

# 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 Literature Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Sarah Cupit

Moderation Leader Email

sarah.cupit@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Katrina Haig

Minute Keeper Email

KHaig@gyc.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.

Margaret Boyce Hobart College  
Sarah Cupit Elizabeth College  
Melissa Cuthbertson St Michael's Collegiate School  
Elizabeth Delaney Rosny College  
Alison Farmer The Hutchins School  
Katrina Haig Guilford Young College  
Penny Leder Calvin Christian School  
Greta Lucas Elizabeth College  
Emma Nathan Friends' School  
Shelley O'Reilly MacKillop College  
Bob Pill Rosny College  
Adam Shaw Friends' School  
William Simon St Michael's Collegiate School  
Charlotte Vickers 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.

Ellen Rees Hobart College

## 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, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

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

B+/B/B- for an overall rating of Criterion 4

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

The group first came to a shared understanding of Criterion 4: C4 Compose and craft analytical responses to texts. From the stem, the group agreed that the Criterion is a holistic one in which the following should be evident:- a clear line of argument - logical progression- effective use of supporting evidence- position/clear answer to the question- analysis/crafting/composition- synthesis/bringing together the content information (C1, C2)- language of writing about literature - metalanguage (C7)The elements that therefore lie at the heart of the criterion are:E4 - synthesising content (e.g. text/context; critical interpretation/author)E5 - structure, how to develop argument, sequential progression of ideasE3 - literary language/conventions and style fits somewhat within this criterion. However, there are problematic elements: E1: relationships between texts, audiences and contexts, E2: author's ideas and values, and E6: connections between ideas and values, which appear to be repetitions of elements of other criteria.E7: plans and drafts is also covered by C8 and was not assessed in this meeting.

For the overall rating of Sample 1: B, the following evidence was identified: The student uses topic sentences but logical connections are not really there. The student shows some knowledge of the poem, makes some credible points and brings together some of the elements of the question and content, however, the response is a bit vague and not focussed on the question. The B rating was given in recognition that the student does more than just describe. The elements were broken down in the following way:E5: B. There is evidence of structuring the response into a line of argument. The last part of the introduction: "timeless nature" is the best example of their use of effective structure and the topic sentences are signposted in the introduction. The student addresses the question in first sentence of Paragraph 1 and elaborates in the second sentence. Given it is an exam script, the response falls off at the end. The last two paragraphs don't contradict the students' initial argument, they just don't add much to it.E4: B. The main body of paragraph is quite detailed but not enough for the A range. There is effective use of supporting evidence. The elements are brought together in a cohesive paragraph and there are some good transitions. The group struggled to come up with evidence that the student is answering the question with references to "timeless", however, it was noted that this is not an explicit requirement of C4 - a big omission of the criterion that should be addressed in future versions.E3: In the first paragraph - the best one - the metalanguage and choice of verbs shows they are evaluating the choice of language. There is a close focus on language 'country' and the effect. They note the technique of using large gaps, choice of diction, the use of nouns as names,

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

hyphenated words etc. E1: C range and E2: C range. There was some mention of the Jewish names of Symborska's poem showing external knowledge of context and the Aboriginal context of Aunty Doreen. There was nothing on the audience context of either poem. Moderators discussed what this might look like and agreed that students interpreting the poems from the perspective of their own context is a lot to do in an exam. E6: C range. There was good evidence of the ideas in the poems but almost no evidence of a discussion of values. The use of 'sacred' in Paragraph 2 shows in implicit recognition of values.

Moderators noted that the incongruous elements E1, E2 and E6 are replicated in C2: demonstrates understanding of the influence of cultural and historical contexts. As a result, students are being penalised (or rewarded) twice. Moderators feel that these elements are creating unnecessary complexity in C4 and should be removed as they are already a requirement of other criteria and are not extensions of the criterion stem.

Discussion focussed on ways to improve E3: There could be more focus on language choices - the examples the student has used are sound but not wide ranging. This is a rather neutral, clinical response and it is not clear the student is really thinking and feeling what they are writing. There is nothing about enhancing aesthetic appeal, so can't be in the A range. The student could discuss the 'affect' as well as the 'effect' - saying that they have an intellectual or emotional response and this would show a deeper engagement with the text. The discussion of 'tone' would facilitate this: for example, the Harkin poem is not an angry poem but reconciliatory. In terms of a personal response, when evaluating the literary convention, structure and style, they could look more at what has impacted upon them in some way. Moderators agreed they are looking for voice and the language of engagement. They could frame the aesthetic appeal in terms of the power of the poetry. For example recognising the title, "Still" = stillness and silence as profound given the subject matter of the Holocaust; 'profound' or 'powerful' are evaluations through which to examine aesthetic appeal, although the students would need to say profound or powerful in what way. There is little sense that these are poems of specific free verse form. Appreciating the choices in form could be a way of addressing the appeal of the works...and to make some sense of Elements 1, 2 and 6: The student could recognise that these poems refer to things in the past but have a significance to current audiences; there is very little sense of how the poems were created in a contemporary context. The student could state the relationship between the text, audience and context in the introduction, however, a complete examination of this would be difficult if the student were to also answer the question. Moderators recognised that, while they would rarely assess Elements 1 and 2 of C4 separately from C2, they still need clarity and distinction between the criteria. It is clear that this solid "B" response against the stem is being compromised by the requirements of E1, E2, and E6.

