

2019 March Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Meeting took place in:

South

AM or PM session?

AM

Which AM Meeting is this report for?

HASS - Studies of Religion Level 3

Moderation Leader Name

Simone McManus

Moderation Leader Email

smcmanus@gyc.tas.edu.au

Minute Keeper

Simone McManus

Minute Keeper Email

smcmanus@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.

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

Andrew Clarke - St Mary's College -
Kyle Fifield- Calvin Christian School -
Mary-Anne Johnson - Guilford Young College -
Simone McManus - Guilford Young College -
Lisa Seddon - Guilford Young College -
Maddie Walker - The Friends School -
Kylie Sullivan - Guilford Young College

None

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

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

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

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

C- Criterion 2/ C- Criterion 4

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

Criterion 2 - The student has not guided us in the introduction - what is the contemporary ethical issue to be addressed? We intuit that it is Abortion. Some structure - an introduction, body and conclusion - but there is not strong paragraphing and there are some spelling errors and grammatical weaknesses. There is no place for a graph within the text of a formal essay. Analysis is extremely limited Reward and recognition of limited knowledge and concepts would be recognized as a Criterion 1 concern and would get the student over the line between C-/T+

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

Clear introduction, body and conclusion. Clear idea of what is the question that they are answering and the ethical issue to be addressed. More detailed information about each framework and then application of the framework to the ethical issue of Abortion. There needs to be more analysis and more evidence - moving from just memorization of some limited knowledge of the two ethical approaches to far, far deeper analysis and coherent argument

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

Group consensus was that this student would only be in the C- range and it warrants a pass only due to the clear and accurate understanding of some key terms and concepts related to the ethical frameworks. That said it is a brief and limited coverage of Natural Law (Aristotle, Aquinas mentioned, mention of purpose in life, the principle of Double effect, life beginning at conception - potentiality) in Utilitarianism (mention of Bentham, Mill and Singer, Preference Utilitarianism and the concept of Personhood, "greatest good for the greatest number") Very limited credible evidence, only refers and briefly to the analysis of the theorists. Does distinguish between religious and non religious frameworks.

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

-Practice scaffolding responses to Ethics (and other Sections of the external exam paper) based on former papers so that all aspects of the Question are answered.- Stress that students must know their ethical approaches- founder and principles and be prepared to distinguish between those that are religious and those that are non religious approaches clearly- having clearly outlined understanding of the ethical theory candidates must be able to apply the theory to the ethical issue and analyse using evidence how the theorist of this approach would apply ie. Natural Law or Utilitarianism to the issue of Abortion, provide evidence not only from information but quotes of theorists, examples, consistent argument and by drawing conclusions to provide a coherent and evidence based conclusion

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

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

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

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

C2 - B+/A- range/ C4 - A

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

This candidate has a clearly structured, thoughtful response albeit with extremely long paragraphs. There is an incredible breadth and depth of knowledge (C1) The use of language is sophisticated and spelling is accurate. This candidate has read widely around the topic of abortion and the response is incredibly detailed and showcases wider reading and research on this topic. Detailed and sophisticated understanding of Divine Command Theory and Virtue Ethics was unpacked coherently and the candidate was able to apply the theory to the ethical issue of Abortion providing supporting evidence in legal cases, coherent evidence based argument made in a cohesive and nuanced manner.

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

- Criterion 2 - Stronger adherence to shorter paragraph lengths, sharpen introductions and conclusions to ensure they very succinctly address the exam question- Criterion 4 - continue to build in supporting quotes

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

The group agreed with our discussion above with some helpful suggestions around sharpening exam essay writing technique with respect to sharper introductory and concluding paragraphs. Continue to return to key phrases and words in the exam question and link back to the question throughout the response. Sharpen up response to the strengths and weaknesses of each approach to make the evaluative nature of the essay more explicit.

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

- Review of past exam questions - practice scaffolding and planning essays- Review model answers which show good use of P>E>E>L in paragraphing - Point or Topic/Explain/Evidence and Link (back to the question)- Develop summary charts that provide an opportunity to clearly identify strengths and weaknesses of ethical approaches- build up a strong body of evidence to draw on for use in the exam

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 3

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

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

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

C2 - C- range only and C4 - C-/D+ range

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

C2 - The student provides a brief outline of their two approaches and refers to Euthanasia as the topic in the introduction. Not referring to the key components of the question in the introduction, a missing conclusion, weaker grammar and spelling put the candidate into the C range for C2C4 - the candidate describes Natural Moral Law and Utilitarianism to a limited extent but does not apply them to the topic of Euthanasia. There is very limited analysis or evaluation of the theories - "in Natural Law the candidate notes that students do not make decisions on rationality alone but also using instinct and emotion" is an quoted example of an attempt to look at the weaknesses of Natural Law as an approach but the grammar is weak and this is note explicitly applied to Euthanasia as an ethical issue.

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

C2 - A stronger introduction that indicates that the specific demands of the question will be addressed - namely state explicitly the two approaches religious and non religious to be addressed and to explicitly name the ethical issue of Euthanasia- clarity in meaning within the essay, grammatically correct sentences, spelling accuracy, a conclusion needs to be providedC4 - more explicit application of evidence to support claims or knowledge of the theories - weaknesses and strengths of approaches need to be addressed for the evaluation of theories- explicit application of theories to the ethical dilemma

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

As we continue to review and revise our thinking and checked in with our Northern counterparts we realised that this response had deficits in the structure of the essay, its weak essay structure, grammar and spelling. The question was not explicitly addressed so the C2 ratings began to sit at a C-/D+ level. Once again - weak evaluation and application of theories to the topic of Euthanasia and limited evaluation of the weaknesses and strengths of the approaches put this response at the C-/D+ range

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

- Once again - scaffolding of essay responses using practice exam questions- review of model essays - focus on specifically addressing the demands of a question, clear introduction, body and conclusion- creating charts which explore strengths and weaknesses of ethical theories- emphasise on the three fold approach - detail the theory, apply the theory and evaluate the theory

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 4

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

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

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

C2 - A / C4 - A/A+

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

Criterion 2 - addresses the demands of the question - distinct introduction, body with good paragraphing and strong conclusion - links back to the question throughout
 Criterion 4 - a breadth and depth of understanding of the ethical issue of Just War, mature and sophisticated understanding of the ethical approaches of Natural Law and Utilitarianism as applied to Just War theory. Nuanced and intelligent with supported evidence throughout from historical events, quotes, commentaries, quotes from sacred texts, Pope Benedict XVI, Hare. All drawn together to make a strong cohesive argument against going to war in Iraq through application of two contrasting ethical approaches - strong response

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

- This is an excellent response under exam conditions - if the student had had time they may have had a quick proof read for careless errors but given the time frame and exam setting a very strong response and a good model approach for teachers to read and reflect on in their preparation of their students studying Ethics.

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

Clear consensus between the group that this was a first class - accurate, detailed and nuanced response. In the high A range.

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

- Keep on keeping on - a strong essay. Model essays such as these would be beneficial for our students to have on TASC website.

Planning for September Moderation 2019 - Statewide Samples

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

Criteria 3 and 5 - Section A - Religious Traditions and Beliefs

Course Support

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

The identification of some model essays for students on the TASC website in this subject.

We have a new group of teachers to the subject who would appreciate some good exemplars to assist them in creating scaffolds and guiding their students.