

2018 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Technologies - Food Cooking and Nutrition 2
Moderation Leader Name	Marg Sprague
Moderation Leader Email	marg.sprague@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Belinda Straatsma
Minute Keeper Email	bstraatsma@calvin.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.	Belinda Straatsma Chris EDWARDS Dana Gerke Alexandra Rodrick Fiona Harris Marg Sprague Rosemary Dwyer Mary Young
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Nil

meeting.

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, Element 2
Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 2

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

Cr 2, element 2 - A. Cr 4, element 2 - A ** We were unsure about the C- assigned and wondered if it was a mistake.

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

Crit 2, element 2:
Succinct construction and organisation of check-list terms.
Extensive use of relevant course-specific terms.
Crit 4, element 2:
Sample 1 provided in depth explanation of essential hygiene principles.

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

'A' ratings for both criteria were assigned as assessment to this task.

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

All members of the group agreed on the above ratings

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

1. Make sure students realised that there were two tasks (some students missed this). This could be highlighted on the task sheet.
2. Advise student to create a checklist of hierarchical nature - according to importance of each checklist point.

ratings)?

E.g. No.1-the most important safety item then No.2-the second most important item

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 2 = All elements, Element 2
Crit 4 = All elements, Element 2

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

Crit 2 - B Crit 4-B

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

Criterion 2, element 2: Meeting agreed on 'B' rating.

*Checklist was a little random; less items to tick, although the student had made use of course specific terms.

Criterion 4, element 2: Group again agreed on a straightforward 'B'.

*Organisation of points could have been improved

*Not an extensive justification and examples not evident

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

*Better organisation of points

*More sophisticated use of terminology & course specific language.

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

'As above'

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

Explain to students how to organise information into a checklist i.e. categorise

ratings)?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Crit 2 = All elements, Element 2
Crit 4 = All elements, Element 2

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

Criterion 2, element 2 - B-/C+ Criterion 4, element 2 - B-/C+

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

Criterion 2: The student certainly has displayed course knowledge but was not always correct in terminology.

Criterion 4: Did the student identify or describe? Much discussion took place hence the split rating of B-/C+

*Student was required to explain one point from each category but explained eight. This sample provided evidence of good examples and also weaker examples.

*Student clearly did not read the question correctly or simply aimed to maximise their chances of receiving a higher rating.

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

Crit 2 element 2: Create a more organised checklist using more sophisticated terminology & course specific terms.

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

'As above'

Sample 3- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain

Read through task sheet with students, outlining requirements

a higher rating (or ratings)?

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 2 = All elements, Element 2
 Crit 4 = All elements, Element 2

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

Criterion 2: C Criterion 4: C

Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Criterion 2, element 2: We decided this sample was definitely not a T.
 It is literate, it shows that understanding is basic which we felt definitely equated to a 'C'.
 The student organised their information, they used their terminology. It is a C. They have just done the bare minimum.
 Cr 4, element 2: The student has completed the task, identified what was required but again has done the bare minimum.

Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

More description required

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

'As above'

Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help

Scaffold the task more
 **The meeting all agreed that the Moderation task was excellent for the purpose of moderation.

the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

All participants appreciated its clarity and tight guidelines ensuring students couldn't get off track.

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply

Level 1 or 2

For Level 1 or 2 courses please nominate the criteria for moderation.

Criterion 8 Element 4

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

determined by Michelle Summers

Email

michelle.summers@education.tas.gov.au

Sharing Resources

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

Discussion took place particularly around assessment tasks relating to Criterion 8.

IT resources & new apps suited to this course were shared plus a desire to share more resources in order to work smarter.

Course Support

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

This was not discussed at any length.

All participants found the meeting both valuable and enjoyable. A great sense of collegiality.

course: