

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

Submission Time: March 22, 2018 10:42 am

Meeting Details

Meeting Venue:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which Learning Area is this Report for?	Humanities and Social Sciences (HASS)
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	HASS - Philosophy Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Lachlan Valentine
Moderation Leader Email	lachlan.hine@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper (if available)	John Williamson
Minute Keeper Email	williamsonj@fahan.tas.edu.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

Ben Felstead
John Williamson
Lachlan Valentine
Elizabeth Hamilton
Louise Bender

anyone who was extra on the day

Extras - please enter the names and schools (and email addresses if you have them) of anyone extra who wasn't on your attendance list:

Louise Bender

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

Patrick Berechree

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against

C1
C2
C4

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

C1 B- C2 B+ C4 B

What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given

Group consensus on C1/B-; C2/B+; C4/B because despite the fact that the northern meeting pursued Cs (in a similar way to the exam markers) we thought it was better understood and much more sophisticated than its original marks might suggest and offered a good structure and through-lines of logic.

C1.1 The response exhibited structure of ideas relevant to the question in a coherent, though not always proficient, manner. The language of the response at times inhibited the flow of the essay, and was likely the

reason for its harsh marking in the exam last year.

C1.2 The response communicated an understanding of a wide and relevant range of philosophical ideas and arguments, but did not always draw out and make appropriately apparent the significance of these, which emerged only after a few readings as implied and insightful.

C2.2 The response effectively employed a wide range of terms, but did not always clarify their meaning or significance for their own philosophical discussion.

C2.4 The response included many relevant explanations and concepts for the question of Dualism, but these were lacking in detail for an A range rating.

C4.1 Whilst the student used a wide range of evidence, critical evaluation on this basis was not forthcoming.

C4.3 The response included reference to specific thought experiments and examples from philosophers' arguments, such as Nagel's bat, Jackson's Mary & the Black and White Room, and Dennett's contention regarding the subjective sensation of tasting coffee. Nevertheless, these were not effectively synthesised in support of their own interpretation of Dualism and qualia.

C2.2

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

See above

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

The meeting strongly felt that this sample was harshly marked last year, and that the subtlety of its understanding was overlooked due to the manner in which it was expressed, and the pressure on markers of completing marking on time. For the student to attain a higher (and just) rating, further cross-marking and consultation during the exam marking process must be facilitated. We feel that this could be achieved by further

initial cross-marking of each section of the exam, which would require an additional day of marking. Indeed, as we are in the first year of implementing the new course, with altered criteria, only recently published and newly refined exam specifications, and new content, it is the professional opinion and urgent recommendation of the meeting that the teachers of the new curriculum are given greater opportunity to engage with one another in a state-wide meeting to more effectively and equitably deliver and assess the subject.

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against

C1
C2
C4

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

C1 B+ C2 B+ C4 B+

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

Group consensus - although more discussion on this - because this essay, despite its heroic, academic tone, was not particularly well synthesised, nor was it as comprehensive as the A rating required.

C1.1 The response exhibits academic confidence, flows with an assured voice, and appears, at least initially, to be logically and progressively structured to address the question and communicate a mastery of the material. However, on closer inspection (which such a forum allows) it became apparent that much of what was promised by the piece was unfulfilled in practice.

C1.2 The essay appears to present a comprehensive range of ideas, however, these are less relevant to the question than the writer assures us.

C2.2 The response exhibited an assured and accurate

understanding of the philosophical concepts at hand, but these were not always relevant and supported a discussion that did not directly address the question.

C2.4 Once more, there seemed to be a wide range, but these were often lacking in substantial detail and did not support an appropriate engagement with the question addressed.

C4.1 The response engages with a wide range of philosophical ideas relevant to the unit, however, seems determined to make these fit a question that is ultimately not addressed, nor can it then be critically analysed.

C4.3 The response seems to synthesise a wide range of philosophical evidence, but ultimately is too shallow for the A range and does not follow through on interpretations offered.

