2018 September Moderation - Report

Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	North
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	HASS - Psychology Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Suellen Kackely
Moderation Leader Email	suellen.kackley@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Lynn Hendley
Minute Keeper Email	lynn.hendley@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.	Jill Kerr - Marist Regional College Andrew French - Scotch Oakburn College Leigh Dobson - Launceston College Nathan Hill - Launceston Christian School Lynn Hendley - Launceston College Lyn Haberle - St Patricks College Jess Campbell - St.Brendan College Laura Korpershoek - Circular Head Christian School Suellen Kackley-Keep -Don College Caroline Osborne - Hellyer College
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Tobi Allan - Smithton High School

meeting.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 4 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5 Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	4-=B, 7=B-

Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given.	Shows a good understanding of 4 memory theories Describes the theories Has mentioned the key concepts Has described the stimulus but not quoted from the stimulus Included some Empirical evidence and used the name of the theorists names Good reference back to the question

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

Explain further the key concepts

Include more empirical evidence

Need to quote from the stimulus

More detailed information from only 2 (maybe 3) theories instead of spreading out across 4

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

Crit. 4:2 a solid explanation of the theories

crit. 4:4 describes the theories and there is some analyses

Crit. 4:6 presents a position with some empirical evidence given

Crit. 7:1 some explanation of stimulus but does not quote from it

Crit. 7:2 some empirical evidence mainly theorists name

> Crit. 7:3 very little assessment of research findings
>
> Crit. 7:6 some links between empirical evidence and concepts/theories needs but could explain further

Sample 1- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help

More detail with empirical evidence

Relate the stimulus more to 2 theories.

Explain key concept further with examples

Evaluation of the theories (limitations and strengths)

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 4 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5 Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6
Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	4=C+, 7=C
Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given.	A brief discussion of 3 theories A good brief evaluation of each theory with key theorists Refers to the stimulus but little analysis

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

More detail, longer answer

Need examples and further empirical evidence

More detail explanation of theories with examples

Link stimulus to theories and quote from it

Draw examples/diagrams to illustrate

Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments

Crit. 4:2 a fair explanation of the theories

crit. 4:4 describes the theories and very little analysis

Crit. 4:6 presents a position with some empirical evidence given mainly theorist names

Crit. 7:1 some explanation of stimulus but does not quote from it or strongly link with theories

Crit. 7:2 some empirical evidence mainly theorists name

Crit. 7:3 no assessment of research findings

Crit. 7:6 very little links between empirical evidence and concepts/theories needs but could explain further

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

provide examples and further empirical evidence

Detailed and lengthy explanation of theories with examples

Stimulus analysis should include theories and relate back to question

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Crit 3 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5 Crit 7 = Element 1, Element 2 Element 3, Element 6
Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	3=C- 7=t+
Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	A fair explanation of the theories: Operant and classical. Relates elements to the stimulus but doesn't explain the elements of Classical Conditioning. Explains punishment and reinforcement.

Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Inclusion of empirical evidence eg little Albert and They Shy girl. Comparison of classical and operant conditioning. Inclusion of schedules of reinforcement Need to discuss the comparison of the theories, strengths and weaknesses of each theory. Need to explain key concepts eg Graduated Exposure and acquisition. When explaining stimulus the student needs to quotes from it.
Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Crit. 3:2 a fair explanation of the theories (limited terms used) crit. 3:4 describes the theories but there is not analyses Crit. 3:6 presents a position but no empirical evidence given Crit. 7:1 some explanation of stimulus and does relate Classical conditioning Crit. 7:2 no use of empirical evidence Crit. 7:3 no assess of research findings Crit. 7:6 no links between empirical evidence and concepts/theories
Sample 3- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Include empirical evidence Comparison of classical and operant conditioning. Need to discuss the comparison of the theories, strengths and weaknesses of each theory. Need to explain key concepts eg Graduated Exposure and acquisition, schedules of reinforcement

