

# 2019 March Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	PM
Which PM Meeting is this report for?	Science - Chemistry Level 4
Moderation Leader Name	Deborah Beswick
Moderation Leader Email	deborah.beswick@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Katrina Munting
Minute Keeper Email	kmunting@friends.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.

Deborah Beswick - Elizabeth College  
Melanie East - Fahan School  
Joanna Finney - Rosny College  
Brendan Gourlay - St Mary's College  
Adam James - Hutchins  
Yvette Jones - Hobart College  
Satwinder Kaur - Claremont College  
Neil Lay - Collegiate  
Anthia Lyons - Guilford Young  
Marjorie Morgan - Hobart College  
Katrina Munting - Friends' School  
Elsa Rector - Rosny College  
Brenda Winning - Friends' School  
Nigel Brookes - Guilford Young

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

Jason Hoare - Elizabeth College  
Will Walker - Elizabeth College  
Chris Evenhuis - Calvin Christian School. (Phillip Banham in attendance instead)

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

B (As internal marking. Confirmed by standards document)

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

Around the room before discussion:343231.53130.53028.52625.5

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

\*\*Note: much of our discussion points are the same as in Sample 2. Sample 2 was moderated first.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

26/40 = B (If it was an internal piece of work). Confirmed by the standards document = B

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

Working through each question and discussed the following:- quality of answers- interpretation of the question- how marks are allocated within the solution Q8a) delta H and Ea were given marks b) error carried forward for 'your' diagram. c) only 2 factors discussed with some language not included. Q9 a) Tricky. Credit assigned where possible b) Units needed to be included c) correct selection of producer gas and some explanation.

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

**Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.**

**Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

Q10a) only responded to finally, not initially .b)c) Some discussion of both directions of reaction d) discussed the concept)

Q11 .a) in essence this answer is correct b) 2 good obs given c) classification and explanation required for both marks d) Just the effect was needed. e) x, 2x, relative sizes needed provided.- spikes are needed but relative size was not penalised

Q12a) b)c) Correct process followed

Q8a) - All 4 features were needed and relative sizes were important. - Activation energy must be very small. Delta H needed to be larger due to 'burns vigorously' .b)- error carried forward for 'your' diagram. c) - having 3 distinct points discussed with language. - 'Frequency' was important.

Q9 a)b) c) needed to relate back to part b) to explain this well

Q10a) needs to be initially as well as finally b)c) needed to explicitly identify the driving force. d) needed to talk about LCPE)

Q11 a) b) macroscopic observations are constant. Various are acceptable. c) talking about the reverse reaction was not needed. d) lines cannot go below the initial value. Use a ruler!

Q12a) correct equation needed b)The use of Bronsted-Lowry term seems to throw students off. c) Assumption required to gain full marks

Across the room - raw scores prior to today...302926.5262524.523.521 For discussion: Cut-offs = is this based on our classroom expectations? Exam marking expectations? Standards document? Marking based off reading examiners comments, off JAK's answers or our own set of solutions. Also discussed where Kc is 'large' for question 11 a). Maybe the markers' comments need to reflect this. More detail is needed in the question that 14.5 = large

- Making explicit how marks are divided/allocated within an answer.- Teachers must teach about the peak size and final position relative to the initial concentrations for equilibrium. The examiners were lenient when marking this though.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

**Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion**

**Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?**

**Sample 3 - Summary of**

Criterion 6 = Overall

t (marked internally). Approaching a C (possibly on the external exam).

Around the room marks before the discussion 17.5|6|5|3.5|3.5|2.5|10

group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

C (assessed internally and mapped with the standards)

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Around the room before discussion:2322.52|2019.5|8|7|16

### Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criterion 2 & 3

### Sharing Resources

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

Robust discussion about atom size vs ion size, particularly for anions. How this is traditionally taught and comparing this to actual measurements.

## Course Support

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

- \* More support for staff who teach 7-10 as well as Year 11-12, to attend TASC marking. There needs to be more provision of relief for staff to attend. Not all teachers teach purely in Year 11-12 and need to have classes covered.
- \* It would be helpful to know what the final external ratings were for these samples to compare back to after moderation.
- \* Future exams needs to be more predictable, not so creative. It doesn't need to be all original, all the time.
- \* TASC MUST provide the marking examiners' feedback to the setting examiner. These comments are written by the marking examiners but the CHM415115 setting examiner does not receive them each year.
- \* It is disappointing that TASC again has not supplied the 2019 info sheet by this date. This should be ready for the first day of teaching each year.
- \*The English system for Year 12-13 is interesting and has some good points. See here for more detail (To be provided by Nigel Brookes):