

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

English – English Writing Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Greta Lucas

Moderation Leader Email

Greta.Lucas@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Adam Shaw

Minute Keeper Email

ashaw@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.

Greta Lucas (EC)
Rosy Davies (EC)
Emily Bullock (Claremont)
Jennifer Miller (GYC)
Anita Manners (GYC)
Shelly O'Reilly (Mackillop)
William Simon (Collegiate)
Angela Fraser (St Mary's)
James McLeod (Hutchins)
Margaret Boyce (HC)
Erin Horthe (Rosny)
Wayne Papper (NW Christian)
Elizabeth Delaney (Rosny)
Kylie Shelley (HC)
Anna Forward (Fahan)
Adam Shaw (Friends)

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

None

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

In small groups at the meeting, the overall marks given for criterion 4 were: C-, C-, C-, C-, C-, C-, C.

The marks recorded and uploaded were a little more varied for the Elements, but consensus was achieved on the overall mark.

- E1 The writer attempts perspective, but doesn't effectively use it. It's the same voice throughout, despite first and third person narrators, and mother and son characters. C-/C. Moderators suggest not alternating perspective unless the student has achieved a certain stylistic confidence. Also suggested that the writer should avoid anachronisms (movies reference in 1915).
- E2 Ideas are there, but not really explored in any depth or sophistication. Ideas, but not themes. The writer needs to develop ideas more over the course of a piece.
- E3 The 'C' descriptor fits this sample well. "Contrived" allows for a broad category for students' work to fall into C. The voice of the nurse, for example, does not align with her age nor her experience. Setting should be more believable and specified. Research could be conducted to improve how setting is conveyed and how characters react and respond in certain situations. Research into WWI necessary.
- E4 C- Exaggeration tends to diminish the style: "Blood cascades down their bodies", "Tears are constantly streaming down her face".
- E5 This was the lowest marked element in this sample, achieving a t/C-. Moderators suggest the student identifies an audience and pitches the piece to them.

Overall rating for C4: C-

General suggestions: In each instance, more reading and/or viewing will help.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

In small groups, the overall marks give for criterion 4 were: A, A-/B+, A-/B+, A, B, B+/A-

- E1 A Good perspective shifts in two of the pieces.
- E2 A
- E3 A- Plausible characters.
- E4 A The piece has a consistent style and voice. Colour and descriptive language effectively used, here and there, in all pieces.
- E5 A

Overall rating for C4: A

General suggestions: Watch for pacing – delivery can be a little plodding and repetitive in parts, which disengages the reader.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

- Northern schools have suggest either C3, or C5 (which assesses the Reflective Statement).
- Southern meeting agreed on C3! Suggesting E2, E3, E5 be the focus.
- After the moderation meeting, the northern moderator contacted the southern moderator and said their meeting had decided upon C5, with a focus on the Reflective Statement (Note: markers will still need to read the whole folio).

Sharing Resources

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

Greta shared a 'Showing, Not Telling' explanation and activities

Course Support

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

Perhaps some professional development where experienced Writing teachers share strategies and possibly resources for certain modules.

Information from Curriculum Services:

Curriculum Services explained their attempts to clarify C1 and C2 last year. No consensus was able to be established from the input received from various schools. Accreditation has been renewed to 2021; required amendments can be considered during this time. Curriculum Services can't see a clear way forward – the course needs to be entirely re-written, the current criteria are dysfunctional. Seven criteria are required (otherwise awards get cut out). Call will be made for participants in the course development process, but 215 and 315 writing courses will need to be prepared alongside one another