

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which PM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Sociology Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Marco Guerzoni

Moderation Leader Email

mguerzoni@gyc.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Sarah Banks

Minute Keeper Email

Sbanks@gyc.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.

Melinda Minstrell
Jane Barling
Sally Thomas
Mel Wall
John Williamson
Debbie Claridge
Giovanna Padas
Anna Williamson
Katrina Hutchinson
Sarah Banks
Marco Guerzoni

Apologies/absences - please enter the names of teachers and their schools who appeared on the moderation leaders list who did not attend the meeting.

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, Element 2, Element 4, Element 5
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C1 B+ C7 B+

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

General agreement that the answer was well-structured and used concepts appropriately. Was considered an answer reflective of high B/A ratings, with sound conceptual linkages to the stimulus material.

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

To achieve higher ratings re C1, greater evidence of a deliberate exploration of the strengths and limitations of theoretical perspective was required. Evaluative commentary and critical analysis is an area upon which to develop to move this candidate to the A rating.

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

General agreement that that the candidate demonstrated a competent understanding of perspectives and offered sound evaluation, though lapsed in focus, in sections, when addressing the specific essay topic of the relativity of deviance. Discussion (concerns/uncertainties) around what constitutes, and how much 'weight' is to be given to the 'strength and limitations' evidence for C1. Emphasis of discussions highlighted the need for elements of each criterion to be assessed equally, that it is necessary to look for /at that which is written rather than what is not in a student's work, with the latter not driving final ratings considerations. Request for some feedback/ guidelines to be forwarded to teachers in the lead-up to the next moderation meeting, specifically re the apportioning of assessment 'weight' across C1 and C7 (how is it possible to be light and C1 and not, also, on C7?).

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

Given the question focus on the relativity of deviance, what constitutes the relativity of deviance might have been tackled more directly, re the constructions of social deviance, the social reactions to it and how it is socially sustained? i.e. Why is the same attitude, behaviour, or condition praised in one situation and condemned in another? So, deviance cannot be explained or understood in terms of absolutes or essential characteristics nor can it be explained or understood apart from its social setting.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

Criterion 1 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5
 Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 2

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

C1 B+ C7 B

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

Although difficult to read, the candidate offered a coherent argument that is substantiated by relevant material. It offers some evaluation of theory, and links discussion to the stimulus.

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

Necessary to respond more clearly to the essay topic (deviance theory). Greater evaluation of the alternative sociological theories was required to progress this contribution above the good 'B' rating.

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

As above.

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Develop greater critical evaluative discussion to compliment the good summary accounts of each theoretical perspective, specifically re evidence 3 (C1). This sample is within range of 'A' ratings with revision of and refinement in this area.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 1 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5
 Criterion 7 = Element 1, Element 2

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

C1 C- C7 t+

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

Data shows some difference in lower range, though submission ratings were clustered consistently, predominantly around the C/T ratings categories.

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

See below.

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

See below.

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

Increased content, theoretical focus and a more purposeful attempt to answer the question by addressing specific 'hooks'/foci I the question and stimulus excerpts. Too descriptive and diluted .

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

Sample 4 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 1 = Element 2, Element 4, Element 5
 Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1

Sample 4 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C1 C+ C7 C+

Sample 4 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

Met the minimal expectations according to the evidences, satisfactorily.

Sample 4 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

Greater depth and sophistication of analysis and conceptual linkages. Greater detail relating to the relativity of deviance was needed. Evidence 3 (C7) was not evident; 'strengths and limitations' need to be incorporated in discussions of alternative theories.

Sample 4 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element level if applicable.

On review, consensus that there was no directly stated discussion of strengths and limitations (so did not meet the A standard, despite good use of terms and concepts). Adjustments to the 'B' rating was accepted as appropriate. There was a need to look beyond the poor spelling and syntax, and note the candidates attempts to discuss perspectives and theories. Evidence of some endeavour to discuss relativity, albeit superficially, was evident.

Sample 4 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Data on C1 is more varied with an A to C- variation, with greater uniformity of assessment standards, on C7. On review, consensus that there was no directly stated discussion of strengths and limitations (so did not meet the A standard, despite good use of terms and concepts). Consensus for adjustment noted. Look beyond poor spelling and syntax, ability to discuss perspectives and theories, attempt to discuss relativity was evident.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

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

Email address of the person providing the samples for September moderation

Each of the elements across all of the externally assessed criteria , attached to the external Investigation Project - Criterion 5: Use ethical sociological research methods^[1]; Criterion 6: Use evidence to support a sociological point of view^[1]; Criterion 7: Communicate sociological ideas, information, opinions, arguments and conclusions .

Marco Guerzoni will provide two samples, from representative Southern schools and colleges, with Sally Snell (Northern Moderator) who collect two from northern colleges. This will offer a representative sample, across different school/college centres. It would be good, if possible, to have one sample from one of the extension schools running Sociology 3.

mguerzoni@gyc.tas.edu.au ; Sally Snell <sally.snell@stpatricks.tas.edu.au>

Sharing Resources

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

- YouTube videos Van Krieken
- YouTube videos Crash Course Sociology.
- Twynham College online resources
- Course material links as below.
<http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/savvy/introsociology/TeacherResources/RelevantResourceTable.html><http://www.discoversociology.co.uk/introductiontosociology/socialisation><http://www.mrtredinnick.com/sociology.html><https://thesocietypages.org/sociologysource/category/in-class-activities/>

Course Support

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

- Recommendation to Chief Examiner - to provide feedback/direction re teachers' reservations/uncertainties if it is a realistic expectation to ask a 'C' student to describe 'strengths and limitations' of alternative theoretical perspectives, (CI, evidence 3)?
- Teachers find the elements of the standard difficult to apply, literally, to the assessment process. Teachers are willing to help compile and offer instructional suggestions to the Chief Examiner to ensure markers have realistic and defined parameters from which to assess students responses on this standard for Criterion 1. .
- Discussion of the format and content of the Marking Examiners' report, highlighted calls for greater detail and informative/constructive direction to assist teachers and students. A recommendation that subject teachers provide a

guidelines document/proforma for external markers and the Chief Examiner, on how this document can be improved to provide more useful feedback that can be readily transferred to teacher/class delivery needs. There was agreement that it would be beneficial if this could be actioned for implementation, this year.

- There was unanimous agreement that the external IP be moderated in September in the September meeting, specifically C5 and C7. There was consensus from the group that it may be time to review the value of the IP as an external assessment task, and possibly re-purpose it as an internal work requirement.
- Clarification on what is the stance re data selection and generalization to inequality issues, given many of the interview tools collect opinion and attitude responses, not directly attributable to discussions of wider systemic manifestations of inequality. This has been noted in the examiners' comments, though no directive/recommendation has been outlined for subject teachers.
- Is the IP still meeting its original intended purpose? Has the assessment process in its present form, consistently and accurately assessed students' performances equally, when aligned with ratings achieved for these criteria internally and externally, on the written examination component?
- Has the sustained and solitary concentration on inequality as the research focus for this task, prompted a recycling and re-conceptualizing of tried and trusted formulaic contributions, or, of greater concern, the perception amongst teachers and students, of a topic bias?
- Questions arose as to the validity of the research component, and by extension, the value of continuing with the IP as an externally assessed task.
- Query on how C7 as an overall rating is decided by TASC?