

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

Science - Environmental Science Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Nicola Anderson

Moderation Leader Email

nanderson@friends.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Lynn Jarvis

Minute Keeper Email

lynn.jarvis1@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.

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

Warwick Butler
Ian Riley
Micaela Guest
Mathew Derrick
Lynn Jarvis
Nicola Anderson

Marty Goss

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 2 = Overall
 Criterion 3 = Overall
 Criterion 4 = Overall

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

criterion 2 - C to high Cs for both C2 and C3, C4 low C to C-

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

Areas to improve - direction to the hypothesis, better variables are needed, Mundy Scale was created by student perhaps that should have been noted somewhere (future researchers need to know this), variety of resources could have been greater, no tabulation of data in the report compared to the appendix. Mentions the issue very slightly, but not tied to their results.

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

Explanations and in-depth analysis of the issue of plastic waste and biodegradability.

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

All elements considered but only some applied to this (and each) case study - this results in the discrepancy in the marking.

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

Students to nominate the criterion that will be assessed before they submit their case study. this means that they need to look at the criteria and understand the standards

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 2 = Overall
 Criterion 3 = Overall
 Criterion 4 = Overall

that criterion

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

C2 = B; C3 = B; C4 = B-/C+

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

Crafted the design of a box to measure data and make it controllable, the design of the case study considered the impacts of the erosion in his backyard, the anecdotal evidence about the stopping areas was eroded and compacted pushed this into a B from a C.

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

No ethics included, risk assessment, hypothesis quite weak, no control mentioned, no analysis of the method C2, the data analysis was there but it was not critically analysed so did not get to an A grade. Limitations would have strengthened his analysis and gained the A grade. Raw data not included, should have been in the appendices. Justification of the student's methodology and mention of improvements for future should have been included. Method was written as a recipe - not acceptable. C4 - need to pull the impacts that were mentioned in the introduction into the discussion / conclusion - relate back to the end of the report so it all ties together.

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

All elements considered but only some applied to this (and each) case study - this results in the discrepancy in the marking.

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

Emphasis the need to critically analyse and evaluate his experimental method. Start the students to think about a real world issue, and then go from there, in terms of scientific design.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 2 = Overall
Criterion 3 = Overall
Criterion 4 = Overall

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

C2 = A-/B+ C3 = B+ C4 = no consensus reached as the issue was abiotic/biotic not human impact; C4 issue required for this moderation task but in reality not applicable to this case study.

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

C2 = No direction in the hypothesis, method was confusing as to difficult to interpret, no justification for the use of the sub-sampler.

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

One comment 'seemed to be two studies done but combined and could have been more narrowed down'.

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

All elements considered but only some applied to this (and each) case study - this results in the discrepancy in the marking.

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

From the curriculum document "particular emphasis on the criteria not included in the external assessment (Criteria 1, 3, and 4)." means that the group would like confirmation that C4 is not essential for the case study.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Sample questions that are new in C7 making sure that the new topics, virtual water and enteric bacteria are included, written and shared. Possibly used as mid-year exams or test questions, to be cross marked for moderation in Sept. Elements will be included in the standards for cross marking/assessment.

Sharing Resources

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

Ian - emailed a task about migration task – food webs and energy changing over time. C5 and C6 Changes over time. Lots of discussion about improving case study; getting students to self-nominate the criteria for assessment before the case study is submitted.

Course Support

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

Elements need to be specific to the assessment task and pre-selected before moderation. Some elements and criteria should have been 'not assessed' in this moderation task.