

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	English - English Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Fran Moore
Moderation Leader Email	fran.moore@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Giovanna Padas
Minute Keeper Email	gpd@hutchins.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.

Fran Moore - Elizabeth College
Giovanna Padas - The Hutchins School
Adam Chambers - The Friends' School
Kristen Leeds - Guilford Young College
Yvette Blackwood – Friends
Sue Hawkins - Claremont College
Gillian Goldsworthy - St Mary's College
Felicity Leonard - Hobart College
Ineke Laning - Calvin
Heather Hankinson - Fahan School
John Dalco - Hobart College
Rebecca Harrison – Elizabeth College
Kate Herr - Elizabeth College
Kate Askey-Doran - Rosny College
Jo Longbottom – Collegiate
Michael Steedman-Cross – Collegiate
Alice Smith - MacKillop College
Erin Hortle - Rosny College
Caitlyn Richardson - Hobart College
Kate Dewar - Hobart College
Jennifer Miller – GYC
Christina Martini – GYC
Lorise Clark - St Mary's College
Emma Puszkars – GYC
Anita Manners – GYC

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

Bronwyn Moran – GYC
Alison Savage - GYC
Michael Dobbie – GYC
Nadine Frick - Friends

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

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

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

C3.1 = C | 3.2 = C- | 3.3 = C- | 3.4 = t+ | OVERALL C3 = C-

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

It is a "thin" paper, shallow understanding of the text, contexts and perspectives.

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

Greater textual evidence. Greater accuracy and clarity of expression

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

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

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

C3.1 = B+/A- | 3.2 = B+ | 3.3 = B | 3.4 = B/A- | OVERALL C3 = B+

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

Sets up the perspectives/lenses but doesn't really understand them. Close analysis and evaluation of language, especially page 2, 2nd paragraph: combines plot, structure, analysis and evaluation of perspective.

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

Not a big move from explanation to analysis. Own interpretation is not overly explicit/strong. Contexts of production and reception could have been stronger. Are the creators of this text telling black stories or are they adding black stories to the existing white narrative?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

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

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

C3.1 = B | 3.2 = B | 3.3 = B- | 3.4 = B | OVERALL C3 = B

Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Strong personal voice, well-substantiated claims. Covered author's purpose well. Quotes seem 'plonked in', rather than analysed in terms of their impact on the reader...is this a prepared response?

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Much greater analysis of language (the 'HOW') and literary style (construction of text, narrative, etc. The unique perspective of the central character is key to this text, but an evaluation/analysis of this was omitted from the response). Greater depth of context (e.g. gender dynamics, class struggles in this 1980s industrialised town). Greater specificity/precision, it is a bit generalised.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate

C4 and C6 (all elements)

the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

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:

1. In terms of Criterion 3, element 4: students must "defend" their position for a 'B' and "justify" it for an 'A'...Is it not more difficult (sophisticated, academically demanding) to defend one's position than to justify it? Do students need to bring an alternative perspective to defend their position for an A? Would it not make more sense to swap the verbs (defend and justify), so a student's justified perspective is in the 'B' range, and their defended perspective in the 'A' range?
2. Is it possible - after the group has reached consensus on the Overall rating after the moderation process - to see what the paper actually received for their exam?
3. Given the wide disparity of ratings, would it be better to have statewide moderation meetings, rather than split North-South meetings?
4. Are teachers assessing/using the elements (and the standards) during their marking process throughout the year or just in Moderation meetings? One teacher admitted that they gave an overall mark for the piece, without looking at the elements...[insert "Eek!" emoji here]
5. More PL on C3 would be appreciated!
6. Is there a possibility for exam markers to only mark texts they have taught?
7. Thank you so much, Lisa Davies, for clarifying the tricky bits about this course, for reminding us what we are here for and what the course actually asks us to teach and reminding us not to make things complicated!