

Principal Assessor Report 2002

Assessment Panel:

**Construction Craft
and
Construction Technician**

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

Construction Industry Practice – Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2001	
Pre appeal	37
Post appeal	37

Number of entries in 2002	
Pre appeal	36
Post appeal	Not available

General comments re entry numbers

Over 60 candidates, from four centres, started the course and 36 of these completed the external assessment project. In 2001, five centres presented.

General comments

There was a marginal decrease in the ability of the candidate group from that of 2001, with slight decreases in both the pass rate and mean mark. 2001 results had shown a marked improvement on 2000, and generally the level of achievement in 2001 has been maintained. There was a greater range of ability in the candidate group than in 2001, as indicated by increases in both the number of candidates not receiving an award and the number achieving grades A and B.

Candidate performance varied considerably between centres. The mean mark for all candidates was 102.8 from 200. The mean marks for the four centres were 121.3, 118.0, 98.7 and 92.9.

There was a small improvement in the marks awarded for the evaluating stage of the project.

Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

These were unchanged from year 2001.

Grade	Lowest mark (from 200)
Upper A	170
Lower A	140
B	120
C	100

General commentary on grade boundaries

Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries.

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The same project specification was used in years 2001 and 2002. The characteristics of the candidature were unchanged and there was no evidence to justify any changes in grade boundaries.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Results were reasonable, with a number of candidates submitting excellent project portfolios.

Centres seem to have overcome the problems of 2001 in interpretation of the project specification.

One centre, as in 2001, did not allow candidates to start the practical assignment until early June, after the published date for submission to SQA. Although these projects were submitted late, the candidates' results were by far the best of the four centres.

The standard of drawing work showed considerable variation between centres, and little variation between candidates at a single centre. This seems to indicate that centres are placing different emphasis on the requirement for drawing work of the assignment to at least maintain the standards of the course component unit Drawing for Building.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

The mean mark for the *planning stage* was 21.2/40 (21.6 in 2001) and that for the *developing stage* 61.8/120 (64.7 in 2001). One centre achieved mean marks of 28.0 and 70.5.

The candidates from one centre produced excellent scale drawings.

Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at quantifying and costing materials.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

The mean mark for the *evaluating stage* showed a slight improvement from 17.7/40 in 2001 to 19.8/40 in 2002, although many candidates continue to have difficulty in appraising their own work.

Sketches and drawings produced by candidates from two centres were extremely poor, with little indication that candidates had any knowledge of or skills in building drawing.

Areas of common misunderstanding

In the *planning stage*, for the third year, some candidates mistakenly set timescales for completion of the construction project rather than for their own assignment. Teacher/lecturer feedback on draft items of evidence should have prevented this.

The quality of evidence for the setting work of the practical assignment varied from centre to centre. One centre produced an excellent video, which clearly identified each candidate and the role he/she played in setting out. Another centre simply provided a photograph to identify each candidate, which provided no evidence of activity.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

Currently, there is little evidence of teacher/lecturer feedback to students on draft items of evidence, or of any shadow marking of projects for support of estimates. Candidates should be provided with feedback to enable them to improve their work prior to final submission to SQA. Before submission to SQA, teachers/lecturers should look over the candidate portfolios to ensure that presentation is satisfactory and that no items of evidence are missing.

Centres must ensure that in all cases:

- the SQA flysheet is attached to each project
- the candidate and teacher/lecturer declarations are signed.