

# 2019 March Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	PM
Which PM Meeting is this report for?	English - English Writing Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Tanya Wilson
Moderation Leader Email	Tanya.Wilson@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Lyndon Riggall
Minute Keeper Email	lyndon.riggall@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.**

Sharon Beattie Scotch Oakburn College  
Marjorie Cardwell Launceston Christian School  
Cheryl Gamble St Brendan-Shaw College  
Anne Gunn Launceston Church Grammar School  
Samuel Holmes Circular Head Christian School  
Sharyn Lawrence Launceston College  
Ruby Lyons-Reid Ulverstone High School  
Jane McInarlin Geneva Christian College  
tracy moon Hellyer College  
Lyndon Riggall Launceston College  
Kate Rockliffe St Patrick's College  
Gina Slevac St Patrick's College  
Steve van Ommen Marist Regional College  
Craig White Don College  
Tanya Wilson Newstead College  
Glenn Wyllie Newstead College

**Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who**

All present.

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, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

Overall - 'C' range standard folio

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

Element 1 - Some consistency created by voice. Poetry was weaker. Some differentiation of perspective but lacking clarity. There is a general consistency to the student's response across all areas. Element 2 - Poetry is superficial. War piece lacks research. Ideas and themes were explored but occasionally became muddled. MND piece became caught up in the mechanics of the disease, rather than its emotional consequences. Element 3 - Characters tell the audience what to feel, rather than showing us, which compromises the overall engagement of the folio. 2-dimensional archetypes--'the nurse', 'the soldier'. Element 4 - Language features were simplistic and discordant in several instances. Poetry was highly literal. There were some powerful verbs and metaphorical devices. Element 5 - Several elements are simplistic or predictable. Much of what is written is generic.

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

Element 1 - Language consistency to historical context. Perspective through characterisation could be more subtle and less typical. Student identifies that they want to show different perspectives, but do not fulfil their own aim. Element 2 - Title of 'Distance Between Home and War' implies ideas that were not further explored by the piece itself. Student could be advised to pick a clear issue or theme and not try to "have it all." Element 3 - Building further complexity into characters and plots would heighten the effect of the student's work. Element 4 - Detail in language features and technique, as well as more appropriate word choice, would heighten the student's work. Element 5 - Lacking emotional/intellectual response, although the piece engages some interest.

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

The group reached consensus that this was in the region of an SA standard folio.

**Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain**

Prioritise focus and authenticity in the student's work, building this through characterisation and deeper reflection on the ideas being discussed. The folio needs to be more emotive and more real-as one example a poet should be reading poetry and understand and use the techniques of others. The student should focus on creating original or more inspiring pieces of work.

a higher rating (or ratings)?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

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

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

Overall: A-

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

Element 1 - Pieces 'Tuesday' and 'Butterflies' were consistent and sustained with an appropriate level to purpose and genre. Element 2 - Many of the ideas and themes presented were beautifully presented and well-considered. Element 3 - Characters were particularly well drawn and explored. Plots were original and presented in a way that piqued readers' interests. Element 4 - Attention to detail in language use and continuity across the folio was to be applauded. Markers' found themselves 'lingering' over particular lines. Element 5 - Imagination of markers was engaged and the folio evoked desired emotional responses.

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

Element 1 - Piece 'Head Above Water' did not clearly come together and required intense inference. The signposts for interpretation of this piece were not clear, and could be expected to be at this stage of the year. Element 2 - Reflective Statement lacked some understanding of what the purpose of the ideas and themes presented were. Element 3 - Some confusion of character based on use of different names for a single individual. Element 4 - 'Head Above Water' as a piece was confused in several places. Markers were not always aware where the piece was going. Some editing could tighten expression and improve effectiveness of paragraphs. Element 5 - Editing with the audience in mind is a vital way to promote emotional responses.

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

Consensus is that this folio would likely attain an HA award.

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

Some pieces felt that they had more polished - this could be more consistent across the three pieces. More time on the Reflective Statement would heighten reader understanding and make the writer's intentions clearer.

## Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criterion 5 - All Elements. 2nd Preference: Criterion 3 - All Elements.

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

Gina Slevic, Cheryl Gamble, Tanya Wilson

**Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation**

gina.slevic@stpatricks.tas.edu.au; cgamble@sbsc.tas.edu.au;  
tanya.wilson@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.**

Lyndon has recommended Masterclass as an online resource featuring writers such as Neil Gaiman, Margaret Atwood, and activities to accompany.

## Course Support