

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Which Learning Area is this Report for?	Mixed Field (SDI, Work Readiness, Career and Life Planning)
Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Mixed - Student Directed Inquiry Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Carmen Robotham
Moderation Leader Email	carmen.robatham@stpatricks.tas.edu.au
Minute Keeper	Carmen Robotham
Minute Keeper Email	carmen.robatham@stpatricks.tas.edu.au

Attendance

<p>Please enter the name and school for all attendees. This can be copied and pasted from the registration list sent to the Moderation Leader.</p>	Lucy Grove - Launceston College Sarah Lillywhite - Scotch Oakburn College Kate Reynolds - Ulverstone High School Carmen Robotham - St Patrick's College Simon Shaw - Launceston Church Grammar School
<p>Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.</p>	None

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

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

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

Criterion 1 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6, Element 7, Element 8

Criterion 1 - B

Criterion 1 - Element 1 - B

Sense that the inquiry proposal appears somewhat vague and wasn't clear and concise enough and so did not fully realise the full expectations of an A rating for Criterion 1 - Element 1: "creates inquiry questions which are substantial in scope, contained and focused, clearly and precisely worded, demonstrate critical distance and an objective stance and allow for transdisciplinary inquiry"

It was felt it more sat within the B rating "creates inquiry questions which are substantial in scope, contained and focused, demonstrate an objective stance and allow for transdisciplinary inquiry"

It was felt it had more than a limited objectivity.

Criterion 1 - Element 2 – B

Moderators deliberated over this for quite some time (prior to moderation meeting) as there was a feeling that it did address all key features but not in a clear enough or concise enough manner.

B rating given "creates detailed and clearly articulated inquiry proposals with key features*".

Criterion 1 - Element 3 – An A rating given the student "responds to inquiry questions from a broad range of perspectives.

***Criterion 1 - Element 4 – A A lot of skill required in putting together a book, and the photography used so the evidence of the ICT use was present and also authentically selected for this SDIA rating given "uses a wide range of ICT tools to effectively support and enhance development of inquiry".

Criterion 1 - Element 5 – B

Given a B on the grounds that the book demonstrates much of the reflection and the nature of the final product "assesses the success of addressing the inquiry question by articulating clear and detailed reflection"

Criterion 1 - Element 6 – B

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

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

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

Given a B based on "presents conclusions that coherently synthesise the outcomes from the inquiry".

Criterion 1 - Element 7 - B

The student identifies and communicates but a question how deeply or where the analysis is present.

Given a B "identifies, assesses and articulates degree to which the inquiry is transdisciplinary in nature".

Criterion 1 - Element 8 - B+ A B+ given as not enough evidence of the A rating "clearly and concisely articulates effective development of own knowledge and skills specific to the inquiry question."

The moderating group felt that marking without the student presentation where further articulation may have been presented and without the entirety of the journal and depth of reflections has limited the upper end of the assessment. However it was felt that the product demonstrated that much of this may have occurred however an assumption could not be made without the additional evidence which logically was perhaps provided at the panel presentation.

In summary the group consensus is that overall this Criterion is marked at a B

Provision of the additional information for moderation would be beneficial to the moderators.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

TBC

