

# 2019 March Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Modern History Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Nevenko (Nev) Bartulin

Moderation Leader Email

NBartulin@gyc.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Jenny Jones

Minute Keeper Email

jenny.jones@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.

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

Nevenko Bartulin Guilford Young College  
Sophie Gibson Elizabeth College  
Gillian Goldsworthy St Mary's College  
Jane Heazlewood The Hutchins School  
Jenny Jones St Michael's Collegiate School  
Sally Polanowski Rosny College  
Felicity Leonard Hobart College

Kelly Allen  
David Barber  
Matthew Sayers  
John McLaine

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 4 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 5  
Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 7

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

C4: C-                      C7: t+

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

Needed to be much more specific in analysing the different schools of thought. A question was raised as to whether Ian Kershaw should be quoted as an historian to do with terrorism. The response lacked depth, detail and was unfinished. No identification of different historians; didn't examine relative merit.

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

A wider range of historical evidence (e.g. discussion of different terrorist groups) needs to be used. Explicit analysis of differing historiographical interpretations (mentioning one historian - who may not even be applicable in this case - is clearly not enough).

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

Historians and the merits of their interpretations need to be discussed/analysed in detail (element of criteria 7: 'analyses and evaluates relative merits of differing historical interpretations and representations).

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

Encourage students to view/study the rubric and the standards/elaborations in greater detail.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 4 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 5  
Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 7

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

C4: A-      C7: A-

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

Very good use of evidence. In terms of C7, the paper needed more analysis of the bias of some commentators, eg, where are they from? There was also a fair degree of insightful/nuanced discussion of the differing interpretations of commentators.

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

A little more on identifying nationality/world view of the commentator as this might affect the commentary. More context needed in analysis of terrorist groups.

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

The meeting acknowledged that responding to the terrorism question is much harder to work on for C7; there are very few historians and/or commentators (in comparison with the Cold War). Student opinion needs to carry the essay.

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

To read more widely on the subject of terrorism (including political scientists and any new historiography on the subject).

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 4 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 5  
Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 7

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

C4: B      C7: B

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

No analysis of relative merit. More of a chronology of the Cold War without focus on the question "beginning and end of the Cold War". Good amount of evidence. Identified the different schools of thought. Doesn't give detailed context of different historians.

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

The student would need to fully address the question and provide a more in-depth analysis. The essay needs to be a little less descriptive (i.e. simply providing facts and describing events/chronology).

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

Again, students need to focus on evaluating the relative merits of differing historiographical interpretations (element 7 of C7).

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

More direct instruction and discussion of the viewpoints and biases of the differing historiographical schools (looking at the origin and context/time periods of the schools in more detail).

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 4 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 5  
Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 7

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

C4: C+    C7: B-

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

Superficial discussion of information; doesn't provide the context of each school. Solid but doesn't provide sufficient evidence and/or examples. Doesn't give historical information in support of arguments. Some analysis pushes C7 to the low B range. Weak on post-revisionism. Somewhat over simplistic on occasions.

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

The historical evidence needs to be more extensive, detailed and specific/precise (i.e. referring to more events and historical processes).

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

Providing the context of the time in which the historiography was dominant is very important in this section.

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

Showing the student - through a model essay - the best way to interweave the events of the Cold War (i.e. historical evidence) into an essay that needs to focus on an analysis of the differing historiographical schools/interpretations.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

C3 and C5 (Modern History)

State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation.

Nev Bartulin

Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation

NBartulin@gyc.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.

Teachers of Germany discussed various strategies and approaches (e.g. the use of relevant web/media resources), especially when it came to incorporating/analysing the question of social changes (particularly in relation to the Weimar Republic).

Course Support

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

PL to be organized for teachers with UTAS lecturer particularly to do with the Cold War (Gavin Daly).

- Issues to do with marking were raised. Students who went in with high marks and obvious EA students were dropped consistently with teachers around the table.
- What can be done to address this?
- Issue to do with C7 being an historiography essay as opposed to a chronology of the Cold War Russia dates are problematic. The current dates are not logical due to the overlap of Stalin's regime in both sections. This is highly problematic for student learning. The current dates are: 1917-1941 Revolution, Lenin, Stalin to Operation Barbarossa 1941-1953 Operation Barbarossa to death of Stalin The meeting requested they be change to the more logical: 1917-1929 Revolution and Lenin 1929-1953 Stalin