E5: BE4: BE3: B E1: C range E2: C range E6: C range E7: not assessed

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

**Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain**

For E3: Teachers should encourage students to develop a sophisticated response that acknowledges both the 'effect' and 'affect' of the poet's choices. This requires an understanding of 'tone'.

a higher rating (or ratings)?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

This sample was not moderated.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 4 = Element 3, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6

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

A, A-, B+ = agreed on A range

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

E5: The response has a solid structure, good integration of quotations, topic sentences are signposted in the introduction and laid out in order. There is a clear, cohesive line of argument. Page numbers are included; this is impressive but not necessary. E4: The student returns to the question of "new ways of thinking" throughout and lot of detailed evidence is used to support the arguments. There is some musicality of the sentences written. E3: The student recognises the authorial intent and effect of the compositional features of the text. They examine a range of literary conventions and stylistic features. They have evaluated the aesthetic appeal implicitly. They name language conventions and examine their effects, for example, "illustrates the entrapment and confinement...a clearer picture". E6: Not assessed

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

E5: This is an exceptionally well-structured response for an exam script. This was a good script to show that if a student synthesises the elements of their response very well, the onus is on the marker to read really closely as the synthesis might be so effective that the evidence against the separate elements is missed. E4: The student could have more closely addressed the question "new ways of thinking" throughout. It is more an examination of the main themes of the novel (eg, war trauma, masculinity, gender etc.) with "new ways of thinking" imposed on top of this. However, it was recognised that Regeneration was published in 1991 but set in WWI - Barker illustrates emasculating effects, so by definition it's new ways of thinking. The student sets up the argument at the start that Barker is deliberately presenting a new way of thinking, so every mention of Barker henceforth links to the question implicitly. Again, moderators recognised the issue that Criterion 4

does not explicitly require students to answer the question, which is an essential skills for an English response. Moderators recognised that while it is good to encourage the C and B range students to explicitly refer to the question and the content elements: for example, "This demonstrates a new way of thinking by..." The A range student's integrated response is more nuanced in language and needs to be assessed holistically. E3: The response is, perhaps, a little light on compositional features. The use of meta language in identifying and appreciating the effects of the language choices was a little light. E6: Again, this dense content descriptor, requiring that the student links ideas and values, appears out of place here.

E5: AE4: AE3: A-E6: Not assessed

**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)?**

This was agreed to be a strong script for an exam response.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Sample 4 was not assessed.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Section A exam scripts, moderating Criterion 2 and 4 together.

**State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation.**

Will Simon from Collegiate and Adam Shaw and Emma Nathan, both from The Friends' School

**Email address of the person**

william.simon@collegiate.tas.edu.au; ashaw@friends.tas.edu.au; enathan@friends.tas.edu.au

providing the samples for September moderation

### Sharing Resources

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

Katrina Haigh from GYC has recommended the Library of the Future website <https://www.futurelibrary.no>, particularly Margaret Attwood's comments that examine the idea of context: <https://www.messynessychic.com/2019/03/08/famous-authors-are-writing-books-for-a-time-capsule-library-none-of-us-will-ever-see>. Teachers are reminded that the Year 11/12 website has some resources for English Literature, including Dr Naomi Milthorpe's analysis of "Whoso List to Hunt" and "Ode to Autumn". Teachers can keep up-to-date through the RSS feed subscription. Please note that the exam specs are very specific about students not 'splitting' their comparative text study in the exam. They can only write on their Module 2: single text for the single text questions in the exam. The process has begun for the selection of the 2019 prescribed text list. Submissions closed last week and expressions of interest are needed from DoE, Independent and Catholic schools to participate in panel. The draft list will be circulated for comment. For students choosing a poet for their Independent Study, they should write on six poems and include these in the study so that the marker knows what they are.

### Course Support

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

As the text list will be new next year, teachers would value:- A booklet that analyses the twelve new poems in context - as published by DoE at the beginning of the current course, along with suggested readings.- Professional learning about the new poems and their contexts to follow up, perhaps from UTAS- Teacher-led PL at the beginning of Term 3 to take the lead on ways to teach the texts from the new list that they know well- PL from English Writing teachers to teach English Literature teachers strategies for the Imaginative Response for the Independent Study