

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

Maths - General Mathematics Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Lance Coad

Moderation Leader Email

lance.coad@collegiate.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Lance Coad

Minute Keeper Email

lance.coad@collegiate.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.

Paul Barron Rosny College
Lance Coad St. Michael's Collegiate
Helen Cooke Elizabeth College
Marcus de Puit Calvin Christian School
Ivano del Pio St. Mary's College
Jeremy Dooley Guilford Young College
Kathy Foster Fahan School
Jane Fricker Tasmanian eSchool
Tash Marshall Elizabeth College
Sheenagh Neill Rosny College
Sam Pinkerton Guilford Young College
Tim Price Elizabeth College
John Schuringa Elizabeth College
Ken Stanley Tarooma High School
Rachel Townsend Hobart College
Louise Watson Hutchins
Yvonne Woodward The Friends' School

Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who

Leahanne Reid Claremont College
Mick Verrier Hobart College

did not attend the meeting.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

A

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

Significant convergence of view obtained in blind marking (32 indicated a type of A, 3 indicated B+ in the statewide totals).

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

Not required

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

B

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

There was an early feeling that this paper merited a B rating, based on the statewide marking spread in which 30 indicated a type of B. There were, however, four teachers who indicated a low A and one who favoured a high C. So this paper was considered in small groups. After consideration, each group returned a verdict of B, providing a consensus B.

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

To assign a higher rating here means to assign an A. In brief, the student would need to make fewer errors, and, more particularly, would need to demonstrate that level of skill pointed to in the standards. The student failed to present an algebraic solution when specifically requested in one place, and struggled to comprehensively address the more demanding questions. That said, sufficient knowledge was demonstrated to merit a B.

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

See the above comments.

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

NA

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

that criterion

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

C

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

This sample straddles the t/C boundary. In the blind (pre-meeting) marking, the majority favoured a t rating, but following small group discussions, the consensus moved to C. It was observed that there was perhaps limited scope afforded by the examination questions to support a base level C student to adequately provide evidence of a C rating. It was noted that the last two questions in the examination section were not attempted by this student, which, in terms of marks acquisition is significant, but in terms of demonstrating competence against standards is problematic. How is one to apply a standard to an absence of evidence?

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

One question that arises when looking at applying C standard elements (or any standard elements) is this : how many elements should be satisfied before a standard can be regarded as having been met? If a question set affords a heavily constrained opportunity to demonstrate ability against standards elements, how can a rating be determined? This should not be such an issue when the determination of a rating is made over the course of a year, but it must be a consideration in the context of an external examination.

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

See the above comments. Fair to say, the consensus was C, but there remained considerable sympathy for a t/C borderline determination. It is pleasing to note that the views of those in the meeting were only narrowly spread.

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

One recommendation is to carefully consider the need to anticipate performance ratings when constructing questions. Examination questions ought to afford all students the chance to demonstrate their ability relative to a defined standard.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 6 = Overall

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

B

sample?

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

The groups worked independently to determine ratings and all agreed that a B rating was demonstrated.

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

There was almost no interest in assigning a higher grade than B; the pull was down, not up. So what would need to be seen in order to assign an A? More correct answers, and, in particular, fewer mistakes on the more demanding questions. Closer attention to the requirements of questions, more precise articulation of reasons and correct selection and application of methods would also help.

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

B

Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

The student's attention could be drawn to the art of reading questions, and then cross checking answers against that close reading.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criteria 1 (Communication) and 7 (Trigonometry)

Sharing Resources

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

A series of instructional videos developed by Bruce Stack (Rosny) was promoted. Bruce has kindly offered these videos to anyone in the meeting who appreciate access to them. I will facilitate access to the videos via an email link to Bruce's account storage. The use of the calculator to perform day counts was discussed in circumstances where an investment accrues interest on the number of days. The question to be considered is, do we encourage students to simply apply the day count (with a calculator), and quibble less about whether or not the interest accrues on each of the first and last days of the investment? In the final analysis, the question should be written to be explicitly clear, and it is not expected that a question would

be written with the specific purpose of "catching students out" on the application of one extra day's interest. The use of the TVM mode of a calculator was also discussed in the context of an annuity in arrears. The question of how to apply the negative signs at the data entry stage was asked. There are (at least) two ways of entering data and obtaining a correct solution, but will the examiners be equally happy with either processing method, or is there a preferred method? The feeling of the meeting was that either method would suffice, provided the student makes a correct interpretation. Sam Pinkerton, speaking as a representative of a marking group, suggested that either would suffice, and agreed that a pragmatic approach to marking would be applied.

Course Support

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

1. There is a question over the syllabus supplement. The version several of us have is <Gary Anderson, Curriculum Teacher Leader Mathematics, Version 4 March 2016>. This document does not seem to be generally available. We cannot locate it on the TASC website. It was suggested that it might be on the Year 11/12 site, but it could not be found there, either (and why would materials be spread across two sites?). We ask that it be made available on the TASC site under the section titled "Supporting documents including external assessment material".

2. There was a request to review the Information Sheet (formula sheet). The lack of elaboration of variables in the finance section was particularly noted. Even though a syllabus review is approaching, the meeting requested that the information sheet be revised (minor amendments only) prior to this year's examination.