

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

**Submission Time:** March 13, 2018 5:34 pm

## Meeting Details

<b>Meeting Venue:</b>	South
<b>AM or PM session?</b>	AM
<b>Which Learning Area is this Report for?</b>	Humanities and Social Sciences (HASS)
<b>Which AM Meeting is this report for?</b>	HASS - Psychology Level 3
<b>Moderation Leader Name</b>	Teresa Blizzard
<b>Moderation Leader Email</b>	teresa.blizzard@education.tas.gov.au
<b>Minute Keeper (if available)</b>	Giovanna Padas
<b>Minute Keeper Email</b>	gpd@hutchins.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**

Bonita	Moroni
James	Broad
Donna	Evans
Jen MacGibbon	
Chad	Cullen
Lisa	Seddon
Tersia	Oosthuizen
Teresa	Blizzard
Fiona	Witcomb
Giovanna Padas	

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:

none

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

Lisa Colombo

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 1

Sample 1 - Criteria assessed against

C1  
C6  
C8

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

Sample #    C1: A    C6: B+    C8: A

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

C1-Overall quality of written report is very good with sound understanding of theoretical knowledge and concepts demonstrated.

-A wide range of evidence is used

-Appropriate inferences are drawn from the data

C6-Ethical considerations and understanding of process, quality and limitations are very good

	C8-Appropriate balance between sections of the report and grammatically correct with appropriate language and style
<p><b>What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p>	<p>C6- For an A rating hypothesis would need to be clear/operationalised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graphing requires improvement(should have used a coefficient scatterplot graph)</li> <li>-Preferably a larger sample size (of 15-20 as opposed to 6).</li> </ul>
<p><b>What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Sending out a greater number of surveys to participants so there is a higher chance of more being returned to experimenter</li> <li>2) Reminding them of course work regarding operationalization of hypotheses</li> <li>3) Having graphs checked by teacher or peer for suggested improvements and doing more research and reading about the process involved with correlations</li> <li>4) Thoroughly check reference list and ensure all sources are actually included in-text. Remind student that a Bibliography is not a requirement of the Psychology IP.</li> </ol>

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 2

<p><b>Sample 2 - Criteria assessed against</b></p>	<p>C1 C6 C8</p>
<p><b>What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this Sample?</b></p>	<p>Sample 2    C1: t+    C2: C-    C3: C-</p>

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

C1- Validity of topic was questioned, but it is valid - this report simply didn't articulate the gender differences nor the gender theories associated with the Stroop effect

C6- Ethics were considered, method was explained, IV/DV were mentioned but did not operationalize DV. Sample size of only 3 per gender

C8-- Irregular tense throughout

- Addressed the minimum standard/guidelines (poorly, but addressed)

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

C1-As per IP guidelines- mention of nature/nurture debate

C8-More new information included as very repetitive

C8- Increase word limit to add more depth to discussion

C1- Validity of topic was questioned, but it is valid - this report simply didn't articulate the gender differences nor the gender theories associated with the Stroop effect. This would need to be addressed for a higher rating

C6-Better acknowledgement of limitations of process employed

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

Careful discussion of the topic with student at the planning stage to ensure it is appropriately chosen and addressed

Ensure students read the guidelines regarding process and create a checklist for students to tick against their IP as they are progressing with their work (at each stage in the process-eg: Do you have at least 10 participants for your experiment?)

Suggest that students find more research for their IP to add strength to their argument-remind them how to

access databases, Google Scholar etc.

Remind students of the importance of proof-reading their work prior to submission.

## Moderation and Annotations for Sample 3

**Sample 3 - Criteria assessed against**

C1  
C6  
C8

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

Sample 3 C1: B+ C6 B+ C8 B+

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

C1:- Analysed theories and introduced concepts  
- Didn't relate to nature/nurture initially

C6: Well-conducted research, - Mentioned speed in intro but didn't test  
-Incorrectly identified emotion and eyes as IV (should have been gender)  
- Limitations were explained well  
-How sample was selected was not mentioned (assumed it was a convenience sample)

C8: Some imprecise language (broad statements)  
- Limited links to theories

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

C8: Less reliance on direct quotes - over 50% in intro alone (so can't have an A on C8)

C6: More depth/detail about their results (such as the range of scores, male responses to male eyes, etc), including "this is a difference of..."

C1: Introduce nature/nurture earlier and make more explicit links to theories

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

C8-instruction on the difference between paraphrasing and direct quotes and the 'less is more' approach so that some of the student's contribution is more evident in the introduction by using connecting statements that help their writing flow.

C1: Attention to the nature/nurture/ interactionist approaches throughout the intro and revisit in the discussion

C6: Encourage the student to expand on their analysis of results by giving the differences between scores but also making more comparisons within the data itself.

## Summary of any further samples moderated

**Further samples - Criteria assessed against**

C1  
C6  
C8

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

C1: T C6: T C8: T

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

C1: Intro is just rewriting research already conducted (no analysis nor synthesis)

No connection to gender or nature/nurture

Discussion is missing

C6: No mention of how variables will be measured

- Results are difficult to follow PLUS the questions are open-ended, but results are 'Yes/No' responses, so

they don't match

- "attractiveness" is not explained, nor is there any theory/research pertaining to this variable

C8: No word count, irregular tense; poor expression

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

Overall the report was lacking in regard to understanding of topic content, the correct process required for answering the question posed and the quality of the written report.

C1: Intro requires integration of appropriate research with findings only and how they connect to understandings of nature/nurture debate in Gender and inform the hypothesis

Inclusion of at least a small discussion which ties back to at least one piece of research in the intro as well as puts forward the limitations of the study

C6: The variables should match the study being undertaken

C8: Some evidence of proof-reading and adherence to formal writing conventions. A word count that at least meets the lower limit of 800 words, with a cumulative and final word count also included.

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

Ensure that any problems with the student's initial plan are carefully discussed and recorded by student

A checklist for student to complete at each stage of the report writing process and clear deadlines for completion of each component so student does not become time poor and fail to complete discussion/proofread work

## Planning for September Moderation 2018

**Are you planning**

Larger number of samples for all teachers to assess in advance of the meeting - with the option of teachers to

<b>on:</b>	bring further work for conferencing
<b>Please list the criteria to be moderated:</b>	C1, C4 and C7
<b>Briefly describe the type of task you plan to look at:</b>	Sample responses from the mid-year exam questions on the topics of Gender and Memory (Teresa Blizzard to write the exam questions and provide to all teachers).
<b>Please state the name of the person supplying the samples for the September moderation</b>	Teresa Blizzard
<b>Email</b>	teresa.blizzard@education.tas.gov.au

## Sharing Resources

<b>Please provide details of any resources or teaching or assessment strategies, useful links etc. that were shared in the meeting.</b>	Teachers agreed to share resources via email to teachers new to the course as requested throughout the year.
---	--

## Course Support

<b>Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Curriculum Services to consider in relation to this</b>	Any Professional Learning opportunities would be appreciated (especially guest speakers from UTAS regarding new approaches and research methods/ethics).
---	--



**course:**

## 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?**

Sample 2  
Sample 3