

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

Maths - Mathematics Methods Foundation Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

David Coulson

Moderation Leader Email

DCoulson@lcs.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Ashley King

Minute Keeper Email

ashley.king@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.

Michael Bousfied – Hellyer
Ian Britcliffe - Scotch Oakburn
Adrian Cooper - St Patrick's College
Dave Coulson – LCGS
Norman Gregory - Sheffield School
Naomi Heaven – Hellyer
Shelly Keightly – SBSC
Ashley King - Penguin HS
Kym Knights - Newstead College
Aileen Lake - Launceston Christian School
Ed Love - St Patrick's College
Colin Peters – LCGS
Nathan Peterson - Scotch Oakburn
Louise Searson - Launceston College
Roger Tattersall - St Patrick's College
Rosalie Thompson - Launceston College
Paul Townsend – LCGS
Reima Wall - Launceston College
Chaojie Zhou - Leighland Christian School

Apologies/absence s - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

Adrian Baron - Newstead College
Mike Clancy – Marist
Mark Solari – SBSC
Will Walker - Elizabeth College

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

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

C

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

Discussion around the fact question 46 in the criteria 7 assessment, which was an extension type question which is not in the syllabus. In sample 1 one participant rated the sample a B- as they removed the final question from the total (instead of being /36 changed to /31). Brought up a discussion with TASC which I missed as I was learning how to take minutes. Would you be okay with the question if the equation was given. The issue is they can't get the total marks for the question without getting the equation for the first part of question.

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

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?

Issues with rates of change, equation to the curve therefore the student via the rubric cannot get a B.
Maybe we should make suggestions about how the assessment tool might be improved

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

Instrument requires more opportunities for higher grade. Limited in the ability to access A standard content.

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

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

More of a range in our results therefore it's probably something we should go through.6/6 Page 1
4.5/5 page 2 - not enough detail in the algebra (changed to 5)
2/2 question 17 - gradient table?
They haven't shown a maximum. They have not completed the question without stating it a max.
Justification in the question is needed to show the maximum.
2 marks not enough to show the gradient table.
Setting of the question needs to be 3 marks
Gradient table needs to shown to get full marks.
If student had showed the smiley face that could have been enough.
Leaving it blank is not good enough.
2/3 nit picking on the last mark
Question 42 - 2.5/3
43 - 2/3 (wrong sign from the initial part)

44 - 3/3
 45 - a. 1 b. 1 c. 0 (wrote derivative but used the wrong formula)
 46 - a. 0.5 b. 0 c. 0

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 7 = Overall

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

A

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

No need to discuss sample 4 and they got everything correct, Mostly.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criterion 8

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

Southern Moderator (Janeen)

Email address of the person providing the samples for September

not known

moderation

Sharing Resources

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

Discussion - Student improvement

Cut-offs incredibly high, 32-33/36 for an A. Get one wrong and you can't get an A. The students that have already done 4 are returning to do methods 3. It's ruining the bell curve. Exclusion rule brought in? Students shouldn't be able to do methods 3 after 4. This happened with general. Real issue at the moment. Is this a helpful pathway for students.

Foundation 3 in year 10, then 4 in year 11.

What does a successful methods 4 student learn from doing methods 3 the year after.

TASC controls the guideline.

TASC maybe need to allow 10s points to count.

TCE is not equitable across all courses. More participation points rather than success.

Could you get them twice if you got a PA.

Changing the system to maybe bring the score down for Methods 3.

Methods 4 Pas doesn't get a numeracy tick. So there are issues everywhere with mathematics.

Curriculum services information

Tinkering with the courses around exam specifications. External exam 3 marks questions being tweaked for various mathematics questions.

Improving the exam? Could have been a few A aspects exhibited in the exam.

Graphing the gradient function as an example.

The effect of the results have on these kids. Criterion based assessment isn't really what happens in the exam marking. As it's a relatively new course we should be able to have an influence on how this course is marked. Less on the bell curve more of the criteria. It's unfair and strange how we still stick to the bell curve. It's really affecting our students. Some students get shifted down grade due to the shifting of percentages based on the marking of the exam.

If there were more A's there would be more EA's

If maths methods 3 and maths general 3 were the same difficulty there should be the same in ATAR scores. Need more equity for those doing it the second time.

Sharing resources - Using the dropbox. Anyone got any wiz bang teaching strategies.

How is criteria 2 going for everyone?

Is it achievable for students to be able to complete criteria 2 with all the other content.

As I get a lot of extra time with my grade 10s I have found time for criteria 2 assessments.

Criterion 8 in second semester. Does anyone have any samples from last year?

Anything else up for discussion.

Course Support

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

See previous page