

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Philosophy Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Carl Hinde

Moderation Leader Email

carl.hinde@education.tas.gov.au

Minute Keeper

Carl Hinde

Minute Keeper Email

carl.hinde@education.tas.gov.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.

Carl Hinde - Launceston College
Nicholas Clements - Launceston Church Grammar School
Joshua Martin - St Patricks College
Wayne Roberts - St Brendan Shaw College
James McLean - Newstead College

N/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

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

B+, B

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

The group believed the student had demonstrated a strong understanding of the unit. There was a wide range of philosophical positions communicated.

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

Some participants felt that the student had misunderstood what precisely 'Compatibilism' was, and that their definitions were shallow at times.

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

It should be noted that there was not unanimous consensus on the 'B' rating, with one participant advocating for an A, while another participant initially not convinced of the B rating. There was lengthy discussion of the fact that the candidate had not adequately responded to the question. The moderator pointed out that nowhere in the elements on C3 or C4 can we penalise students for not answering the question, but nevertheless this may have skewed people's perspective on the quality of the candidate's response.

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

It was noted that the student's response was, to an extent, an 'information dump' that did not address the question in explicit terms. Evaluation of philosophical perspectives is essential to ensure strong marks are consistently awarded.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall
Criterion 4 = Overall

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

T+, T+

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

The group felt that there was not enough clear evidence of knowledge to award a pass rating on either criterion. Some discussion was had about whether or no a C- on C3 was achieved, however when comparing with other C papers, markers did not feel a C- rating was applicable.

Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Clearer communication is needed to 'describe and explain philosophical arguments'. Although there was an understanding of correct terminology, it was very hard to decipher whether or not the student understood the arguments.

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Some discussion, but a clear consensus.

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Some basic paragraphing and sentence structure work with the student could possibly have lifted this students level of achievement.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 3 = Overall
Criterion 4 = Overall

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

C and C

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

It includes a very basic summary of the central component of Schopenhauer's position on love. It is clearly written and communicates the basic ideas fairly well.

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

Note - I have taken the Southern Moderators response here as it sums up the conversation from the North very well. Rather than a retelling of de Botton's quote and the content of the question the response required much more thorough analysis of Schopenhauer's rationale which led him to argue that romantic love is nothing more than the inescapable drive of the will to life. Moreover, the response relies far too heavily upon the student's ability to write well, and offers only anecdotal and generalised thoughts rather than analysis, and never really utilises these to any evaluative effect in order to analyse Schopenhauer's philosophy.

Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

There was a clear consensus on this response.

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

Examining Schopenhauer's arguments in more depth, exploring their implications and evaluating their merits in more detail is required.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

Criterion 3 = Overall
Criterion 4 = Overall

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

A and A

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

Very strong understanding, critical evaluation, well communicated and lots of depth. A very strong essay overall.

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

In the 45 minute timeframe we felt it would be harder to do much better than this, a different approach could be taken, but this was very good.

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

Clear consensus amongst the group on this paper.

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

N/a

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

1 and 5 - externally assessed elements.

State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for September moderation.

Last year's exam? Russell Cooper?

Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation

russell.cooper@education.tas.gov.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:

Given the new content for this course we would appreciate some professional learning relevant to two key changes to the course: Unit 4.1 is in only its second year and not all teachers are yet familiar with its content. Professional learning for this Ethics unit, facilitated by UTAS would be beneficial in assuring the quality and consistency of our assessment standards. In Unit 5 a new philosopher has been introduced. The inclusion of Simone de Beauvoir is an important addition and act of balancing a course traditionally weighted far too heavily towards the study of dead white men. Teachers and students are thrilled about this change, but also have yet to deliver this content, and would very much appreciate support in development of resources and the assistance of an academic learned in this important area of philosophy.