# 2019 March Moderation - Report

## Meeting Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting took place in: | South |
| AM or PM session? | AM |
| Which AM Meeting is this report for? | HASS - Philosophy Level 3 |
| Moderation Leader Name | Lachlan Valentine |
| Moderation Leader Email | lachlan.valentine@education.tas.gov.au |
| Minute Keeper | Lachlan Valentine |
| Minute Keeper Email | lachlan.valentine@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. | Alisha Watkins Elizabeth College<br>John Williamson Fahan School<br>Elizabeth Hamilton Rosny College<br>Lachlan Valentine Hobart College |
| Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting. | Michael Dobber GYC |

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<br>Criterion 4 = Overall |
| Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample? | Criterion 3 A- Criterion 4 A- |
| Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | Sample 1, whilst it could have more directly addressed the question and presented a more cohesive contention in response, nevertheless exhibited a broad and informed understanding of the problem of Free Will. Indeed, this response showed a sound understanding of the major responses to the problem of free will, including Libertarianism, Compatibilism, as well as Hard Determinism, and effectively analysed and evaluated these, though perhaps not always to the depth we would expect for solid As. The response offered consistent evidence in its analysis of the arguments from a range of relevant philosophers including Peter van Inwagen, Daniel Dennett, and Baron de Holbach, as well as addressing the potential impact of these positions for the justice system and our sense of morality. Were we to assess this sample against criterion 1, we would award a B+, as the response should have more directly addressed the question in all of its aspects, and with a more relevant focus. |
| Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)? | In order for this response to attain a higher rating it should have more clearly or directly addressed the question, which explicitly asked for an evaluation of Hard Determinism, and the associated idea that our feeling of possessing free will is merely an illusion. Neither of these tasks were convincingly undertaken, despite material relevant to these key points being addressed. Where the most significant failing of the response lies is perhaps with its lack of critical evaluation of Hard Determinism, which is almost entirely unchallenged throughout the essay. The student fails to take up James' criticism that Hard Determinism is a position that is unfalsifiable, or dogmatic, which renders it a position advocated for with scientific evidence, which is itself unscientific. The response also overstates the freedom Libertarian positions advocate, failing to acknowledge the distinction between event and agent causation, effectively constructing a strawman. |
| Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable. | The group consensus for this response was reflected in the pre-submission of results, and there was slight movement by some up a grade (B+ to A-) on criterion 3 following discussion. Worryingly, there was evidence of one marker who awarded this response marks in the C range, which indicates an assessment that is significantly out of step with their peers, which of course, is the whole purpose of the quality assurance process to address. |

### 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<br>Criterion 4 = Overall |
| Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample? | Criterion 3 D+ Criterion 4 C- |
| Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | This response, although quite unclear at times, nevertheless reflected a student who has a basic understanding of the problem of free will as well as the difference between Hard Determinism and Libertarianism. The response was able to articulate one of the key issues of the debate, which is that these positions differ in their definition of free will, which means their responses to issues to do with criminal punishment are difficult to reconcile or evaluate. |
| Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)? | The position the student eventually advocates is largely unsupported by much analysis or evidence aside from vague and often contrary assertions and rhetorical questions. Moreover, there is very little evidence of an understanding of the logic behind these positions without the marker projecting or reading into the response with the principle of charity in mind. |
| Sample 2 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable. | The group consensus for this response was evenly split between those who wanted to award the results reflected in this report, and those who wanted to award a C-, rather than a D+ on criterion 3. We were able to compromise by reflecting upon how the removal of element 4 of criterion 3 as an externally assessed standard, which had meant criterion 3 was difficult in an exam context, would mean that the student was more likely to attain a C- with the updated external assessment specifications, something which was raised as an issue during exam marking in 2018. |

### 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<br>Criterion 4 = Overall |
| Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this | Criterion 3 C Criterion 4 C |

| | |
|---|---|
| sample? | |
| Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | This is an articulate response to the question which cleverly utilises the language of the task and the Alain de Botton quotation so that it initially appears more sophisticated than its substance actually amounts to. The essay directly responds to the question by simply accepting or agreeing with the proposition rather than addressing its 'fairness' and proceeds to retell de Botton's perspective rather than mount much in the way of analysis or relevant philosophical evidence. Nevertheless, it is articulate, flows as an essay exam response should, and does address the question, hence it passing, despite our concerns with its academic merit. |
| Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)? | 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. | The group consensus for this response was reflected in the pre-submission of results. Worryingly, there was evidence of one marker who awarded this response marks in the B range, which indicates an assessment that is significantly out of step with their peers, which of course, is the whole purpose of the quality assurance process to address. It is especially understandable how this may have occurred as this piece presents, at least initially, as an informed and balanced essay, that is directly responding to the question. |

## 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<br>Criterion 4 = Overall |
| Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample? | Criterion 3 A- Criterion 3 A |
| Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given? | This is a strong, informed, and thorough response that weaves other pertinent points of Nietzsche's philosophy throughout the answer, whilst explicitly addressing the question. The response offers a sophisticated and nuanced understanding of relevant concepts, such as the will to power, Ubermencsch, self-overcoming, and slave morality, in addition to addressing the notion that suffering is an essential aspect of the good life. |
| Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a | Although there is very little to improve upon, the response could be critiqued for not thoroughly analysing how Nietzsche reached his position, or the rationale underpinning his key thoughts. For instance, further detail on why Nietzsche diagnosed life denying principles within Christianity and how this amounts to a poor |

| | |
|---|---|
| higher rating (or ratings)? | or weak willed response to the pain and suffering of the human condition could have strengthened the response. Moreover, the essay did not always justify its assertions with evidence beyond pertinent quotations, which were nonetheless welcome. The student might also have attempted an analysis of 'Amor Fati' or the Eternal Recurrence, however, given the time restrictions it is understandable that this was not undertaken. |
| Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable. | The group consensus for this response was reflected in the pre-submission of results, and there was slight movement by some up a grade (B+ to A-) on criterion 3 following discussion. Pleasingly, there was evidence of consensus across the board as all of the pre-submitted results reflected similar standards. |

## Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

| | |
|---|---|
| For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation. | Criteria 1 and 5, externally assessed elements |

## 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. |