

# 2018 September 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](mailto:lance.coad@collegiate.tas.edu.au)

Minute Keeper

John Schuringa

Minute Keeper Email

[john.schuringa@education.tas.gov.au](mailto:john.schuringa@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.

Stephen	Bray
Lance	Coad
Helen	Cooke
Marcus	de Puit
Ivano	Del Pio
Jeremy	Dooley
Silvia	Escobar
Geoff	Gaskell
Brendon	Herron
Cameron	Hudson
Jason	McDonald
Samantha	Pinkerton
Thaddeus	Rose
John	Schuringa
Bruce	Stack
Rachel	Townsend
Jon	Williams
Yvonne	Woodward

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

Greg Timms  
Tim Price

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

4

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

We had three samples to consider and time to consider all three. Pre-meeting submissions for this sample were mostly C to t ratings, with the majority within the C range.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each

Criterion 4 = Overall

critterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

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

C

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

It was observed that the test covered C level elements, and that performance on this sample predominantly satisfied C rating standards (elements 3, 4, & 7 were noted). There was a sense that the standards were not comprehensively met, however:

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

More correct answers to questions addressing B and A standard ratings.  
Fewer errors.  
Some questions were left unanswered (including questions that addressed C rating standards).  
One group questioned the level of literacy of the student.

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

Group ratings were C, C, C, C-, C-, with consensus pitched at C.

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

The first requirement is to shore up (consolidate) a C rating. This student might require more opportunity to make a convincing case that a C is warranted as a final rating. Assessment could be pitched at a C rating standard, rather than a generic C-A set of questions, to avoid distractor effects and to minimise time-related assessment constraints.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Crit 4 = All elements

elements within that criterion

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

B+/A

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

Two groups preferred A; Two groups B; one group B+. Consensus was that this paper straddled the requirements of low A, high B.

Comments in support of A:

"Enough evidence for standards 3, 4, 5";

"Meets all elements' requirements at A rating that are in this test."

Comments in support of B+

"Too many plotting questions [on the assessment task]; small mistakes (e.g. 3 dp instead of 2dp); rounding; need interpretation of data to improve for an A."

Comments in support of B:

"This student in element 5 did not meet the standard; weakness in numeracy in Q1b, Q3a; overall at B standard element."

"Good understanding of the content but have difficulty with the details - namely interpretation of scatterplots, residuals, gradient and describing trends."

"From standards: didn't find association explicitly, but implied (B-/C); one scatterplot missing (b); models residuals and interprets (A); extrapolated correctly and explained (A); got gradient and missed interpretation (B); time-scale plot was good and trend understood (B+); deseasonalise time series and fit model (A)."

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

There was a sense that this sample demonstrated something close to an A, but that, considered holistically, did not necessarily merit that rating. The notion of a holistic rating is not necessarily consonant with element-focused assessment, however, unless there is an element which requires a holistic judgement - and there is not; and yet, for experienced teachers, this overall "sense" of the merit of a paper is a virtue not lightly to be dismissed. Indeed, the challenge is to articulate and understand the capacity to interpret the relative merit of a paper.

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

On that, by the way, there was a note in the meeting to the effect that this paper "felt" better than the other samples, but it was difficult to say how.

Note: any determination that the articulation of the elements in the standards has more merit, or is clearer, or is more readily applied in practice, than the judgement of an experienced practitioner is contestable.

See above.

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

Interpretation of data to be improved eg. gradient, residuals, patterns, trends etc.

In comparison to sample 3 sample 2 demonstrates a substantially greater knowledge and understanding of bivariate data.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Crit 4 = All elements

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

B

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

There was consensus that this paper met the standards for B. Among the five groups, three identified it as a B, two as a B-.

**Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in**

More attention to (correct) interpretation. Fewer errors or omissions, particularly on those questions that afforded

order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

A standard ratings against elements.

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 a higher rating (or ratings)?

Difficult to say, of course: who knows, but the student might be achieving at her limit of ability. the students needs to know what is required to earn an A, and to understand the significance of the difference.

### 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.

C6 - Finance from 2018 external paper

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

Joshua Moore

Email

joshua.moore@education.tas.gov.au

### Sharing Resources

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

There was discussion on the tension between setting assessment tasks to demonstrate knowledge versus tasks designed to familiarise students with the examination structure. It was asked whether the examination constraints (36 minutes per criterion, one criterion per section) lend themselves to a substantial determination of the relative merits of a student's work. Several teachers noted that they quite deliberately use a structure different

were discussed.

to the examination when making internal assessments.

## Course Support

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

One question that relates to assessment (external) was raised:

Thinking particularly of students who are searching for a C rating, who perhaps do not have strong literacy skills, can each section in the examination commence with a selection of questions that relate to elements pitched at the C-rating standard? that is, a selection of questions with minimal literacy requirements that afford a student the opportunity to demonstrate those rudimentary mathematical skills required for a C-rating without being embedded within a more extended structure, albeit scaffolded?