

# 2018 September 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	John Williamson
Moderation Leader Email	williamsonj@fahan.tas.edu.au
Minute Keeper	Sue Newitt
Minute Keeper Email	snewitt@calvin.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.	Sue Newitt Graeme Oddie Kate Peacock John Williamson Peter Jones Nevenko Bartulin Felicity Leonard Sally Polanowski Gillian Goldsworthy Jenny Jones Jane Heazlewood
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who	Sophie Gibson Elizabeth College John Dalco Hobart College

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 1

Please list the criteria (and elements if specified) being moderated for this sample

Criterion 3  
Criterion 4  
Criterion 6

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

This sample represented a borderline at B+/A- on several of the criteria and thus presents us with an opportunity to fine tune those

Criterion 3 - agreement generally that this was well written and in the B+/A-. Discussion focused on the clear and logical structure of the essay (elements 1 and 2), the coherence of the argument (element 3) and the way the student was able to use the appropriate grammar, spelling and punctuation (element 4) as well as a range of appropriate sources (element 5)

Criterion 4 - agreement that again the sample represented an A-/B+. Discussion focused on the fact that while there was a wide range of detailed evidence used to support the argument (element 2) it was not consistently analysed or evaluated (element 3)

Criterion 6 - agreement that this sample was in the A range. It analysed and evaluated the threats both internal and external (elements 1 and 2) and attempted, reasonably successfully, to show how the system of government affected the way in which it responded to the threats (element 3). On balance the meeting agreed that it was an A-.

## 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  
 Criterion 4 = Overall  
 Criterion 6 = Overall

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

C3 - B+; C4 - A-; C6 - A-

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

The sample was well constructed and clearly expressed and the argument was cohesive (criterion 3); the sample was endowed with a high level of evidence although this was not consistently weighted and analysed; the sample was advanced in its discussion of the internal and external threats as it did try to analyse and evaluate them.

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

On Criterion 4 we would like to see the development of element 3 so that there was a more consistent analysis and interpretation of the evidence.

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

C3 - A-  
 C4 - B+  
 C6 - A-

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

The important issue is that teachers should encourage student to consistently analyse and evaluate events, actions of individuals, groups and governments so that throughout the response there is a fluency to the answer at a high level.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each

Crit 3 = All elements  
 Crit 4 = All elements

<p>critterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion</p>	<p>Crit 6 = All elements</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?</p>	<p>C3 - B-; C4 - C+; C6 - C</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?</p>	<p>The information presented in the sample was tied to the question asked nor did it attempt to weigh up or analyse the events or actions. Thus it was assessed at the C range on Criteria 4 and 6. For Criterion 3 there were moments when the expression was clear and logical but it too often lacked coherence and structure thus bringing it down to a B-.</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>This sample was filled with information but it was a list only. It needed to be more closely connected to the question asked and it needed to weigh up the importance of the internal and external threats.</p>
<p>Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments</p>	<p>C3 - B- C4 - C+ C6 - C</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>It is important for teachers and students to understand that simply listing events and dates does not automatically create and answer! This sample showed a high level of knowledge but with not sufficient connection to the question, nor did it attempt to analyse the events or evidence.</p>

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

<p>Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within</p>	<p>Crit 3 = All elements Crit 4 = All elements Crit 6 = All elements</p>
--	--

that criterion

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

C3 - B; C4 - B; C6 - B

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

The written expression (Criterion 3) was clear and logical but looked a bit rushed towards the end and was, from time to time, lacking in coherence. Regarding the evidence presented in the sample (criterion 4) it was thorough and showed a good range of detail but not always well selected - hence it too was assessed as a B. The B assessment for Criterion 6 also indicates that sample was competent in terms of describing and assessing the threats although it seldom attempted much serious evaluation of the events and actions.

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

For this sample to have rated more highly it would have to have shown a much greater level of analysis and evaluation (criteria 4 and 6) and a greater degree of coherence (criterion 3).

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

This student had obviously prepared well and was able to write about the issues competently. the next step would be for the teacher to encourage a more thorough and serious weighing up and assessment of the various events, actions and threats.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Crit 7 = All elements

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

C7 - B+

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

This sample does begin to seriously assess the interpretations in terms of their context and nationality but does not always evaluate the reliability and validity of those interpretations.

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

Some more consistent analysis and evaluation of the interpretations, especially in terms of their reliability and validity.

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

C7 - a good B but not quite consistent enough for A

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

Clearly this is a good student who should be encouraged to balance their discussion of events and interpretations and who could be expected to do better on this criterion with guidance about how to manage the assessment

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 5

Sample 5 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 7 = All elements

Sample 5 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C7 - B-

Sample 5 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

This sample does not really do much more than "describe" the various interpretations.

Sample 5 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Some serious analysis and evaluation of the interpretations, especially in contextualising the interpretation in terms of when it was written and the nationality of the historian.

Sample 5 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

It is at B level but not consistently doing much more than a description of the interpretations and occasionally really only identifying. so, on balance a B- is right.

Sample 5 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

More thorough description and analysis/evaluation of the interpretations in terms of their context and validity.

## Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 6

Sample 6 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Crit 7 = All elements

Sample 6 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C7 - A-

Sample 6 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

This sample has contextualised the interpretations and has frequently used the terms "this provides evidence for an orthodox interpretation". This sample shows evidence of good analysis of sources and historical opinions although there were a couple minor lapses which took the mark to an A-.

Sample 6 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Although this was a high level response on criterion 7, the meeting would have liked a little more consistency considering that this was a research task rather than an in-class test essay.

ratings)?

Sample 6 -  
Summary of  
group consensus  
at element level  
with comments

A- is right because it is at a high level on elements 1, 2 and 4 but with a few moments of lacking the focus that is required for a straight A

Sample 6 - What  
actions would you  
recommend for  
teachers to help  
the student attain  
a higher rating (or  
ratings)?

-

## 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.

Cr 4 & 7 for Section C (3 samples)

Cr 5 for Section A (3 samples)

Samples taken from 2018 end of yr exam

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

CTL

Email

wendy.frost@education.tas.gov.au

## Sharing Resources

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

Cold War Films - 'Bridge of Spies', '13 Days', 'Berlin Wall'  
Terrorism films - 'Baader-Meinhof', the British Propaganda  
films, 'Rendition', 'Syriana', 'The Eye in the Sky', 'Terror in  
Mumbai'



---

## Course Support

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

N/A