyse or evaluate. Does not really examine the effect of the use of language. Identified and explained - but not analysed.

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

We would need to see deeper analysis of the connections between author values and text. Key aspect - has the student answered the question and compared the 2 poems? E5 - structured, fits together but not sophisticated.

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

Holistic marking is more useful - rather than pulling apart the criterion. E1 and E2 are only a part of marking the Criterion and for this, 3,4 & 5 are specific to part B and 1-6 for part A response.

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

More explicit analysis and more linking. Also some unpacking of the 'timelessness of loss'. The metalanguage of poetry needs to be used in the analysis.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

that criterion

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

C to C-

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

Struggled with the question - competing? Describes the connection between Text and context. There is some evidence of understanding of different ideas of the time. Structurally ok. The way they have interpreted the question is problematic. Not much identification and use of evidence. A lot of retelling . Made statements without explanation.

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

Clearer analysis and support.

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

As above. No analysis and no support with quotations.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

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

A

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

Analysis and synthesis are high level. E4 and E3 managed very well. Short reflection in the middle of the analysis detracts from the voice in the essay? Do we want 3rd person, distanced voice throughout or do students include 1st person reflective? Supports own response to the text - reiteration of what has been said - but does not need to be there. Some like the reflection on the issues... and how the novel impacts on current ways of thinking.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus

Very high level. Coherent and clear - well controlled. Some discussion on whether the 1st person reflection is needed. Some agreed that it was quite sophisticated.

with comments to element level if applicable.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

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

A range

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

A well-controlled response. Student really knows what he/she is writing about. Interesting pairing...A huge amount of critical interpretation is woven into the response. Discussion of text genre is present. The whole essay is structured around character, genre and setting. Paragraphs not clear re comparison? Some found it well constructed as it linked back to the idea of alienation. Has cleverly woven in perspectives of others.

Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Comparison between the two texts could have been more clearly written. 'Setting' paragraph does not end well.

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Very strong response in exam conditions. Paired text essays seem to lend themselves to E1 & E2 evidence.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Sharing Resources

Course Support

Please provide details of any

Too many elements for C4. Criteria being broken down this way has resulted in many different sorts of essays being produced. Is this OK? Are we trying to assess

future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course:

too many things in too many ways? This needs review. Markers should err on the side of 'they have done most/ met most elements'? There seems to be a lot of doubling up? Future Criteria to be marked??C6 or C1? Independent Studies?