

**Form Name:** Years 11&12 March Moderation 2018 - Report

**Submission Time:** March 13, 2018 2:35 pm

## Meeting Details

**Meeting Venue:**

South

**AM or PM session?**

PM

**Which Learning Area is this Report for?**

Science

**Which PM Meeting is this report for?**

Sciences - Physics Level 4

**Moderation Leader Name**

Paul van Tienen

**Moderation Leader Email**

pvantienen@friends.tas.edu.au

**Minute Keeper (if available)**

Matt Wilson

**Minute Keeper Email**

matt.wilson1@education.tas.gov.au

## Attendance

**Please enter the Name, school and email address for all attendees - you should be able to copy and paste this from the Attendance list you were sent - removing anyone who didn't attend and adding**

Greg Timms  
Ben Hendriks  
Paul van Tienen  
Peter Smythe  
Chris Bracken  
Julie Fryer  
Matt Wilson  
Yohann D'Souza  
Orion Hedges  
Brendon Gourlay (Stand in present)  
Andrew Jones

<b>anyone who was extra on the day</b>	James Seddon
<b>Extras - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone extra who wasn't on your attendance list:</b>	none
<b>Apologies/absences - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone on your attendance list who did not attend</b>	none

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

<b>Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against</b>	C3 C4
<b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b>	C3 - C , C4 - C
<b>What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given</b>	<p>C3:</p> <p>No in-text referencing. (E3,4)</p> <p>No broader research - beyond source article. (E1)</p> <p>Some evidence of reliability of sources. (E1)</p> <p>C4:</p> <p>Stated an opinion, with context. (E2, E3)</p>

	No demonstration of understanding of negative consequences - analysis is superficial. (E4)
<b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b>	<p>C3: More differentiation between the student's work and the content of the source articles.</p> <p>C4: More tension between positive and negative consequences, leading to a conclusion.</p> <p>*Noted that a key element of the assessment (the presentation) is not here for marking.</p>
<b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b>	Re-vamp the assessment description to allow more room for discussion and create more emphasis on discussion and analysis.

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

<b>Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against</b>	C3 C4
<b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b>	C3 - B, C4 - B
<b>What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given</b>	<p>C3:</p> <p>No in-text referencing. (E3, E4)</p> <p>Reliability of sources was addressed in some detail. (E1)</p> <p>Bibliography was detailed. (E5)</p> <p>C4:</p>

Reasonable detail and analysis against elements E1, E2, E3.

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

C3: In-text referencing is a must.

C4: More detail and balance required against E4, E5.

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

See note for Sample 1.

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

**Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against**

C3  
C4

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

C3 - C, C4 - C

**What evidence supports the rating(s) the group has given**

C3:

In-text referencing. (E3, E4)

Evaluation of resources is present. (E1)

Minimal breadth of resources. (E1)

Difficult to separate student's work from article content. (E3)

C4:

<p><b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p>	<p>Opinion/discussion merges with article content.</p> <p>C3: Better referencing and more structure.</p> <p>C4: More detail and analysis in the discussion.</p>
<p><b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p>	<p>See Sample 1.</p>

### Summary of any further samples moderated

<p><b>Further samples - Criteria assessed against</b></p>	<p>C3 C4</p>
<p><b>What ratings have the group assigned this/these Sample(s)?</b></p>	<p>C3 - B, C4 - B</p>
<p><b>What evidence supports the ratings the group has given</b></p>	<p>C3:</p> <p>Quotations helped with differentiation. (E3)</p> <p>Referencing had reasonable depth. (E1)</p> <p>Credibility of articles was well addressed. (E1)</p> <p>C4:</p> <p>Huge use of quotations undermines analysis and discussion of physics content. (E1)</p> <p>Impacts on society are reasonably well discussed. (E3)</p> <p>Benefits are broadly considered. (E4)</p>

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

C3: Need to reference quotations properly - especially when significant.

C4: More discussion of negative consequences should be included. Conclusion needs to be based on evidence.

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

See Sample 1.

## Planning for September Moderation 2018

**Are you planning on:**

Small number of same samples for all teachers statewide to assess in advance of the meeting - with the expectation that all teachers bring further work for conferencing

**Please list the criteria to be moderated:**

C4

**Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:**

Discussion about the possibility of the course going to 5 examinable criteria. Should this guide our chosen criteria?

Science in society task: Space Junk

**Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for the September moderation**

Paul van Tienen

**Email**

pvantienen@friends.tas.edu.au

## Sharing Resources

## Course Support

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

Early consultation about the possible shift to 5 external criteria.

## Annotated Exemplars

**Which of the samples you have looked at today along with your meeting notes might be suitable to develop further into an annotated exemplar?**

Other: none

**Any comments:**

The task wasn't suitable as a robust assessment against C3 or C4