

2018 September 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

Simon Bennett

Moderation Leader Email

simon.bennett@collegiate.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Lyn Tunbridge

Minute Keeper Email

ltunbrid@friends.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.

Simon Bennett - Collegiate
David Westmore - Rosny
Sue Hawkins - Claremont
Lyn Tunbridge - Friends
Adam Croser - GYC
Michelle Quayle - GYC
Sam Cure - Oatlands
Ella Kearney - EC
Avril Cowarn - New Norfolk High
Lisa Seddon - Hobart

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

Rosalie Kinstler - apology

did not attend the meeting.

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 3

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

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

1 x C+, then B+ to A

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

A-/A

Answer could have been stronger on strengths and limitations. Reduce example and more weight to strengths and limitations. Time constraint must be taken into account.

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

A-/A given done under exam conditions.

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

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

nearly all a B

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

N/A

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

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

Greatest spread in marking - currently C- to B

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

Greatest spread in marking - currently C- to B

Evidence to support C+

Assessing, not analysing (required in SE). Lack of depth/explanation, limited range of concepts and use of relevant language (eg ratio, obiter, distinguishing etc). Example is not used effectively. Lack of detail for 20 minutes. A lack of clarity in expression has obscured

meaning.
Consensus now C+.

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

Develop points in more depth, make use of cases when analysing eg Mabo.

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

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

C-. t+ (in addition, 1 x C+)

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

C-/C
Reasonable differentiation of binding/persuasive precedent. Used some key terms. Did not address all elements of the question. Lack of examples and depth.

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

Use of examples and greater depth of discussion. More deliberate in addressing the question.

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

C-

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.

Criterion 3

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

Lyn Tunbridge

Email

ltunbrid@friends.tas.edu.au

Sharing Resources

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

Case decided in Full Court of Supreme Court early September on compensation not paid to a partner for anxiety/depression as a result abuse - Lyn to forward.

Course Support

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

March Moderation

Moderation will be based on a range of samples across a range of ratings provided by TASC from this year's examination.

The moderator will liaise with the Chief Marking Examiner, Curriculum Services and/or TASC in the new year, as soon as discrepancies between internal and external ratings and will decide upon a question and criteria to moderate based on this, as well as the Chief Marking Examiners feedback about the most problematic questions and criteria from the examination.

In the event that information from TASC or feedback

from the Chief Marking Examiner is either inconclusive or unavailable by the time generation of samples is required then, moderation shall involve Criterion 3, given it is the first time adversary/ADR system has been assessed over 30 minutes.

Given 2019 will be the first year for quite some time that exam specs will be consistent with the previous year.

May depend on consensus with north of the state.