

2018 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	HASS - Accounting Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Susan Oakden
Moderation Leader Email	susan.oakden@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Neesha-Marie Hartog
Minute Keeper Email	neeshamarie.hartog@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.	Jeremy Dooley - GYC Karen Maslen - Oakwood/TAFE Jodie Schafferius - Hutchins Lynn Tunbridge - Friends Richard Korn - Elizabeth College Susan Oakden - Elizabeth College Neesha-Marie Hartog - Hobart College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Simon Bennett - Collegiate

meeting.

Annotated Sample

Please specify which moderated sample has been selected as being the most appropriate to be the annotated sample, should the meeting choose to do so.

Sample 1

Please list the criteria (and elements if specified) being moderated for this sample

criterion 3

Please be specific as to why this sample was chosen - provide as much detail as possible relating back to the evidence it contains against the standards

It had the most errors on it which were a good basis for discussion of the way the proposed marking scheme could be implemented. It is assessed against element 3 in particular, but was also a opportunity for the meeting to discuss elements 1 and 2 and how marks might be allocated to those components.

If you have annotated your sample in hardcopy form, please scan and load the file here.

https://s3.amazonaws.com/files.formstack.com/uploads/3003169/66114717/441673913/66114717_sample_1_moderation_25092018134753-0001.pdf

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

that criterion

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

3 x C, 6 x C-, 1 x t+, 2 x t

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

For Income Statement:

- Incorrect placement of Sales returns account
- Incorrect calculation of sub-total after 'Add Other Revenue'
- No attempt on the Balance Day Adjustment for Advertising or Bad debts
- Depreciation on Van not included at all
- Incorrect placement of Cartage on Purchases
- Office Fit-out was included in Income Statement (but is a Balance Sheet item)

For Balance Sheet:

- Accounts receivables attempted but incorrect
- No attempt at Prepaid expenses
- Incorrect placement of Provision for Doubtful Debts
- Incorrect classification of Loan
- No figure included for 'Add Net Profit'
- 'Add liabilities' was included as a line item for Owner's Equity

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

- Correct placement/classification of accounts
- Attempt at all balance Day adjustments
- Correct balance day adjustments
- correct use of calculations

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level

The interpretation of the Proposed Marking Scheme was discussed and it was recommended that the scheme is further refined to ensure clarity for markers so consensus can be made more easily.

with comments

This needs to be done at State level.

Marks need to be allocated to 'simple' and 'complex' Balance Day Adjustments, as per Syllabus.

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

as above.

Explicitly teach the classification of accounts.

Ensure understanding of simple and complex balance day adjustments (BDAs).

Advise students that no attempt at BDAs will result in very few marks being allocated.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 3 = All elements, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

1 x B+, 6 x B, 2 x B-, 1 x C+, 1 x C, 1 x t

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

no headings on either Report.

Both reports had only 2 columns being used. (needs to use 3 and 4, as per the Templates in Course Appendix)

For Income Statement:

Inventory Adjustment and Cartage on Purchases incorrectly placed

No sub-total for Net Sales or Finance Expenses

Office fit-out included in Income Statement (incorrect placement)

Bad debts attempted but incorrect calculation.

	<p>For Balance Sheet:</p> <p>Goodwill, Building and Delivery Van (& Accum Depreciation) incorrectly classified.</p> <p>No Total Liabilities amount recorded</p> <p>Incorrect (and not balanced) totals for Net Assets and Owner's Equity.</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Correction of above.</p>
<p>Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments</p>	<p>The Proposed new marking scheme must be refined and then clearly communicated to all stakeholders.</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Discussion based on sample question "Bertram's Business Enterprises"</p> <p>A) Balance Day Adjustment discussion</p> <p>Based on the syllabus document -</p> <p>Simple entries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accrued expense • Prepaid expense/stocks of supplies • Revenue received in advance/prepaid revenue/unearned revenue • Accrued income • GST Clearing • Depreciation of a new asset • Depreciation of an existing asset using straight line • Write off bad debts <p>Complex entries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory adjustment • Depreciation of a new asset for a part period • Depreciation of an existing asset using diminishing balance • Increasing or decreasing the provision for doubtful debts • Any adjustment being written in a way that may not be seen in prior learning

The meeting discussed awarding more marks in the IS & BS for complex adjustments compared to simple adjustments as per below (Simple = 2 marks per account, Complex = 3 marks per account). These marks are based on correct calculation and correct classification.

