

2018 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:	South
AM or PM session?	AM
Which AM Meeting is this report for?	HASS - Psychology Level 3
Moderation Leader Name	Lisa Seddon
Moderation Leader Email	Lisa.Seddon@education.tas.gov.au
Minute Keeper	Giovanna Padas
Minute Keeper Email	Giovanna.Padas@hutchins.tas.edu.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.	Bonita Moroni (Calvin) James Broad (Claremont) Donna Evans (Fahan) Jen MacGibbon (Friends) Chad Cullen (GYC) Lisa Seddon (Hobart College) Tersia Oosthuizen (Hobart College) Sally Thomas (Collegiate) Giovanna Padas (Hutchins) John Schuringa (Elizabeth College)
Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the	Charlotte Vickers (St Mary's College) Teresa Blizzard (Rosny College)

meeting.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

<p>Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion</p>	<p>Criterion 4 = Overall Criterion 7 = Overall</p>
<p>Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?</p>	<p>C1 B-, C7 B-</p>
<p>Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?</p>	<p>Sample A (Memory) - evidence cited for grade given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Described memory, rather than analysed/evaluated • Understood the theories but didn't really evaluate • Not particularly good on defining memory (key aspect) • Didn't go into explaining the different types of LTM (in the question) • Quite a few incorrect pieces of information • Tiny reference to 'elaborative rehearsal' but inaccurate <p>C4 Consensus: B-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much evidence/research, limited use of stimulus (just repeated 2, but didn't use the graph in stim 1) • Not using other evidence to support the models presented • Difficult to know how much stimulus use takes a student from a B to an A • Not in the high B/A range because they didn't add anything new <p>C7 Consensus: B-</p>
<p>Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Analysis and evaluation Evidence/research beyond stimulus materials</p>
<p>Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus at element level</p>	<p>See above</p>

with comments

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

Crit 3 = All elements
Crit 7 = All elements

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

Sample C: C3: C/C-, C7: C-/t+

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

Sample C:
Limited range of terms
Description of theories to a degree

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

Defining all of the key terms
Identification of stimulus materials correctly

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

Sample C (Conditioning) - evidence cited for grade given:

- Used a limited range of terms and concepts correctly
- Described theories to a degree
- Used a limited range of perspectives
- Haven't used/defined 2 of the 3 key terms
- Stimulus 2 is incorrectly identified
- Stimulus 1 said 'Counter Conditioning' yet the key term asked for 'graduated exposure'

C3 Consensus: C-/C

	<p>Sample C (Conditioning) - evidence cited for grade given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Didn't link to classical conditioning • Quite weak - some identification/description but certainly no analysis <p>C7 Consensus: Borderline C-/t+</p>
<p>Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>See above</p>

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

<p>Sample 3 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion</p>	<p>Crit 3 = All elements Crit 7 = All elements</p>
<p>Sample 3 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?</p>	<p>Sample D: C3: B/B+, C7: B</p>
<p>Sample 3 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?</p>	<p>Sample D: Explained and described terms well But no evaluations</p>
<p>Sample 3 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Sample D: Analysis and evaluation needs to be included, beyond just an explanation Human research/application is needed.</p>
<p>Sample 3 - Summary of group consensus at element level</p>	<p>Sample D (Conditioning) - evidence cited for grade given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained/described the terms very well and used them fluently and confidently • Little/non-existent evaluations

with comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much more than regurgitation of material <p>C3 Consensus: B/B+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first element of C7 is tricky to translate: this is a written exam response, so difficult to summarise "quantitative and qualitative data in a wide range of formats" • An 'A' student goes beyond the animal studies, then moves into human research/application <p>C7 Consensus: B</p>
Sample 3- What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?	See above

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion	<p>Crit 1 = All elements Crit 7 = All elements</p>
Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?	Sample E: C1: B-, C7: B-
Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?	<p>Sample E:</p> <p>Good real life applications</p> <p>Including Bouchard was good but no genetics definition and weak intelligence definition</p> <p>Used both stimuli</p>
Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in	<p>Sample E:</p> <p>Clearer (and more) definitions</p>

<p>order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>Correlation doesn't mean cause and effect and this should be mentioned in analysis</p>
<p>Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus at element level with comments</p>	<p>Sample E (Intelligence) - evidence cited for grade given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showing/explaining what the stimuli presents and applying it to real life/what it means • A lot of describing the graph, not explaining it • Good to include Bouchard, but didn't define genetics (which they had to) • Definition of intelligence is weak <p>C1 Consensus: B-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used both stimuli and brought in other evidence • Didn't deal with correlations that well (e.g. higher correlation = more similar) • Correlation isn't cause and effect • Good range of evidence used <p>C7 Consensus: B-</p>
<p>Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?</p>	<p>See above</p>

Planning for March Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

<p>Please select all that apply</p>	<p>Level 3 or 4</p>
<p>For Level 3 and 4 courses please suggest criteria for consideration by CTL's.</p>	<p>Four samples from Human learning section of end of yr exam</p> <p>Cr3 E2,4,5</p> <p>Cr 7 E1,2,3,6</p>
<p>Please enter the name and email address of the person providing the samples:</p>	<p>CTL (Wendy Frost)</p>
<p>Email</p>	<p>wendy.frost@education.tas.gov.au</p>

Sharing Resources

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

Checklist for IP completion for students to self-regulate
Strategies for academic integrity
Identification of timing for scope and sequence
Suggested textbook for 2019

Course Support

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

Far fewer samples to be able to appropriately consider all in the meeting.

And selected samples to be far easier to read. Really illegible handwriting is unnecessary for a sample.