

# 2020 September Moderation - Report



## Meeting Details

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 3 = Overall

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

B range

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

There was consistency across each of the breakout groups, that Sample 1 was a contribution of sound potential, meeting overall, assessment within, or at, the B range. The candidate touched on the major perspectives, demonstrating understanding of the differences between each, albeit favouring one at the expense of a balanced treatment. There was a good attempt to address key concepts which were correctly identified using a range of terms and concepts and referencing of real-life contexts via the stimulus material. It outlined inequality well, and there was an attempt to analyse. There was competency in arguing a point of view in areas of institutionalised inequality, though lapses in robust evaluation and inconsistencies in critical exploration that describes and applies conceptual linkages between sociological ideas and real-life situations in CAS restricted assessment at a higher (A) rating. A little unstructured and disjointed on this aspect in sections.

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

The sample was not a 'C' rating as analysis was attempted, it analyses a point of view in areas of inequality. While it is unstructured and disjointed in areas, there is an attempt at evaluation. It is superficial (a 'little bit of a word salad, without a clear understanding of some theory'). Improvement in fluency of argument, greater unpacking of references to the stimuli, increased analysis and evaluative unpacking of theories ('it is quite gumpy!'), and the rectifying of language and expression inconsistencies are areas upon which to focus. To improve and attain the higher 'A' rating, the candidate is encouraged to 'pull from a greater collection of theorists.

Sample 1 - Summary of group consensus with comments to element

This demonstrates potential competency on each of the elements, without doing enough on and across them to qualify for the higher 'A' rating. Unanimous in the view that this candidate shows enough evidence

level if applicable.

of understanding of inequality, the major theoretical perspectives, concept understanding, and the nuances of incorporating concepts from the stimulus. With increased focus on critical evaluation, the provision of 'an extended sophistication of examples', and the rectifying of 'language and grammatical errors', the view was that this candidate can qualify for the higher 'A' rating once these adjustments have been implemented.

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

As above. Guided instruction in these areas, it was felt, would advance this candidate's potential to secure the higher rating. By concentrating on eradicating 'description focus' and prioritising 'evaluation emphasis' the view is that this contribution could progress further. As outlined above, language and expression lapses are readily fixable, and pulling on a broader cache of empirical evidences will further consolidate these gains.

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

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

C+ to B- range .

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

The sample generated considerable healthy and robust conversation in areas relating to the task function , its value as a moderation 'partner' to Sample 1 given its different nature, and the difficulties in identifying where this sample sits on specific criterion requisites - specifically, that relating to analyse theories about inequality and social categories. The sample produced a broad range of assessment ratings because of these considerations, ranging from an 'A' rating to a 't' rating. From this perspective the sample was problematic, as well as a good springboard of how tasks can ease or compliment the moderation process.

Noting this as significant and essential in candidates' contributions, the real need for pieces to reflect referencing rigour is recommended in future moderation tasks. Further, task commonality is recommended.

When considering the elements 1,2, 3 there is evidence of this candidate's attempts to address the criterion re analyse theories about inequality and social categories, though the lack of theoretical perspectives, means this candidate would secure a 'C' rating. But there is some good historical material relating to indigenous history of inequality, the causes and impact re educational and work, and generational/historical inequality, implying systemic disadvantage and cycles of discrimination and disadvantage,

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

There is more description and factual recounting than there is evaluation of, and detailing on, the major theoretical perspectives. Referencing (see above) is key; 'one cannot tell clearly; which parts are the student's work in this sample'. Describing the sociological issue and situation of indigenous inequality, using a range of terms and concepts, this student can refine that which has been made here, which shows how social institutions engage with and shape inequality. On this point, the sample does enough to position it at the C+ rating, and possibly escalates it into the B -range.

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

The Sample 2 was, as mentioned a good discussion piece. Its limitations centred on the task itself; as a primer and literature search task, it was supported as 'a useful exercise' which several moderators have used or indicated would consider using, as a valuable info-graphic primer for a more conventional follow-up essay response. The piece is strong on its historical amassing of factual content relevant to indigenous inequality but does not outline specifically theoretical perspectives. This theory, linking to causes might have been shaped further. There was agreement that some attempt to delineate the various factors that lead to indigenous inequality is on show, despite considerable literature search padding that clouds, rather than clarifies understanding. There is also a lot of unnecessary backstory content at the expense of genuine analysis and evaluation. Streamlining and expanding critical evaluation of sociological perspectives and concepts is needed. This task did generate important conversations around task make-up as internal tools (one of the request from the March meeting) and the importance of linking tasks to elements for assessment. All positive moderation outcomes.

Notwithstanding points raised earlier (see above comments), the consensus was, that while little attempt to analyse or to actually evaluate factors is evident, and that the candidate is simply describing one key area of inequality, there is sufficient evidence of an attempt being made to show how social institutions engage with and adapt to inequality, placing this piece in the C+/B- range.

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

Encourage candidate to describe terms and concepts and provides a range of empirical theories and evidences for inequality. Build on developing a robust evaluation and analysis focus, using the good scaffolding of the content addressed in this sample.

### Planning for March Moderation 2021 - Statewide Samples

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

For the March 2021, the request is for samples of IP, with a specific targeting for exemplars that can differentiate between A and B ratings. Specifically, what constitutes a clear, 'strong A' and what is the differentiation point for a B rating, a point of ongoing contention over many years re the IP external marking.

State the name of the person who will be

Simon Shaw and Marco Guerzoni

providing the samples for moderation

Sharing Resources

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

There was brief mention made re the resource 'approach' teachers used for online delivery of material and the provision this has opened-up for further discussion around how on-line delivery approaches might streamline or advance the subject, and its student appeal rating. Resource sharing around this was recommended for further discussion in March, with a longer time allocation, perhaps, for this focus than in past moderation sessions. Encouragement for teachers to share these resources used during the iso on-line period was suggested to commence traction re this resource pooling across colleges.

Acknowledgement of the considerable and significant role of teachers in this subject during these difficult times was made.

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Years 9-12 Curriculum to consider in relation to this course:

NA