If balance day adjustment attempted but incorrect (but in correct statement) 1 mark awarded.

If balance day adjustment attempted but incorrect, and in the wrong statement, no marks awarded.

If balance day adjustment attempted and correct, but incorrect statement = minus 2 marks (which means 0 marks awarded if a simple adjustment, but 1 mark can be awarded if a complex adjustment).

If balance day adjustment not attempted, some marks awarded for allocation to statement?????

B) Subtotals

Meeting discussed marking of subtotals and that when marking, all subtotals needed to be considered.

Therefore, for the Bertram example, 5 marks overall would be awarded for subtotalling (see adjustment marking guide attached to show where subtotals needed). Marks awarded on student subtotal answers.

C) Formatting (columns and underlining)

Meeting discussed awarding marks for columns and underlining and agreed on 3 marks overall (2 marks for columns and 1 mark for underlining).

D) Loss of marks for incorrect classifications

Meeting discussed allocation of marks when a student classifies an account in the right section, but wrong sub-classification. For example, classified advertising as a general expense instead of a selling expense. Half a mark awarded for correct account and amount, but incorrect sub-classification?

E) Loss of marks for incorrect statement

Meeting discussed allocation of marks when a student allocates an account to the wrong statement. The account would be awarded zero marks unless it is a balance day adjustment. In this case, marks would be awarded for the balance day adjustment calculation only (how many marks though?). See dot point A. Suggestion: Perhaps 0 marks if simple adjustment and 1 mark for a complex adjustment?

F) Headings

1 mark allocated for each statement (0.5 for business name and 0.5 for statement name and date), therefore 2 marks overall.

Income Statement and Balance Sheet adjusted as per Southern meeting discussion

Marks

Income Statement accounts & amounts (including adjustments) 22

Balance Sheet accounts & amounts (including adjustments) 27

Sub-totals overall (both statements) 5

Formatting (columns & underlining both statements) 3

TOTAL MARKS for question 57

Breakdown of marks %

Balance Day adjustments (24 marks) 42%

Inclusion of other accounts & amounts from trial balance (25 marks) 44%

Sub-totals (5 marks) 9%

Formatting (3 marks) 5%

TOTAL ALLOCATION of marks for question 100%

Adjusted marking scheme attached (excel).

Susan Oakden's marking of samples:

Sample 1

Past years marking scheme	Suggested marking scheme
Southern meeting marking scheme	

T (<30%)	C- (47%)	C (58%)
----------	----------	---------

Sample 2

Past years marking scheme	Suggested marking scheme
Southern meeting marking scheme	

B (74%)	B (73%)	B (78%)
---------	---------	---------

Southern meeting split in opinion over new marking scheme and whether it should be pursued. No majority either way.

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply	Level 3 or 4
For Level 3 and 4 courses please suggest criteria for consideration by CTL's.	still being decided between North and South meeting moderators.
Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:	Susan Oakden
Email	susan.oakden@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.	<p>Discussion based on sample question "Bertram's Business Enterprises"</p> <p>A) Balance Day Adjustment discussion</p> <p>Based on the syllabus document -</p> <p>Simple entries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accrued expense • Prepaid expense/stocks of supplies • Revenue received in advance/prepaid revenue/unearned revenue • Accrued income • GST Clearing • Depreciation of a new asset • Depreciation of an existing asset using straight line • Write off bad debts <p>Complex entries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory adjustment • Depreciation of a new asset for a part period
---	---

- Depreciation of an existing asset using diminishing balance
- Increasing or decreasing the provision for doubtful debts
- Any adjustment being written in a way that may not be seen in prior learning

The meeting discussed awarding more marks in the IS & BS for complex adjustments compared to simple adjustments as per below (Simple = 2 marks per account, Complex = 3 marks per account). These marks are based on correct calculation and correct classification.

