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 Foundation Level 2
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 Angie Dicker Kaoru Sherrif Sarah Jago Rebecca Seward Danielle James Emma Maletta
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 Criterion 5 = Overall
Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	Cr. 4 - B Cr. 5 - B
Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Good range of content. Logical and coherent flow.
Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Greater inclusion of kanji Greater accuracy in particle use
Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Spread of results, particularly C.5 Lack of kanji, but is this necessary at mid-year, depending on what teacher has taught.. Found discussion/consensus difficult as a mid-year piece. Decided to moderate each sample EOY piece of work. Too many basic errors to be A for Cr. 5

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the	Crit 4 = All elements Crit 5 = All elements

elements within that criterion	
Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	Cr. 4 - B- Cr. 5 - C+
Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Use of some advanced structures for level 2 (e.g. kaku koto mo suki desu)
Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Greater kanji use, some simple kanji missing e.g. 'suki' Greater katakana accuracy
Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Sample 2 was difficult to read. Perhaps using a standard template would be beneficial for moderation tasks. Referred to course standards. Felt it sat at the top of the C range for Cr. 5. Some common kanji missing e.g. 'Suki'. Some katakana errors Again referred to standards and felt it just sat within the B range for Cr.4 due to use of some more advanced structures.

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 Crit 5 = All elements
Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	Cr. 4 - A Cr. 5 - B+

Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Inclusion of complex structures Coherence of writing as a whole
Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Greater use of level 2 kanji
Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	After referring to standards, we felt that this piece sat within the A range due to the inclusion of complex structures and the coherence of their writing as a whole. Again when reviewing Cr.5 we considered this as an EOY piece. Due to some missing kanji we awarded a result of B+

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 Crit 5 = All elements
Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	Cr. 4: A- Cr. 5: A-
Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Confidently use a wide range of Level 2 kanji characters. Variety and accuracy of grammar structures
Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Greater hiragana accuracy

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply	Level 1 or 2
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.	General Feedback/Discussion: It was easy to mark a very similar task for level 2 and 3. 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 piece.) 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. Discussion around 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