

# 2019 September Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

North

AM or PM session?

AM

Which meeting is this report for?

HASS - Philosophy Level 3

## 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  
Criterion 3 = Overall

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?

Rudimentary understanding of the arguments for and against free will. Communicated satisfactorily.

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

More critical evaluation of the arguments, addressing the question more directly.

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

N/A

applicable.

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

See above.

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 1 = Overall  
Criterion 3 = Overall

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

A+

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

Exceptional communication, analysis of a range of different perspectives in a very sophisticated way.

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

Group concluded that this students was probably doing everything they could, and writing at a tertiary standard.

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

N/A

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help

N/A

the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

### Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 1 = Overall  
Criterion 3 = Overall

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

B/B+

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

Accurate and well communicated description of arguments for and against free will. Some critical evaluation of the question offered in the conclusion.

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

More evaluation of the strengths/weaknesses of arguments. Arguments were presented in a fairly clear way, but not necessarily using sophisticated academic language. Analysis in the conclusion was good, but not compelling.

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

N/A

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

See above

### Planning for March Moderation 2020 - Statewide Samples

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

N/A

## Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

N/A

## Course Support

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

One issue relevant to today's meeting was that we were unable to plan our March moderation as we do not know what the course will look like.

Over and above issues noted above, further problems include:

- There is insufficient time to seek and implement public critical feedback on the course fairly and effectively.
- It has not been made clear how feedback on the draft course will be assessed, implemented or responded to.
- Having been through a series of rushed re-writes in the past few years, we are at risk of repeating history and ending up with yet another 'stop-gap' course.
- Philosophy teachers have already been unfairly burdened by having to adapt to the 'shifting goal posts' of curriculum in the past 4 years - adapting to further changes in 2020 is not reasonable.
- Time is needed to develop and deliver necessary PL to support teachers to deliver a new course - it is impossible for this to happen before 2020.
- The above two points are exacerbated by significant but unconfirmed proposed changes to external assessment structure.
- The process of counselling students for their 2020 subject selections has already been compromised due to uncertainty about the course in 2020.

- Also, other HASS courses are in much greater need of redeveloping, namely

Ancient History, followed by Modern History and Geography.

In light of the above and given that the existing course is still accredited for 2020, we are calling for the implementation of the proposed course to be delayed until 2021.