The TOK Presentation & the Candidate PPD...

How to support candidates for IB Moderation...

KOGNITY

Background

- Theory of Knowledge teacher since 2012

- IB Diploma teacher of mathematics since 1994

- Routinely attend Cat 3 Workshops

- Attended Association of German Int'l Schools Full Day workshop focused on TOK Presentation & the PPD: 2017

- Tips shared with TOK Teaching Team consisting of approximately 6 members resulting in…
  - Moderated grades steady since 2017

TOK Presentation PPD

Moderators think in terms of 'Thresholds' when evaluating against the Global Assessment Instrument

Global Assessment Instrument:

Do(es) the presenter(s) succeed in showing how TOK concepts can have practical application?					
Level 5 9–10	Level 4 7–8	Level 3 5–6	Level 2 3–4	Level 1 1–2	0
The presentation is focused on a *well-formulated* **knowledge question** that is *clearly connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *effectively explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *convincing* **arguments**, with *investigation of different* **perspectives**. The **outcomes of the analysis** are shown to be *significant to the chosen real-life situation and to others.*	The presentation is focused on a **knowledge question** that is *connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *clear* **arguments**, with *acknowledgment of different* **perspectives**. The **outcomes of the analysis** are shown to be *significant to the real-life situation.*	The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** that has *some connection* to a specified **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *some adequate* **arguments**. There is *some awareness of the significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis.**	The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** and a **real-life situation**, although the *connection between them may not be convincing*. There is *some attempt* to explore the knowledge question. There is *limited awareness of the significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis.**	The presentation describes a **real-life situation without reference to any knowledge question**, or treats an abstract knowledge question **without connecting it to any specific real-life situation**.	The presentation does not reach the standard described by levels 1–5.
Some possible characteristics					
Sophisticated Discerning Insightful Compelling Lucid	Credible Analytical Organized Pertinent Coherent	Relevant Adequate Acceptable Predictable	Underdeveloped Basic Unbalanced Superficial Derivative	Ineffective Unconnected Incoherent Formless	

'Thresholds': The Overview

- The *1st threshold* is the **KQ itself**. Critically, if the singular KQ identified is **not** a KQ then the presentation will be marked down to a Level 1;

- The *2nd threshold* regards **how well connected** the KQ is to the RLS. If the connection is deemed unconvincing the moderator will disallow achievement of a Level 3 regardless of the nature of the **argument**;

- The *3rd threshold* regards a **convincing connection** between KQ and the RLS but, if **perspectives** are not evident, Level 4 will be denied;

- Level 4 requires clear, explicit evidence of **'perspectives'**;

- The *final threshold* involves **explicit outcomes**, including applications to other, related RLSs. Outcomes here should include a knowledge claim[s] resulting directly from the analysis. **Implications...!?**

1st Threshold

The *1st threshold* is the **KQ itself**. Critically, if the singular KQ identified is **not** a KQ then the presentation will be marked down to a Level 1;

Might explain why some presentations are drastically moderated down…

Level 2 3–4	Level 1 1–2
The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** and a **real-life situation**, although the *connection between them may not be convincing*. There is *some attempt* to explore the knowledge question. There is *limited awareness of the significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis**.	The presentation describes a **real-life situation without reference to any knowledge question**, or treats an abstract knowledge question **without connecting it to any specific real-life situation**.

2nd Threshold

The *2nd threshold* regards **how well connected** the KQ is to the RLS. If the connection is deemed unconvincing the moderator will disallow achievement of a Level 3 regardless of the nature of the **argument**;

Candidates will want to make the connection explicit & convincing on the PPD...

Level 3 5–6	Level 2 3–4
The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** that has *some connection* to a specified **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *some adequate* **arguments**. There is *some awareness of the significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis**.	The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** and a real-life situation, although the *connection between them may not be convincing*. There is *some attempt to explore the* knowledge question. There is *limited awareness of the significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis**.

3rd Threshold

The *3rd threshold* regards a **_convincing connection_** between KQ and the RLS but, if **_perspectives_** are not evident, Level 4 will be denied;

Note that Level 3 is the first time the qualifier 'argument' appears… EXPLICIT!

Level 4 7–8	Level 3 5–6
The presentation is focused on a **knowledge question** that is *connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *clear* **arguments**, with *acknowledgment* of *different* **perspectives**. The outcomes of the **analysis** are shown to be *significant to the real-life situation*.	The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** that has *some connection* to a specified **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *some adequate* **arguments**. There is *some awareness* of the significance of the **outcomes of the analysis**.

Level 4

Level 4 requires clear, explicit evidence of *'perspectives'*;

AOKs...
WOKs...
Culture...
Gender...
Historical...
Economic...
Generational...
Authoritative...
Technological...
Socio-economic...

Explicit..!!