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

See above

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

See notes from previous sample. This student received A's externally last year, and should not against the new criterion. In order to attain the A range the student needs to address the negatives of the response outlined above.

Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against

C1
C2
C4

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

C1 B C2 B- C4 B-

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

As we read Sample 3 we were able to link with the Northern Meeting. On this we were also in agreement on C1/B; C2/B-; C4/B- because it was quite clear and did more than simply outline features - there was some reasonable explanation and even a little analysis. Certainly, it was beyond a mere C rating.

C1.1 The response adequately structured relevant ideas to form an analytic response. Whilst it was not always or consistently cohesive or effectively composed, it presented coherent, and more than basic understanding.

C1.2 A range of philosophical points of view were covered, the arguments were limited and basic at times.

C2.2 The response employed correct usage of a range of terminology throughout the philosophical discussion, though there were some errors and omissions.

C2.4 The response offered a limited range of explanations that lacked convincing detail at times.

C4.1 The response exhibited a limited range of evidence, but what was offered was employed to effectively analyse philosophical arguments and ideas.

C4.3 The essay included appropriate evidence in order to develop an interpretation, but this was ultimately hindered by its scattered and disorganised presentation, which did not approach synthesis.

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

See above.

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

Once more the meeting felt that this response was unduly rewarded for its proficient prose, which meant its weaknesses against other criteria were overlooked. The previous notes regarding the assessment process and further professional learning for the successful implementation of the new course are only affirmed by

ratings)?

this circumstance.

Summary of any further samples moderated

**Further samples -
Criteria assessed
against**

C10

**What ratings have
the group
assigned
this/these
Sample(s)?**

No further samples were assessed

**What evidence
supports the
ratings the group
has given**

No further samples were assessed

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

No further samples were assessed

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

No further samples were assessed

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**

All examinable criteria and standards

moderated:

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

Midyear exam responses against unpacked exam specifications and consensus on criteria, which is yet to be reached, and must be addressed as soon as possible with an urgent State-wide meeting of all Philosophy teachers.

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

Lach Valentine

Email

lachlan.hine@education.tas.gov.au

Sharing Resources

Please provide details of any resources or teaching or assessment strategies, useful links etc. that were shared in the meeting.

An explanation of Jackson's 'Mary' thought experiment https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gZy3Ky9y_fg (NB the notes that follow it are very good)

A useful pdf of the strengths and weaknesses of Property Dualism is seen at <http://www.philosophyideas.com/files/mind/Property%20Dualism.pdf>

Gerald Jones et. al. Moral Philosophy: A guide to ethical theory, Hodder Education, 2006

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like

The most urgent matter is our request for a State-wide meeting early in Term 2, so that teachers can create a consensus on how the new criteria are to be assessed prior to our Mid-year exams, next QA day, and the end of year exam. This is especially important given that

**Curriculum
Services to
consider in
relation to this
course:**

changes to the published exam specifications occurred during our meeting, and we were unable to discuss these. Alterations to the course document were also published simultaneously. In order to professionally and equitably

implement the curriculum we must reach consensus on how we will be assessing students' work, so that they will be given the opportunity to achieve in an open and transparent manner.

We discussed at length the problems of differentiating between C2 and C4 and exactly where and how we should be assessing "philosophical evidence". The two criteria may need to be re-worded so as to unpack the elements and make them clearer. For example, we might expect as forms of evidence: a thought experiment and/or standard form arguments and/or an accurate paraphrasing of a Philosophers argument etc.

We would like it noted that we are suggesting a meeting of Philosophy markers on the Friday before marking begins in November, to work through protocols and understandings of assessment criteria and the elements - at this meeting a guide sheet could be produced for all Philosophy markers to address the issues outlined previously in this report.

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: We need examples from the new course to assess against the current criteria, including any of these as exemplar would be misleading and unhelpful.

Any comments:

Criterion 1 is the only one that assesses and is related to, expression so let us not get seduced by an elegant prose style when we are marking other criteria.