

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Legal Studies Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Rosalie Kinstler

Moderation Leader Email

rosalie.kinstler@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

David Westmore

Minute Keeper Email

david.westmore@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.

Peter Appleton Friends' School
Adam Grover The Hutchins School
Susan Hawkins Claremont College
Ella Kearney Elizabeth College
Rosalie Kinstler Hobart College
Susan Oakden Elizabeth College
Bob Pill Rosny College
Michelle Quayle Guilford Young College
David Webster Rosny College
David Westmore Rosny College

Nil

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

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

A-/B+ was the consensus

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

high level of evidence from 3 cases cited and used to support evaluation

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

IF the response had evaluated the features earlier in the piece that would have helped

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

discussion about the crossover of elements 1 & 2 in that effectiveness is the same as strengths and weaknesses. element 2 is redundant

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

also discussion re impartial adjudicator being interpreted as both judge and jury but being mentioned separately in syllabus. Question in exam said "adjudicators" so could include jury but it needs clarification. Recommendation is that syllabus should have role of the judge inserted in brackets after impartial adjudicator to make it clear. OR setting examiner should be directed to use the language "role of the judge" in future questions.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

that criterion

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?

Clear strengths and weaknesses were articulated but there was no supporting evidence which put it at the bottom end of the B range

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

Cases and other evidence supporting the arguments put forward

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

N/A

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

Provide more evidence to support analysis so that it becomes evaluation (substantiated judgement)

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 3 = Overall, Element 3

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

C/C+

Sample 3 - What evidence supports

clear identification and description of the processes. No examples

the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

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

Need to analyse effectiveness and provide evidence for the higher grades

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

as above

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 4 = Overall, Element 3

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

t+ consensus

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

very little accurate information. No examples

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

accurate identification and description of processes to pass

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

N/A

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

as above

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criterion 1 , element 2
Russell Cooper to provide samples

Sharing Resources

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

No time as discussion was on exam and further moderation

Course Support

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

See previous comments re Criterion 3 standards and clarification of impartial adjudicator