Level 4 7–8	Level 3 5–6
The presentation is focused on a **knowledge question** that is *connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *clear* **arguments**, with *acknowledgment* of *different* **perspectives**. The **outcomes of the analysis** are shown to be *significant* to the real-life situation.	The presentation identifies a **knowledge question** that has *some connection* to a specified **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *some adequate* **arguments**. There is *some awareness* of the *significance* of the **outcomes of the analysis**.

Final Threshold…

The *final threshold* involves **explicit outcomes**, including applications to other, related RLSs. Outcomes here should include a knowledge claim[s] resulting directly from the analysis. *Implications..?!*

"Short, snappy unjustified questions / statements…"
-Ric Sims-

Level 5 9–10	Level 4 7–8
The presentation is focused on a *well-formulated* **knowledge question** that is *clearly connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *effectively explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *convincing* **arguments**, with *investigation of different* **perspectives**. The **outcomes of the analysis** are shown to be *significant* to the chosen real-life situation and to others.	The presentation is focused on a **knowledge question** that is *connected* to a *specified* **real-life situation**. The knowledge question is *explored* in the context of the real-life situation, using *clear* **arguments**, with *acknowledgment* of *different* **perspectives**. The **outcomes of the analysis** are shown to be *significant* to the real-life situation.

General Tips/Ideas: Part 1

- Moderation based on first two pages only
  - Page 3: Might be ignored; can support candidate…

- One 'sloppy' teacher's PPD being 20% "off": Implications
  - Argument here for Teams taken off timetable…

- Write no more than 11 minutes; subtract media time

- Never award a 10… Why risk it when 7-10 is an 'A'?

General Tips/Ideas: Part 2

- Page 3: "Hedgings"
  - *"Despite the fact that candidate did not mention 'perspectives' I submit perspectives were evident when…"*
  - *"Despite too little argument…"* **phrase nudges moderator**
  - **NEVER write** *"Not a KQ…"*; **better is** *"Despite the debatable nature of the KQ…"*
- DO NOT simply write down "Possible Characteristics"
  - "May as well write nothing…"

Some possible characteristics				
Sophisticated	Credible	Relevant	Underdeveloped	Ineffective
Discerning	Analytical	Adequate	Basic	Unconnected
Insightful	Organized	Acceptable	Unbalanced	Incoherent
Compelling	Pertinent	Predictable	Superficial	Formless
Lucid	Coherent		Derivative	
			Rudimentary	

General Tips/Ideas: Part 3

- Moderator Claim:
  - Q&A @ end of presentation can be used to 'salvage' some open, relevant Global Assessment Instrument issues…!
  - Class itself can look out for omissions and/or phrase questions to 'salvage' any oversights/unclear delivery
  - Note: Candidates may *not* have a copy of the PPD

- Teaching Teams: Consider consistent formatting of the candidate Page 3 PPDs selected for the sample
  - Provides evidence of Internal Moderations…

Team Format of Page 3:

Candidate **effectively links** the "Faraday versus Maxwell" stages of the HS evolution/maturation by provoking with the 'qualitative versus quantitative' nature of such an immature AOK. The KQ directly relates to the reliability of any generalizations within disciplines like Psychology, Economics, etc.

A simple but very effective argument structure sees two fundamentals attacked: [1] "Generalizations are reliable" and [2] "Generalizations are not reliable". Extensive evidence is offered to support/refute initial claim about NON-RELIABILITY made: Katz study of stereotypes and changes across almost four decades; non-representative samples; cultural interpretations; lack of replicability; no causality. Structure = Evidence to support the claim then counterclaims then rebuttals to the counterclaims quickly and convincingly delivered. Copious evidence for follow-up claim about RELIABILITY made: improved technology; replicable studies; memory research breakthroughs; more rigour and less interpretation due to more foundational knowledge established/accepted. Very effective blurring of the HS with the NS when biology {measureable} issues in play. **Overall extensive evidence of TOK perspectives addressed as highlighted in the candidate's PPD.**

Closure brought back to the RLS with explicit references & examples regarding 'significance' and outcomes. Convincing overall arguments brought to an effective close pointing out the pluses/minuses while leaving the listeners with the respectful right to decide. Falls short of 10 marks since arguably significance limited in scope to the opening RLS and not "to others".

Page 3 Structure: Moderation

- **1st Paragraph**
  - Convinces moderator of the critical RLS & KQ *connection...*

- **2nd Paragraph**
  - Addresses effectiveness of the *'argument'*
  - Highlights as appropriate TOK *'perspectives'*

- **3rd Paragraph**
  - Addresses *'significance / implications'* as related to opening RLS and, hopefully, other related RLS

PPD Final: Candidate

- **Issue of Word Count {500}:**
  - AOKs ; WOKs; PK; SK; HumSci …
  - Compare + contrast…
  - Conclusion = AOKs are…
  - If human+robot => something…

- **Issue of ManageBac…?**
  - Word count vs. Lines available = CAREFUL!
  - If narrative then create breaks // On the same line…
    - 'Double slash' for the breaks to reduce blank/'dead' space