

# 2019 March Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	Mixed - Student Directed Inquiry Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Stephen Barratt
Moderation Leader Email	sbarratt@friends.tas.edu.au
Minute Keeper	Steve Barratt
Minute Keeper Email	sbarratt@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.

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

Liz McDermott – Sorell School  
Stephen Barratt – The Friends School

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

Criterion 1 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5, Element 6, Element 7, Element 8

**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?**

Element numbers below with comment to justify rating  
 1 - B Whilst we questioned the wording of the inquiry question, we felt the idea was substantial in scope, allowed for an objective stance and transdisciplinary inquiry  
 2 - C We felt that although the elements were present, some were not detailed or clearly articulate. Notably 'complex concepts and problem solving' and  
 3 - C Range of perspectives clear in ethical considerations. Alluded to getting more perspectives (i.e teachers/primary students), though unsure if this was followed through. Our perception was that due to the lack of research methodology, it is hard to be beyond 'limited'  
 4 - B ICT skills are evident throughout with photography, travel guide creation. New learning made limited reference to new skills developed and how these enhanced the inquiry.  
 5 - C Inquiry question not explicitly addressed in new learnings  
 6 - C Conclusions not clearly stated in reference back to the Inquiry Question. We recognise that this might have occurred in final presentation/journal  
 7 - C Transdisciplinary nature of inquiry evident (in product/tasks undertaken) but not explicit in proposal and/or reflection  
 8 - C Own knowledge and skills evident, though too generic and not specific enough. For example which historical source analysis tool was used, how did new learning about ecology inform the final product.

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

- A clear set of logical conclusions explicitly referring back to the research question
- Explicitly explaining the transdisciplinary nature of the inquiry
- Clearly established and enacted research methodology, with a wider range of bibliographic sources

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

Our consensus was that based on the evidence presented, 6 of 8 elements were given a C and 2 a B - as explained above. Overall rating of a C was given.

**Sample 1 - What actions would you**

- Explicit expectation of qualitative and quantitative research methodology, to ensure a wider range of perspectives

**recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?**

- In new learnings guidance given around how to effectively and explicitly address whether the student has been successful in addressing the inquiry question  
 - Ensure that the transdisciplinary nature of the inquiry is clearly outlined and described

**Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples**

**For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.**  
**State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation.**  
**Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation**

TBC

Carmen Rowbotham will contact Curriculum Services (Janine Bowes) to coordinate

carmen.robotham@stpatricks.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.**

We discussed different brainstorming approaches to help students decide on their topic and focus. Link below:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IZRmSRtyWCFi3Xd66KtEADRljbInlwI8lStmzOzn5RQ/edit?usp=sharing>  
 We also shared a broad sequence of development throughout the whole year, looking at assessment schedules.

**Course Support**

**Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to**

There was support for a student/teacher statewide SDI event mid Term 1 in 2020. In discussion with the northern counterpart, we would need to carefully design the day, with an emphasis on past students sharing experiences/advice, as well as possible external experts (for instance UTAS re: research methodologies). We would need to be careful around students maintaining their unique ideas/interests, as opposed to developing common ideas (because they are seen to work/score well).

**consider in  
relation to this  
course:**

Participants at the southern meeting noted that their ratings, on the basis of the evidence in the work sample, were consistently at the low end of all of the state-wide ratings. This was discussed with the northern moderation leader, and reasons explored. Given the small teacher cohort size for the subject, it was agreed that future meetings should ideally be held as a combined group so that all benefit from the discussion.