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being	Crit 3 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5 Crit 7 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6

moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	
Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	3=B- 7=C+
Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Good comparison of classical condition and operant conditioning. accurate and clear analysis of stimulus some empirical evidence but not human
Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	inclusion of human empirical evidence more examples inclusion of more appropriate concepts eg schedules of reinforcement
Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Crit. 3:2 a good explanation of the theories crit. 3:4 describes the theories with analyses Crit. 3:6 presents a position but no human empirical evidence given Crit. 7:1 clear and accurate explanation of stimulus Crit. 7:2 no human empirical evidence Crit. 7:3 no assess of research findings Crit. 7:6 links between concepts/theories and empirical evidence but only animal eg's
Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	include more human empirical evidence, don't use the animal studies show understanding of theories by using appropriate terminology

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 5

Sample 5 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Crit 1 = Element 2, Element 5, Element 6 Crit 7 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6
Sample 5 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	1=C+/B-, 7=C+
Sample 5 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Have discussed stimulus 2 well and used the stimulus well (maybe over used) showed a good understanding of Spearman. Mentioned some concepts eg reaction range NB Element 6 was used instead of 4 in criteria 1 as it addresses the focus of the question
Sample 5 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	Clear evaluation of the theories. include other theories clearly relate heredity and environment to theories Include more appropriate concepts
Sample 5 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Crit. 1:2 a good explanation of one of the theories crit. 1:6 describes and analyses this theories but needs others Crit. 1:5 presents a position but needs to add evaluation Crit. 7:1 clear and accurate explanation of stimulus Crit. 7:2 includes some empirical evidence Crit. 7:3 no assess of research findings Crit. 7:6 a few links between concepts/theories and empirical evidence NB Element 6 was used instead of 4 in criteria 1 as it addresses the focus of the question - theories

Sample 5 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	Introduction of key ideas and position clearly in the Introduction Include more relevant concepts Discuss heredity and environment thoroughly throughout

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 6

Sample 6 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Crit 1 = Element 2, Element 5, Element 6 Crit 7 = Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6
Sample 6 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	1=A 7=A
Sample 6 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Covered all theories, and discussed heredity and environment. Relevant evidence and good analysis of stimulus. Answers the question NB Element 6 was used instead of 4 in criteria 1 as it addresses the focus of the question - theories
Sample 6 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	not applicable as assessed at an A
Sample 6 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments	Crit. 1:2 a clear explanation of the theories crit. 1:6 describes and analyses these theories Crit. 1:5 presents a position and answers the question Crit. 7:1 clear and accurate explanation of stimulus Crit. 7:2 includes supporting empirical evidence Crit. 7:3 assess of research findings and draws conclusion

	Crit. 7:6 links between concepts/theories and empirical evidence NB Element 6 was used instead of 4 in criteria 1 as it addresses the focus of the question
Sample 6 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	writing to be legible

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

Please select all that apply	Level 3 or 4
For Level 3 and 4 courses please suggest criteria for consideration by CTL's.	4 samples from Human Learning section of end of yr exam Cr 3 E2,4,5 Cr 7 E1,2,3,6
Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:	CTL
Email	

Sharing Resources

Hill (textbook) shows a good evaluation of theories. However, exam markers need to be aware that not all teachers have taught this!

Course Support/Concerns

1. Issue with the charts given at Moderation Meeting. We see the whole state spread however we also would like to break in down into north and south so we can discuss our centres spread: because we can't discuss why it's a c if of the attendees at our centre meeting has not given it. And we may resolve it but we don't know what south and how south has resolved it.
    Axis need to be the same on each chart to make for easier analysis and comparison.

2. *Query regarding the Intelligence question in the external exam*

Alternate theories of intelligence suggests that students can do comparative essays of two theories instead of the debate of what is intelligence and how we measure it.

They also have to relate to environment and/or heredity. The question should address this

Where is the shared thinking going on this?

3. In the exam specs the Elements for criteria 1 should be 2, 5, 6 as they should be the same as the other subject based criteria. Element 6 in Criteria 1 is the same as element 4 in criteria 2, 3, 4.

4. Concerned raised about the rumour that the criteria elements for assessment for exam will being changed for the end of year exam next year.

5. Difficulty with marking criteria 7 as it has 2 components and what happens if a student's work is missing one of those components. How to mark? Discussion in the exam marking to resolve this.

6. Concern about marking and the lack of confidence about using the elements when they don't fit the topic?