

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

Maths - Mathematics Methods Level 4

Moderation Leader Name

Simon McGuire

Moderation Leader Email

simon.mcguire@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Andrew Mason

Minute Keeper Email

andrew.mason@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.

Andrew Mason - Hellyer College
Thomas Cotterell - Don College
Mel Beard - Don College
Nathan Peterson - Scotch Oakburn College
Dave Collson - LCGS
Colin Peters - LCGS
Paul Gray - LCGS
Alan Lee - Geneva Christian College
Chaojie Zhou - Leighland
Mark Solar - SBSC
Marcia Watkinson - USC
Rebecca Sayer - CHCS
Sallyanne Armarego - LC
Reima Wall - LC
Rob Morgan - LCS
David Mohr - St Patrick's College

none

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 7 = Overall

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 7 = Overall

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 7 = Overall

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

B rating

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

Working indicates a sound understanding of basic concepts in integration. Generally working was adequate but there were some questions where markers were not able to follow the process used by this student. For example incorrect pronumerals were in working in one question. Some questions were answered approximately instead of exactly. Debate ensued amongst the markers as to what

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

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

working would be required for the student to achieve an A level result.

A higher proportion of questions would need to be answered correctly, in particular some of the required skills at the 'A' standard were not demonstrated. The incorrect working in places has meant subsequent steps are also incorrect. Markers also felt the material presented lacked adequate knowledge of integration some areas.

Group consensus was reached that this student was working at a 'B' standard as evidenced above.

Focus on correct setting out, by including all elements required for higher mark questions (i.e greater than 2 marks). Some 'A' elements are missing, along with mistakes in several questions and a few questions are not attempted at all.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

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

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

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

Criterion 7 = Overall

B rating

Student shows a sound understanding of integration and uses a minimalist approach to problem solving. Despite this approach the working provided by this student is generally adequate. However, in question 15(b) a number of markers felt the working was inadequate. In this question the student was required to show a result and the working was not at an 'A' standard.

Some elements in the working were missing. For example when integrating the student did not include the constant term in their answers. In some instances the student has made the question more difficult by using rules that are not required in the question, such as the quotient rule. Consistent small mistakes have produced a paper that is not representative of an A level C7 result.

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

Group consensus was for a B rating

Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

An elimination of small mistakes along with adequate working would improve this students results. The student also needs to read each question carefully. For example Q32 asks the student to show full algebraic working and this is missing. Teachers need to emphasise the wording of questions. When algebraic working is required simply using the calculator to produce the result is not adequate for an 'A' standard.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

C7 (integration) an internal sample this time rather than an external sample

Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

Drop box SharePoint Links shared for the above

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this course:

The new exam author will need to be aware sampling is a newish topic and is still a bit of a unknown in terms of precedence due to the small sample size of past papers with sampling. The examiner could improve the paper by giving more guidance around what type of working is required for each question. Some explanation in the course document around what adequate working means would be helpful. Specifically some indication of when exact answers are required would be helpful.