

# 2018 September Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	HASS - Ancient History Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Rosalind Walker
Moderation Leader Email	rosalind.walker@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Sally Polanowski
Minute Keeper Email	sally.polanowski@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.	Rosalind Walker - Hobart College Sally Polanowski - Rosny College Laura Russell - Elizabeth College Mark Allen - The Friends School Hannah Warwarek - the Friends School Adam Croser - Guilford Young College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Nil

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.

Other

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

criteria 4 and 6

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

We chose to moderate the four Ancient Greece samples: Samples 7, 8, 9 and 10 as only one member of the meeting was teaching a different civilisation (Rome).

These four samples allowed us to compare the evidence from at least two different providers against two of the exam criteria. The samples addressed the same exam question and were done under timed conditions.

Samples 7 and 8 addressed the question very differently from samples 9 and 10 and this gave rise to the most discussion, as two different interpretations of the module content and the criteria elements was clearly evident.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 7

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

Criterion 4 = Element 1, Element 3, Element 4  
 Criterion 6 = Element 2, Element 3, Element 4

Sample 7 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Criterion 4 - A-, Criterion 6 - B+

Sample 7 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

In addressing Crit 4, element 3 - The sample had a 'wide range' of primary and secondary sources - 6 quoted primary written sources including: Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus, Aeschylus and Plutarch, a piece of archaeological evidence in the form of a vase painting and two quoted secondary sources: Hanson and Green.

In addressing Crit 6, the sample focused on the relationship between the feature (Warfare and weapons) and the political and social structures of Ancient Greece with a focus on Ancient Athens. The feature was foregrounded (element 2) and the historical context - element 3 - was examined over a period from the mid 7th century to the end of the Battle of Salamis in early 5th century. The geographical context was clearly identified as Athens and the battles of Marathon and Salamis.

In addressing Crit 6 - element 4 - the essay did not focus on 'beliefs and values' although there was mention in the conclusion. (the provider of the sample pointed out that at the stage when the module was taught, the words 'beliefs and values' had been omitted by TASC from the criterion elements for an A rating and the student had not expected to be examined on this aspect of the element).

Sample 7 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

The meeting agreed that there was a wide range of source material used to back up the argument and that the argument was clear and sophisticated but, perhaps, not sufficiently detailed.

Sample 7 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

It was difficult for the group to achieve consensus. Against criterion 4, discussion arose as to the nature of the word 'evidence' - was evidence to be seen as historical facts that supported the argument or 'evidence' for those historical facts from the source material? Element 1 suggests the former while Element 3 suggests the latter. The meeting decided that for an A or B rating to be given both types of evidence had to be included.

The meeting awarded an A- on criterion 4.

Against criterion 6, discussion centred on the extent to which the 'feature(s)' should be foregrounded or whether examination of the 'structures' should take precedence. Once again, more detail would have taken the answer

**Sample 7 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

more firmly into the A range. The meeting awarded a B+ on criterion 6.

The meeting agreed that the demands of the set question were probably too great to be fully addressed in a single answer. The question was criticised for being unclear, the wording 'shed light on' being particularly singled out. The participants also felt that Module B as a whole was too complex to be addressed in a single (one size fits all) question and inevitably gave rise to the very different kinds of answers seen across the two sets of samples (7, 8 and 9, 10). The former were clearly focused on the key feature and the latter on an overview of the structures.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 8

**Sample 8 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion**

Crit 4 = Element 1, Element 3, Element 4  
Crit 6 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

**Sample 8 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?**

Criterion 4 - B+, Criterion 6 - A-

**Sample 8 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?**

Criterion 4, element 3 - four named primary sources, one archaeological source, two named and quoted secondaries.  
element 1 - detailed evidence of democratic developments and institutions inc. Solon, Cleisthenes, Battles of Marathon and Salamis.

Criterion 6, a clear and cogent argument that linked the development of democracy with warfare via the participation of the hoplite phalanxes and then the oarsmen thetes. Geographical context was located in the rise of the polis and then Athens and the historical context ranged from mid 7th century to early 5th century. Once again, beliefs and values were linked to the notion of warfare as the best way to show allegiance to the Polis, however, as mentioned in Sample 1 this element had not been expected by the candidate.

**Sample 8 - What evidence would you need to see in**

Criterion 4 - more specific pieces of evidence and more quotation from the primary sources - the latter

order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

requirement was the subject of considerable debate.

Sample 8 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

As for sample 7.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 9

Sample 9 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 4 = Element 1, Element 3, Element 4  
 Crit 6 = Element 2, Element 3, Element 4

Sample 9 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Criterion 4 - A-/B+, Criterion 6 - ?

Sample 9 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Some members of the group felt that there was sufficient evidence for an A- on Criterion 4 while others were unsure about the quality of the source material presented. Once again the discussion focused on what constitutes evidence. There was a lot of geographical evidence and quite a lot of historical evidence but only two named primary sources - Plutarch and Aristotle. There was robust discussion around whether a student should be penalised for what they don't include, in this case: Xenophon and Tyrtaeus. Some argued strongly that there should not be negative penalties, others that if a student does not use the key primaries for a given topic, can they be said to have presented a 'range' of the best sources.

We had insufficient time to fully consider criterion 6. Discussion arose around the fact that we were unsure as to which 'feature(s)' had been chosen. There was no selection of a chosen feature in the introduction or any mention of what might be deemed a feature until page two of the essay. We had to surmise that the features chosen were Warfare and Women.

Sample 9 - What evidence would

A greater range of primary source material would cement the answer more firmly in the A range.

you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Clearer addressing of all the elements of the set question.  
Clear nomination of the chosen feature.

Sample 9 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

It was very difficult to achieve consensus. Discussion arose around the way this answer differed from the previous two in that it did not centre its argument around the feature but rather around the geographical context and the political and social structures.

As with past moderation discussions the meeting participants were unanimous in their sense of disquiet about the very broad and wide ranging nature of Module B of the course. The unit seems ambiguous and very difficult for students to refine in their individual responses.

The need for PL was discussed again. This was generally regarded as an imperative and felt to require immediate action. As inconsistency remains around how to best teach this very broad ranging unit, this was clearly reflected in the disparate nature of the sample selection and the very broad range of ratings offered against the two criteria.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 10

Sample 10 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 4 = Element 1, Element 3, Element 4  
Crit 6 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 10 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

Criterion 4 - B-, criterion 6 - insufficient time

Sample 10 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Against Criterion 4 - there was quite a lot of evidence offered but not especially focused on supporting an argument in answer to the question. The introduction was singled out as being strong but, while there were a number of named primary sources, there was little actual quotation or paraphrase.

Sample 10 - What evidence would

Evidence needs to be targeted towards supporting the

you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

argument. No secondary sources were offered.

## 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.

Criteria 3, 4 and 7 Section C of 2018 end of yr exam

Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:

CTL

Email

wendy.frost@education.tas.gov.au

## Sharing 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:

The meeting strongly expressed the need for statewide PL on Module B and the development of a statewide understanding of the moderated elements of criterion 6 and the exam specifications. At the end of 2017 this was also proposed but the then, CTL, left before it could be arranged.