

# 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 Applied Level 2

Moderation Leader Name

Christine Gee

Moderation Leader Email

chris.gee@educatio.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Jason Morrison

Minute Keeper Email

jason.morrison@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.

Bronte Adams Rosny College  
Gabriella Adams Bayview Secondary College  
Pamela Barney Claremont College  
Stephen Bray Claremont College  
Chris Ellery Clarence High School  
Sheree Grey Oatlands District High School  
Abigail Haight Tasman District School  
Therese Heland Huonville High School  
Cindy Hill Tasmanian e-school  
Kym Johnson Campania District school  
Jaclyn Jolly Hobart College  
Annette Logan Sorell School  
Ari Powell Tasmanian e-school  
Christine Gee Rosny College  
Jason Morrison Rosny College  
James McLeod The Hutchins School  
Doug Pybus Elizabeth College  
Dee Spaulding St Mary's College

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

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

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

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

C

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

There was some discussion about needing the task outline to assess properly although it was indicated that, despite the task, we could still look for evidence in relation to the criterion and elements. It was assumed that the writing in bold was provided by the teacher to guide student responses. Unsure if all the work was from the same student but assumed it was. Longer written responses were of a higher standard than the short answers. The writer does make reference to how features of the text are presented to affect the audience. "Statistical information coming from such a recognised authority gives weight to argument...." but this was not consistent throughout the sample. The difference in the level of writing could have been pre-determined by the nature of the task - that is, a need for short answer as compared to a request for examples with explanation.

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

The students seems to understand ideas and information but not as much the attitudes and virtually no values within the texts. Need more reference to these. The student needs to show more understanding, through further explanation, of the ideas in the text.

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

C

The group felt that the sample provided sufficient evidence for a C on Criterion 4 but needed to be able to explain features of the text in more detail.

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

The student needs to be taught how to analyse more deeply to ensure s/he answers the question more thoroughly and effectively. The teacher should ensure that the student understands the terms 'attitudes' and 'values' and be able to identify them in a text. Feel the teacher could set richer tasks if this is a major assessment. Short answers provide a means to an end - better understanding but don't encourage higher level responses or provide opportunities to explore ideas etc and personal responses to texts.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

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

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

B

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

Unsure if the task was a response to the picture or if the picture was part of the text the student created. People felt this text was a B+ and possibly an A on element 3 with comments like "I can almost feel the freshness of the water touching my feet gently". This example could be considered to be persuasive and detailed. However, it was felt that this level of personal response was not consistent throughout the piece of writing and so on balance would probably rate as a B. For element 2 it is a clear B as the writer describes how different aspects of the visual text affects the audience. The group felt that there was more description than evaluation and therefore, at a B standard.

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

Would like to see a consistency in standard of writing to ensure a higher award.

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

B  
Felt this was a consistent B but felt that writing could be assessed more highly on Element 3. Still would be a B overall.

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

Again, some of the group felt the lack of task outline/description was an issue for effective assessment. The group felt that the student had the understanding but lacked the analytical skills and vocab to raise the level of their writing. Need to provide exemplars/models of higher level writing and focus on developing the vocab would like to see being used in this type of writing. The distinction between ideas, attitudes and values needs to be clarified for students. An explicit scaffold for approach to analytical writing could be provided and explicitness around explaining what the teacher will be looking for in the task (could mean an unpacking of the relevant criterion to focus on the elements and the levels required for each rating).

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

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

**Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.**

**Sample 3 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

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

c-/t

The piece of writing was 48% plagiarised and as such there was discussion around assessing work that wasn't totally original. Whilst it was felt we should be 'treasure hunters rather than witch hunters' there was a concern that a student may feel s/he could continue to do this if they weren't penalised in assessment. The original writing wasn't unsatisfactory it was just compromised by the plagiarism. The written response did not refer to the text or have evidence from the text. The writer did seem to be aware of ideas and attitudes but they weren't connected to a specific text or textual awareness. At a pinch we can find some evidence for element 1 - but not sufficient for a satisfactory rating.

Need to see references to the focus text/s in which the student is identifying the ideas and attitudes. There are no examples from text provided and consequently no discussion. We would like to see the student write from their own understanding and point of view; it is not okay that they could identify the relevant pieces in someone else writing and use them without direct acknowledgement (not just list in references at end).

C-/t

Evidence is minimal or lacking for each of the elements, especially because each element refers to the need to be relating to a text and this reference is not made in this sample. Those who were inclined to reward the effort of some original writing on ideas awarded a C- but others found the plagiarism too big an issue and awarded a t. It was felt that the sample read a bit like an unstructured rant. It didn't make a lot of sense as it lacked flow and focus.

Students need to be made aware of what plagiarism is and that it is not acceptable. Explicit teaching of research and note-making skills that can then be scaffolded into sentences > paragraphs in the students' own writing. Need to explicitly teach strategies around changing work from research from other sources. Need to be taught how to cite evidence from the original texts or from other writers - need to teach quoting and referencing. The teacher could discuss the plagiarism with the student and identify what was actually required and then allow the student to resubmit their own writing - this is a solid learning opportunity.

---

## Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

### Sharing Resources

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

Resources were shared. Chris Gee to email "Great Speeches" unit and "Deng Adut" unit from Rosny College. Generally people discussed and shared ideas, looked at samples on classroom wall and shared emails for further contact.

### Course Support

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

A request for samples was made by Curriculum Services. Group would like to ask that providers of samples also provide a task descriptor. A general request for more targeted, appropriate PL but online learning and extension schools in particular felt a need for more supportive PL