If balance day adjustment attempted but incorrect (but in correct statement) 1 mark awarded.

If balance day adjustment attempted but incorrect, and in the wrong statement, no marks awarded.

If balance day adjustment attempted and correct, but incorrect statement = minus 2 marks (which means 0 marks awarded if a simple adjustment, but 1 mark can be awarded if a complex adjustment).

If balance day adjustment not attempted, some marks awarded for allocation to statement?????

B) Subtotals

Meeting discussed marking of subtotals and that when marking, all subtotals needed to be considered.

Therefore, for the Bertram example, 5 marks overall would be awarded for subtotalling (see adjustment marking guide attached to show where subtotals needed). Marks awarded on student subtotal answers.

C) Formatting (columns and underlining)

Meeting discussed awarding marks for columns and underlining and agreed on 3 marks overall (2 marks for columns and 1 mark for underlining).

D) Loss of marks for incorrect classifications

Meeting discussed allocation of marks when a student classifies an account in the right section, but wrong sub-classification. For example, classified advertising as a general expense instead of a selling expense. Half a mark awarded for correct account and amount, but incorrect sub-classification?

E) Loss of marks for incorrect statement

Meeting discussed allocation of marks when a student allocates an account to the wrong statement. The account would be awarded zero marks unless it is a balance day adjustment. In this case, marks would be awarded for the balance day adjustment calculation only (how many marks though?). See dot point A. Suggestion: Perhaps 0 marks if simple adjustment and 1 mark for a complex adjustment?

F) Headings

1 mark allocated for each statement (0.5 for business name and 0.5 for statement name and date), therefore 2 marks overall.

Income Statement and Balance Sheet adjusted as per Southern meeting discussion

Marks

Income Statement accounts & amounts (including adjustments) 22

Balance Sheet accounts & amounts (including adjustments) 27

Sub-totals overall (both statements) 5

Formatting (columns & underlining both statements) 3

TOTAL MARKS for question 57

Breakdown of marks %

Balance Day adjustments (24 marks) 42%

Inclusion of other accounts & amounts from trial balance (25 marks) 44%

Sub-totals (5 marks) 9%

Formatting (3 marks) 5%

TOTAL ALLOCATION of marks for question 100%

Adjusted marking scheme attached (excel).

Susan Oakden's marking of samples:

Sample 1

Past years marking scheme Suggested marking scheme
Southern meeting marking scheme

T (<30%) C- (47%) C (58%)

Sample 2

Past years marking scheme Suggested marking scheme
Southern meeting marking scheme

B (74%) B (73%) B (78%)
Southern meeting split in opinion over new marking scheme and whether it should be pursued. No majority either way.

Course Support

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

Southern meeting split in opinion over new marking scheme and whether it should be pursued. No majority either way. We need to have a marking scheme that is easy to understand and apply in an efficient manner.

The proposed marking scheme will need much further clarity in order for it to replace the 'old' (existing) marking scheme which uses a deduction per error format.

We continue to lack clarity around why Criterion 6, element 3 exists in the course document, considering a whole criteria is allocated to this component (in criterion 3). Can TASC and/or CTL PLEASE let us know as soon as possible.

In addition, Unit 5 requires students to choose either Topic 1 or Topic 2. There seems to be a large misunderstanding about what is required in the 'conclusion and recommendation' component of the 'Key Ideas' in Topic 1; are students meant to recommend what a business should do to move forward with their information system (are our students expected to have this level of understanding after 10 months of Accounting 3?). There is also a disjoint between the amount of work that each Topic would take to complete properly - Topic 2 is much more complex and requires MUCH more research. Further clarification of what is required from a 'personal financial plan and investment strategy' is needed as students are unsure about their starting point. Do they 'pretend' they have \$10 000 (as an example) to invest in the types of investments outlined in the 'Key Ideas'? Or do they assume they are a certain age, with a certain type of job on a certain level of income and THEN look at the options? Many students are very unsure how to start.