

2018 September 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	Alison Farmer
Minute Keeper Email	Alison.Farmer@hutchins.tas.edu.au

Attendance

<p>Please enter the name and school for all attendees. This can be copied and pasted from the registration list sent to the Moderation Leader.</p>	<p>Penny Leder, Calvin Christian School Anna Forward, Fahan School Tony Barrett, Friends' School Yvette Blackwood, Friends' School Emma Nathan, Friends' School Adam Shaw, Friends' School Katrina Haig, Guilford Young College Margaret Boyce, Hobart College Ellen Rees, Hobart College Sarah Geale, Rosny College Charlotte Vickers, St Mary's College William Simon, St Michael's Collegiate School Alison Farmer, The Hutchins School Sarah Cupit, Elizabeth College</p>
<p>Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who</p>	<p>None.</p>

appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the 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.

Sample 1

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

CI, all elements

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

This is a current mid-year exam script and so mirrors the assessment task for which Criterion 1 will be assessed at the end of the year. It was selected as a strong response to a set Section B exam question under timed conditions. It demonstrated evidence against all of the elements of Criterion 1 and allowed the moderation group to consolidate a shared understanding of Criterion 1, namely:

- The key to the criterion is "ideas"
- Element 1 requires a discussion of ideas (except for rating C) and their relationship with narrative features. The term, "narrative features" was understood as synonymous with compositional features, stylistic features; as well as including plot, characterisation, genre, and context only when the context is referenced within texts (e.g. Last Cab to Darwin). The phrase "the way the story is told" was accepted as a useful way to think about narrative features.
- Element 2 requires students to refer to narrative features as evidence for the discussion of the main ideas of the text. It was suggested that Element 2 was the main element in CI. In considering the logical connection between Elements 1 and 2, a series of questions is posed: What?/Why? (Element 2) and How? (Element 1).

A visual representation might be:

What?/Why? -> How?

- Element 3 requires students to use the ideas to form an interpretation of texts. The student's "own" interpretation is mentioned first in E3 and then the interpretation of "others". In weighing evidence about the interpretations of others, it was suggested that how the evidence of others' interpretations were used will be given prominence, rather than what the interpretation is or whose interpretation is offered. Moderators were encouraged to be accepting of a range of interpretations from a range of sources. In the A range, the student's own judgement needs to be shown explicitly to be informed by a critical process, which has involved a range of interpretations.
- Element 4 refers to how effectively all the elements of C1 are synthesized, as well as supporting the interpretation with an analysis of connections between the what/why (ideas) and how (narrative features) of texts. Element 4 can also be understood as the next step/extrapolation of Element 3, which considers the significance of.../ the implications of the interpretations of texts.
- Element 5 relates to the word "appreciation" in Criterion 1 and involves evaluation of artistic/aesthetic texts. Element 5 can be understood as an elaboration and appreciation of the narrative features of Element 1. Evidence of evaluation is demonstrated the student's appraisal of the language of composers and structural integrity of texts. (for example, "effective", "successful", "powerful"). Evidence of evaluation is also demonstrated in the student's own discerning selection of language in discussing the text.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 1 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

Criterion 1: A-

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

The student wrote a decent amount, used the introduction, body paragraph, conclusion to structure their analysis of the ideas of the texts and met the task requirements. They named and examined narrative features throughout the response and linked these strongly to the main ideas of the texts. They signposted their own interpretation of the text and engaged with the interpretations of a range of others. The moderation group felt the student had meet the requirements of the criterion very well.

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

For E1, there is a reasonable amount of discussion of ideas and narrative features for the A range, but there could have been more to consolidate an A.

For E3, consideration of why texts have been created at a particular moment for a particular audience is relevant in appraising the interpretation of others.

E5 was present but indirect. The student could have been more explicit about their appreciation of the texts.

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

The meeting recognised the tension between making a holistic judgement, which integrates the elements and provides a single mark for the criterion required by TASC, and marking against individual elements. The meeting returned to the integrated nature of the marking process several times. Recognition of the limitation involved in separating the elements was supported by an analysis of logical connections between elements: E1 and E2; E3 and E4; E1 and E5.

- E1 = A- A relationship between the ideas and the narrative features was demonstrated in each paragraph, for example, the topic sentences draw together an idea and a narrative feature.

E2 = A- Quotations were used purposefully. The student demonstrated a thorough understanding of the ambiguities of both texts (ie. their complexity).

