VCE Units 3 and Unit 4 Philosophy: Performance descriptors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VCE PHILOSOPHY**  **SCHOOL-ASSESSED COURSEWORK** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Unit 3 Performance descriptors** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | |  | |
| **Units 3 Outcome 1**  *Discuss philosophical questions related to the good life and the individual.*  **Unit 3 Outcome 2**  *Discuss philosophical questions relating to the good life and others.* | **Characteristics of study** | | **Key skill** | **DESCRIPTOR: typical performance in each range** | | | | | |
|  | |  | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | | **Very High** |
| Formulating philosophical questions | | **Develop perspectives on philosophical questions** | Identifies relevant philosophical questions within a philosophical issue. | Describes different perspectives for the relevant philosophical questions. | Develops a response to philosophical questions that is informed by relevant philosophical viewpoints, arguments and concepts. | Formulates a critical response to philosophical questions, comparing relevant philosophical arguments and concepts. | | Defends a refined response to relevant philosophical questions, including critical comparison of relevant arguments and concepts. |
| Outlining and analysing philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Explain, analyse and apply philosophical concepts** | Identifies relevant philosophical concepts. | Describes or defines philosophical concept. | Explains philosophical concepts. | Analyses philosophical concepts. | | Analyses and applies philosophical concepts. |
| **Recognise arguments, identifying the premises, the support given for the premises, conclusions, and any assumptions made** | Identifies the conclusion of an argument. | Describes how a conclusion is supported by some reasoning or examples. | Outlines how separate premises support the conclusion of an argument. | Explains basic logical structure of an argument, including how premises are supported by further reasoning. | | Precise outline of the argument and sub-arguments, including any assumed premises influencing the validity or cogency of the argument. |
| **Outline and analyse viewpoints and arguments using appropriate terminology** | Appropriately identifies relevant general perspectives. | Clearly explains central viewpoints and supporting examples. | Accurate outline of conclusions, supporting premises, implications and any assumptions. | Terminology is used consistently and appropriately. | | Arguments are precisely discussed in terms of their logical structure, using appropriate terminology |
| Evaluating philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Offer relevant criticisms of arguments by assessing the plausibility of premises and any assumptions made and showing whether the conclusions follow from the premises.** | Identifies a challenge to a perspective. | Describes a counterexample to a viewpoint. | Outlines why a premise in an argument should be rejected using reasoning or counterexamples. | Explains the relative strength of premises in an argument, including which are most vulnerable to criticism. | | Considers objections to premises, assumptions or possible implications, and suggests counter arguments. |
| Comparing and critically comparing philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Critically compare viewpoints and arguments by comparing the plausibility of the premises or viewpoints, any assumptions made and the quality of reasoning used** | Identifies a broad similarity or difference between perspectives. | Outlines a general similarity or difference between viewpoints. | Explains how a similarity or difference between premises leads to distinct conclusions. | Analysis of both similarities and differences, explaining why contrasts may occur. | | Brings two arguments into critical discussion with each other, to identify how each argument might inform evaluations of the other. |
| Identifies a broad reason to accept one perspective over another. | Considers how a general objection applies to both viewpoints. | Weighs up how contrasting reasoning may handle a counterexample. | Explains how a contrasting premise can inform a counterargument against the opposing conclusion. | |
| Applying philosophical viewpoints and arguments to contemporary debates, questions of contemporary living and case studies | | **Develop perspectives on questions of relevance to contemporary living** | States philosophical perspective relevant for question of contemporary living. | Outlines perspective on questions of contemporary living using reasons or examples. | Explains reasons for differing perspectives on question of contemporary living. | Compares relevant perspectives in response to questions of contemporary living. | | Critically compares the interplay between philosophical perspectives relevant to questions of contemporary living. |
| Developing perspectives | | **Use examples from applied philosophical and non-philosophical sources to support philosophical discussion** | Identifies a relevant source to support discussion. | Outlines perspectives within relevant source to support discussion. | Explains how reasoning and viewpoints in relevant source support discussion. | Analyses source in coherent and relevant way to support discussion. | | Uses various sources with rigour when critically discussing contrasting perspectives. |
| **Reflect critically on perspectives** | Identifies relevant perspective. | Compares relevant perspectives. | Weighs up reasons for supporting or criticising perspectives. | Clearly considers possible objections to own perspective | |
| Using clear and precise language | | **Formulate and defend philosophical positions using precise language** | Assertion of a general perspective in response to the good life. Limited use of appropriate language. | Clearly identifies distinctions between perspectives in response to the good life using appropriate language. | Reflects critically on distinct perspectives given in response to the good life, sometimes using clear and precise language. | Develops perspectives after critical discussion relating to the good life, regularly using clear and precise language. | | Synthesis of perspectives relating to the good life, consistently using clear and precise language. |

KEY to marking scale based on the Outcome at least two tasks contributing total 50 marks

