

2018 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Languages - Japanese Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Danielle James
Moderation Leader Email	danielle.james@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Sarah Jago
Minute Keeper Email	sjago@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.	Jenny Banbury- SOC Angie Dicker- LC Kaoru Sherrif- SBSC Sarah Jago- SPC Rebecca Seward- SPC Danielle James- Don Emma Maletta Representative from Hellyer 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

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

B+

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

Good variety of level 3 structures (some minor errors), however, became repetitive in the second half.

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

Some kanji missing that we felt the student should be able to use for an A result.

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

Greater use of kanji.

Avoid excessively repeating the same grammar structures

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 4 = All elements

that criterion

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?

Wide variety of kanji usage (but some errors in combinations or verbs).

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

Greater inclusion of level 3 grammar structures. Fewer katakana errors.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Crit 4 = All elements

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

C+

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

Accurate Hiragana.
Some inclusion of level 3 structures.
Appropriate length, understood, a degree of fluency

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Greater use of level 3 structures
Fewer kanji and katakana errors. Greater understanding of kanji used (e.g. verb combinations)
Fewer basic errors or particle errors

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Crit 4 = All elements

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

C-

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

Use of kanji and accuracy of hiragana and katakana.

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

Greater use of level 3 structures and fewer errors in basic structures e.g. adjectives

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

A lot of discussion as to whether this piece was a C-/t+

Level 3 structures definitely lacking. Frequent adjective errors.

However, on the whole there was a good use of kanji and accuracy of hiragana and katakana (at C level). We felt that this was enough to just place this piece within the C range. Overall it outweighed the grammatical errors.

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

For the next moderation session, we need to clarify the lens we should use when parking the moderation task when (e.g. the paper should be marked as if it is an EOY

by CTL's.

piece.)

Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:

Christena Halliwell

Email

christena.halliwell@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.

Rebecca shared the updated rubric from last year's markers report. Most teachers were not aware of this but the response was positive and it will now be used. Could this rubric now be shared as widely as possible.

General discussion:

Marking written responses by students with special provision or difficult to read handwriting. Markers should look carefully for formation and accuracy rather than neatness.

Course Support