2019 March Moderation - Report

Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	PM
Which PM Meeting is this report for?	Science - Physical Sciences Foundation Level 2
Moderation Leader Name	Stewart Reid
Moderation Leader Email	sreid@stpatricks.tas.edu.au
Minute Keeper	Stewart Reid
Minute Keeper Email	sreid@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.	Stewart Reid Jacqui Scott Jenny Stafferton Greg Titmuss Andrew McKenzie-McHarg David Cox
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.	None

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = 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?	Some understanding of the particle model. Limited discussion. Limited data representation and no manipulation. No valid conclusions are made.
Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Further discussion to show understanding of particle theory. Explain why on E4 etc. Better data representation
Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Expand discussion answers. Use evidence to back up your discussion. Think about adding further data representation.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = 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?	A well compiled report. Excellent theoretical background research. Discussion points well articulated with some small aspects missing. Has identified trends in the data but has not extended. Has sought out extra data but has not refined the data.
Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	No table of data. Class data needs to be averaged. Axis on graph is not sequential or to scale. Increased accuracy in data manipulation.
Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Provide clearer data representation. Place value on axis in correct order and to scale. Average the class data to provide a more meaningful set of results. Extend on the trends that you have identified.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = 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?	Solid understanding of principles. Discussion shows effort to extend ideas but is repetitive and there are terminology issues. Evidence of some data manipulation but the data is not sequential. Better than a C standard but doesn't reach a B standard.
Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Data needs to be reproduced to be sequential and should be developed to include another resource (eg graph). Terminology needs to be better explained.
Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	See above in box 2.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 2 = Overall
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?	Data shows a huge discrepancy and has a value that is clearly wrong. student has not picked up on this error. Explanation in C2 E3 is incorrect. No discussion of possible error sources. Some discussion of errors and improvements. Data not used in discussion
Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Data needs to be fixed and more manipulation would be preferred. Correct scientific Theories. Include which 'human error' sources could have contributed to the data. Refer to data in the discussion.
Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Pay careful attention to the data. Use more than one source to manipulate the data. Clear up terminology. Refer to the data in discussions. Identify where 'human error' could have occurred

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.	Criteria 6 and 8

Sharing Resources

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

Teachers were given email addresses to ask for resources.

Course Support

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

None