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low 1–10 | Low 11–20 | Medium 21–30 | High 31–40 | Very High 41–50 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VCE PHILOSOPHY**  **SCHOOL-ASSESSED COURSEWORK** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Unit 4 Outcome 1 Performance descriptors** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | |  | |
| **Units 4**  **Outcome 1**  *Discuss philosophical questions relating to belief, belief formation and justification, and discuss the interrelationship between believing well and living well.* | **Characteristics of study** | | **Key skill** | **DESCRIPTOR: typical performance in each range** | | | | | |
|  | |  | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | | **Very High** |
| Formulating philosophical questions | | **Develop perspectives on philosophical questions** | Identifies relevant philosophical questions within a philosophical issue. | Describes different perspectives for the relevant philosophical questions. | Develops a response to philosophical questions that is informed by relevant philosophical viewpoints, arguments and concepts. | Formulates a critical response to philosophical questions, evaluating relevant philosophical arguments and concepts. | | Defends a refined response to relevant philosophical questions, including critical comparison of relevant arguments and concepts. |
| Outlining and analysing philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Recognise arguments, identifying the premises, the support given for the premises, conclusions, and any assumptions made.** | Identifies the conclusion of an argument. | Describes how a conclusion is supported by some reasoning or examples. | Outlines how separate premises support the conclusion of an argument. | Explains basic logical structure of an argument, including how premises are supported by further reasoning. | | Precise outline of the argument and sub-arguments, including any assumed premises influencing the validity or cogency of the argument. |
| **Outline and analyse philosophical viewpoints and arguments using appropriate terminology.** | Appropriately identifies relevant general perspectives | Clearly explains central viewpoints and supporting examples | Accurate outline of conclusions, supporting premises, implications and any assumptions. | Terminology is used consistently and appropriately. | | Arguments are precisely discussed in terms of their logical structure, using appropriate terminology. |
| Evaluating philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Offer relevant criticisms of arguments by assessing the plausibility of premises and any assumptions made, showing whether the conclusions follow from the premises, and analysing the potential consequences for belief, belief formation and justification** | Identifies a challenge to a perspective. | Describes a counterexample to a viewpoint. | Outlines why a premise in an argument should be rejected using reasoning or counterexamples. | Explains the relative strength of premises in an argument, including which are most vulnerable to criticism. | | Considers objections to premises, assumptions or possible implications, and suggests counter arguments. |
| Identifies a potential consequence of a perspective on belief, belief formation and justification. | Clearly outlines a consequence of a viewpoint relating to belief, belief formation and justification. | Precise outline of a consequence of argument using conditional terminology | Analysis of a consequence of an argument, including the extent to which consequences suggest strengths or limitations of a broader perspective. | |
| Comparing and critically comparing philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Critically compare viewpoints and arguments by comparing the plausibility of the premises or viewpoints, the strength of the assumptions made and the quality of reasoning used** | Identifies a broad similarity or difference between perspectives. | Outlines a general similarity or difference between viewpoints. | Explains how a similarity or difference between premises leads to distinct conclusions. | Analysis of both similarities and differences, explaining why contrasts may occur. | | Brings two arguments into critical discussion with each other, to identify how each argument might inform evaluations of the other. |
| Identifies a broad reason to accept one perspective over another. | Considers how a general objection applies to both viewpoints. | Weighs up how contrasting reasoning may handle a counterexample. | Explains how a contrasting premise can inform a counterargument against the opposing conclusion. | |
| Applying philosophical viewpoints and arguments to contemporary debates, questions of contemporary living and case studies | | **Reflect critically on perspectives and the relationship between believing well and living well** | Identifies relevant perspective on believing well and living well. | Compares perspective on believing well and living well using reasons or examples. | Weighs up reasons for supporting or criticising perspectives on believing well and living well. | Clearly considers possible objections to own perspective on believing well and living well. | | Evaluates the interplay between philosophical perspectives relevant to questions of believing well and living well. |
| **Explain, analyse and apply philosophical concepts** | Identifies relevant philosophical concepts for believing well and living well. | Describes relevant perspectives on believing well and living well. | Explanation of concept in relation to questions of believing well and living well. | Applies arguments relating to philosophical concept to discuss questions of believing well and living well. | | Analyses and applies arguments relating to philosophical concept to discuss questions of believing well and living well. |
| Developing perspectives | | **Use examples from applied philosophical and non-philosophical sources to support philosophical discussion** | Identifies a relevant source to support discussion. | Outlines perspectives within relevant source to support discussion. | Explains how reasoning and viewpoints in relevant source support discussion. | Analyses source in coherent and relevant way to support discussion. | | Uses various sources with rigour when critically discussing contrasting perspectives. |
| Using clear and precise language | | **Formulate and defend philosophical positions using precise language** | States a general perspective in response to a philosophical question. Limited use of appropriate language. | Explains personal viewpoint in response to philosophical question using appropriate language. | Outlines reasons why one position in response to question is preferable to another, sometimes using clear and precise language | Coherent and justified response to philosophical question after comparing arguments, regularly using clear and precise language. | | Coherent and rigorous response to philosophical question, leading to perspective refined by counterargument. Consistent use of clear and precise language. |

