

2021 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Which meeting is this report for?

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?

criterion 1: B- criterion 3: C

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

Evaluation and use of language for sample 1 was needed to move from the C range into the B range for criterion 3. Criterion 1 was of a stronger standard than criterion 3. The sample presents a solid understanding of the concepts of the argument, and a broadly accurate analyses. A breadth of ideas was present. The sample follows an essay structure and answers the question.

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

Use of language did not lead to a sophisticated unpacking of the criteria. It was lacking formality and structure at times, without justification of the evaluation. A "B" rating may awarded on Criterion 2 if needs be, but is not assessed at this moderation. A consistency of the argument's contention would be desirable.

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

Elements were assessed a combined standard.
Second standard of criterion 3 - a range of ideas were present i.e. Churchland's.

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

Further structure, supporting evidence and analytical language. Inclusion of a thought experiment regarding qualia would strengthen the essay, and help shape the argument with further supporting evidence.
Physicalist positions were inaccurate at times.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF

Criterion 1 = Overall

SELECTED the elements within that criterion	Criterion 3 = Overall
Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	criterion 1; C+ criterion 3; B-
Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Criterion 3 was strong than one. Argument of introspection was solid supporting substance dualism, as was the masked man fallacy. Criterion 1 demonstrated evidence of a solid essay structure.
Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?	No mention of monism in their argument to address the essay question. Analyses and evaluation was discussed well, but not targeted towards the stated question. Further arguments with a focus on philosophical positions would be desirable.
Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.	All elements assessed collectively across criteria. "Reponses" as an answer was not addressed as a criteria. Overall a solid response but without the depth required for a response assessed at a higher level.
Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	The student has not answered the question directly, rather their answer has inferred the response. Further inclusion of supporting philosophical arguments i.e. Frege and the morning star/evening star and the masked man fallacy. Have to respond directly to the question and use the supporting evidence for analyses.

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?	criterion 1; A criterion 3; A
Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	Strong essay across both criteria. Good use of language, and discussion of the various positions in an analytical response. Student can synthesis the argument at a higher level.
Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in	Minor issues to be mindful of:

order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Use of abbreviations

Incorrectly categorising Chalmers as a substance dualist as opposed to a property dualist. Further flaws within Chalmers argument and his use of Philosophical Zombies. Evaluation was not clear. This impacts criterion 3 specifically.

Use of logic and science interchangeably without specification of certain terms, potentially impacting criterion 1 but mainly criterion 2 (not assessed in this meeting).

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

All elements assessed collectively across the criteria.

Element 2, criterion one: microphysically and claims of rejecting physics are potentially problematic.

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

Further elaboration of theories such as Dennett and Coffee Tasters, and unpacking of the easy and hard problem of consciousness with David Chalmers. Accuracy and consistency was key, and use of logical unpacking of the arguments with reference to deductive and inductive. A scrutiny of a scientific support and analysis of the philosophical zombie argument.

Planning for March Moderation 2022 - Statewide Samples

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

Criteria 1 and 4

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

Ben Felstead

Sharing Resources

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

Resource discussion was around assignment setting and length of time for Good Life.

Discussion vs assignment writing time. Delivery of the content was also discussed.

De Beauvoir analyses - videos available on line. Interview with de Beauvoir- 1975 interview on Youtube.

Textbook Chapter/Articles.

Emails will be sent sharing resources.

TASC work requirements.

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Years 9 to 12 Learning to consider in relation to this course:

- Eastern philosophy/ers as a further concept to be explicitly included as an option to choose from.
- Inclusion of a scope of electives in a rewrite for individualisation of student interest.
- Excellent course structure as it stands currently. Consensus that there is already a freedom to explore further philosophers, ideas and options under the current framework. To retain as much of the existing framework and content as possible would be desirable in this course.