

2019 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

PM

Which meeting is this report for?

HASS - Sociology Level 3

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 5 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 5, Element 8
Criterion 6 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 6
Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

C5 -C+, C6=B-, C7=C+

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

The contribution was over the word limit.

Length of introduction - seems to have grown over the years. Lit review (indication of sociological background)

Discussion of whether each reference cited in the IP, needs to be in introduction. No! BUT clarity is definitely needed. Needs to be explicitly raised at the markers' meeting.

Some references are inaccurate and not in final List

Little depth in analysis

Gender - the core topic - was not mentioned.

Ethical concern: "36 surveys were applicable" - needed to be made clear the reason why.

Only one graph (no title)

Needed a final (close, thorough) proof-read and editing

Survey questions needed numbering

Analysis seemed rushed

APA not understood

Some aspects of the research were...valiant

Raw data in Results section, hadn't been processed

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

Re critical editing and proof -reading. Ensuring sufficient time is allocated for areas that are manageable for students, albeit time consuming and fidgety. The upside, is that time factored in for this on the commencement of the IP, will ensure maximum potential for high ratings on criteria, especially those linked to word limit, spelling and (critically) referencing.

More balanced spread of theory introduction and analysis of data. Teachers to recommend apportioning of content/word limits across the sections, the consensus was, 400-500 words for the Introduction, 700-800 for Analysis of Results and Discussion.

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

Referencing continues to be an area of concern; feeling it is the last area tackled, when dead-line pressures are at their maximum .

Spelling inconsistencies (there is a notable lapse in this language competency in many of the samples reviewed for moderation over the years).

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

Encourage and remind candidates of the need for raw data to be included in the Appendices, particularly in cases when the graphical/tabular presentation of data, is not clear (as was the case in this contribution).

Important to emphasise that the aim of the investigation needs to be articulated and clearly visible (not implied).

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

C5-C+, C6- C+, C7 - C+

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

Issues with research design and method - lack of unpacking of ethics

Attempts at analysis, kept it sociological

Referencing issues

No aim in Introduction

New info in Conclusion

Topic needed to be made more explicit

No titles on graphs

Referencing old data - which is fine IF it is used to show historical trends

No raw data

QUESTION: are theories/theorists compulsory??? Consensus is no!

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

Each of the main areas identified around content placement, close adherence to the guidelines, particularly relating to the titling of graphs and table, the clear identification and articulating of the investigation's aim, and referencing.

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

Some increased application of ethical considerations applied in the investigation needed to have been attempted . Note - this is becoming a somewhat confusing area, as the marking examiners' comments have gone from a 'more is needed' stance, to the more recent, 'less is best' mode. Teachers to gain some clarity around this so they are positioned better to inform students of expectations in this area of the folio research. MG to follow-up.

Not solely restricted to this sample, there is consensus that the Discussion section needs to showcase greater analysis and rigorous interrogation of the data; too much of what is presented in the discussion, is just that, discussion at the expense of analysis. This represents a possible area within which class teachers might receive some guidelines and PL, perhaps enlisting the staff of UTAS Sociology Department. MG can follow-up.

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

Discussion relating to the inclusion of new information in the Discussion section, and the protocol around this. Clarification sought about what to advise in this area. Discussion recommended clear expectations here; MG to follow-up and refer any formal communications through college/school contacts and class teachers.

Discussions re the value of accessing current data; there was acknowledgement that older texts might be an equity issue as some providers may not have large numbers/resources. An issue, nonetheless, to raise at IP Markers meeting as one possible area for consideration in the folio presentations.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

Criterion 5 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 5, Element 8

Criterion 6 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 6

Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3, Element 4, Element 5

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

C5- A-/B+, C6-B+, C7 -A-

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

Consensus = this was the "Pants on fire!" - but can't apply the penalty as the mark (C.7)

No raw data

Figure 1 is nonsensical

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

In-text referencing requires some polishing; accurate APA application

Accurate and relevant processing of data, particularly re presentation in graphical format

Stick to the word limit - some creative positioning of word count box was suspicious attempt to disguise candidate's transgression re word length.

Consider the graphical representation of data - graphs not particularly helpful.

Inform candidate of analysis through rigorous interpretation of data, rather than unnecessary repetition (especially in the Discussion section)

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

This was considered the sample that was the most closely aligned to the 'top-end candidate'. Written composition, research focus, coverage, evidence of good levels of preparation, etc. each point to a student of solid potential. Small things not completed in this contribution, though, could impact markers' overall ratings. There was discussion and some spread of ratings, particularly re

Externally this would be the 'A' standard; inconsistencies as noted above represent final aspects of critical reading and editing, which is to be encouraged amongst all students.

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

As outlined above.

This was, overall, a well written piece in terms of the candidate's command of language, but the consensus of the group was that inconsistencies as outlined above, did detract from the overall quality. Recommendations for teachers focussed on conferencing of student's work through close reading and critical checking, particularly in the final stages, when pressures to submit and meet the deadline, rush important final acts of polishing.

Planning for March Moderation 2020 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate

Internal - C.3 Analyse theories about inequality and social categories - Related to

the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

the study of equality and inequality, the learner (All elements as per the CD)

Sharing Resources

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

Discussions around text selection; the feeling is there may not be a 'complete-fit' text. Plenty of good on-line resources (Conversation, ABS, etc) which most acknowledged they use/have knowledge of. Recommendation that references used by different centres/teachers might be circulated through the year - MG to circulate on-line provision for this with and following consultation with the Northern Moderator.

Course Support

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

Discussion re marking tool and the need for it to be included in the IP guidelines. The consensus was that needs to be a document available to students in the writing of the IP, as it is an important framework through which students can self-monitor their work through the investigation process. For teachers, it will assist their support of students during the conferencing of drafts, etc.

Sarah Banks has raised this with Jill Myers. Marco will follow-up and have a discussion with Sally Snell around views on this expressed by Northern teachers; contact with colleagues will be actioned as soon as details are to hand.