KEY to marking scale based on the Outcome at least two tasks contributing total 50 marks

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low 1–10 | Low 11–20 | Medium 21–30 | High 31–40 | Very High 41–50 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VCE PHILOSOPHY**  **SCHOOL-ASSESSED COURSEWORK** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Unit 4 Outcome 2 Performance descriptors** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | |  | |
| **Units 4**  **Outcome 2**  *Discuss case studies in light of epistemological issues associated with belief, belief formation and justification****.*** | **Characteristics of study** | | **Key skill** | **DESCRIPTOR: typical performance in each range** | | | | | |
|  | |  | **Very Low** | **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | | **Very High** |
| Formulating philosophical questions | | **Analyse the relationship between the general questions explored in Area of Study 1 and the epistemological issues arising from selected case studies** | Identifies general question relevant for case study. | Describes an aspect of the case study in light of general question. | Explanation of issue arising from the case study guided by general question. | Detailed discussion of issue arising from case study to reflect on perspectives relating to the general question more broadly. | | Analysis of issue arising from case study to reflect on perspectives relating to the general question more broadly. |
| Outlining and analysing philosophical viewpoints and arguments | | **Identify and analyse assumptions, arguments and viewpoints relating to belief formation and justification found within selected case studies.** | Identifies a conclusion of an argument within case study. | Describes how a conclusion in case study is supported by some reasoning or examples. | Outlines how separate premises support the conclusion of an argument in case study. | Explains basic logical structure of an argument in case study, including how premises are supported by further reasoning. | | Precise outline of the argument and sub-arguments in case studies, including any assumed premises influencing the validity or cogency of the argument. |
| Applying philosophical viewpoints and arguments to contemporary debates, questions of contemporary living and case studies | | **Identify epistemological issues arising from the selected case studies** | Identifies central concepts debated in case study. | Describes epistemological perspectives relevant to case study. | Describes epistemological viewpoints and arguments arising from case study. | Identifies tensions between contrasting viewpoints arising from case study. | | Identifies clear tensions between perspectives and contrasting arguments that may arise from case study. |
| **Use philosophical concepts, arguments and viewpoints found in relevant set texts for Area of Study 1 to analyse epistemological issues arising from selected case studies** | Concepts from set texts used to identify aspects of case study. | Viewpoints from set texts used to explain aspects of the case study. | Reasoning and examples from the set texts are used to explain an issue arising from the case study. | Arguments from the set texts are used to outline reasoning relating to broader epistemological issues in the case study. | | Comparisons are made between arguments in set texts and the analysis of broader epistemological arguments arising in case studies. |
| **Use philosophical concepts, arguments and viewpoints found in relevant set texts for Area of Study 1 to evaluate arguments and viewpoints relating to belief, belief formation and justification found within selected case studies, in the context of epistemological issues** | Takes a general stance on epistemological issues arising in case study that is generally informed by aspects of the set texts. | Identifies a general reason to support a perspective on epistemological issue, drawing broadly from reasoning found in set texts. | Explains reasoning, examples or counterexamples from the set texts to either support or criticise an epistemological viewpoint drawn from case studies. | Outlines arguments from the set texts to test the relative strength of premises of an epistemological argument drawn from case studies. | | Brings an argument from set text into critical discussion with arguments drawn from epistemological case study, to identify how each argument might inform evaluations of the other. |
| Developing perspectives | | **Reflect critically on perspectives** | Identifies relevant perspectives. | Describes perspective using reasons or examples. | Weighs up reasons for supporting or criticising perspectives. | Clearly considers possible objections to own perspective. | | Evaluates the interplay between philosophical perspectives. |
| **Use examples from applied philosophical and non-philosophical sources to support philosophical discussion** | Identifies a relevant source to support discussion. | Describes perspectives within relevant source to support discussion. | Outlines how reasoning and viewpoints in relevant source support discussion. | Analyses source in coherent and relevant way to support discussion. | | Uses various sources with rigour when critically discussing contrasting perspectives. |
| **Develop perspectives on epistemological issues** | Identifies a relevant epistemological issue. | Describes different perspectives on an epistemological issue. | Develops a response to an epistemological issue that is informed by a range of reasons and examples. | Formulates a critical response to epistemological issues, evaluating relevant philosophical arguments and concepts. | | Defends a refined response to relevant epistemological issues, including critical comparison of relevant arguments and concepts. |
| Using clear and precise language | | **Formulate and defend philosophical positions using precise language** | States a general perspective in response to a philosophical question. Limited use of appropriate language. | Explains personal viewpoint in response to philosophical question using appropriate language. | Outlines reasons why one position in response to question is preferable to another, sometimes using clear and precise language | Coherent and justified response to philosophical question after comparing arguments, regularly using clear and precise language. | | Coherent and rigorous response to philosophical question, leading to perspective refined by counterargument. Consistent use of clear and precise language. |

KEY to marking scale based on the Outcome at least two tasks contributing total 50 marks

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very Low 1–10 | Low 11–20 | Medium 21–30 | High 31–40 | Very High 41–50 |