- E3 = A-/B+ The student was explicit about the critical process and used signposting e.g. symbolism and repression relate to a psychoanalytical perspective; references to Pat Barker, Nicole Kidman and a psychoanalytical perspective integrated a good range of perspectives. It was recognised that the student did more than just quote the perspective of another, but commented on, tested or evaluated it.

- E4 = A- Synthesis was evident in the introduction and conclusion. Students are encouraged to evaluate the views of others and to take a stand. Students can move to "I" in the conclusion.

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

- E5 = B+ Phrases on page 2 such as "validates"; "is made abundantly evident"; "This gives insight", demonstrate "appreciation".

E5 was recognised to be difficult to achieve in an exam situation. The group recommended teaching students to use evaluative words that appraised the intellectual or emotional effect of the work. A first person voice can work well in these cases. "Appreciation" can also be shown in a close analysis of the composer's language choices and their effect. For example, the student could write, "Pat Barker made highly detailed and effective use of the dialogue of the upper class to draw the audience into a consideration of the psychological state of the soldiers". The student could also examine the significance of the title.

A greater understanding of the purpose of the texts and their significance as to why the composer has created them can still appear in an essay response that has been 'funnelled' through a specific exam question.

Students are encouraged to use a range of critical interpretations that may agree with or disagree with their own interpretation.

The interaction between C1 and C4 was considered and the meeting recognised that problems addressing the question related to C4. The focus of C1 is not about answering the question, but rather is about a discussion of ideas, narrative features and interpretations. The meeting agreed that there would be a lower mark on C4.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 1 = All elements, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

Criterion 1: B-

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or

This was the last script examined and, after the fruitful and extensive discussion invited by Sample 1, the group reiterated the advice and understanding about the criterion

ratings) the group has given?

elements from the previous sample.

Moderators identified that the introduction needs to address ideas. While the student discusses some narrative features, they have not chosen the right narrative features as outlined in the question. For example, the third paragraph addressing the women of Regeneration identifies secondary characters, whereas they were required to discuss the protagonist.

The meeting agreed that there would be a lower mark on C4.

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

Students need to channel their knowledge of the text through the question. The issue with the tricky last paragraph could have been solved had the student argued that the secondary characters of the women in the novel elucidated or developed aspects of the protagonists' characterisation.

The group noted that the more work the examiner needs to do to infer the student's demonstrated knowledge against the criterion elements, the lower the mark. Students must make their interpretation explicit, whether in third person or first person.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Crit 1 = All elements, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

Criterion 1: C-

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

While the student shows some knowledge of the text, despite some factual errors, and clearly engages with analysis (Element 2) within the paragraphs, the script does not meet the extra elements of the criterion sufficiently, in particular Element 3 and Element 5.

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in

More evidence that the student has engaged with these texts as purposeful constructions by the composers for a purpose, ie. to develop/explore ideas, would lift the ratings

order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

across all criteria.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

- E1 = C There was some discussion of the narrative features of plot and character, however this was not explicitly named using the appropriate metalanguage.
- E2 = C There was some discussion of the ideas but the student slipped at times into retelling the plot.
- E3 = t+ The student included no other critical interpretations. Moderators could infer that the interpretation was the student's own (by the fact they were writing it!), and there was some explicit recognition in the final statement, but the marker had to do a lot of the interpretive work.
- E4 = C The student needed to do the basics: name the author/director, novel/film.
- E5 = t There was little appreciation of the aesthetic or artistic qualities of the text. Much of the discussion of the text had little critical perspective. To improve the student could show understanding that the text is a construction. It is necessary to say Barker; Teplitzky..., etc.

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

Students should foreground the choices of the composers to show that they understand that texts are crafted via narrative features to develop ideas. Using the last names of the composers at the start of their sentences is a very simple way to direct students to take a distanced, critical perspective of the text.

Exploring the effect or significance of the ideas within the text in the conclusion of the response is a useful way for a student to demonstrate their ability to synthesise (Element 4), as well as appreciate the text (Element 5).

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.

Criterion 4

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

William Simon

Email

william.simon@collegiate.tas.edu.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:

It was noted that there is crossover between criteria and cross over within individual criterion elements. This makes it difficult to do an element-by-element examination of the criterion. The crossover between and within criteria might be addressed in future reviews of the course.