

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Engineering**

**Qualification area**

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

**Fabrication and Welding Engineering Higher**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	6
<b>Pre appeal</b>	6
<b>Post appeal</b>	6

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	8
<b>Pre appeal</b>	8
<b>Post appeal</b>	8

### General comments re entry numbers

There was a small increase in entry numbers this year. Last year there was only one centre. This year there were two.

### General comments

The overall ability of candidates has improved since last year. Candidates are paying more attention to what the question paper is actually asking rather than making their own assumptions about what is being asked.

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

C	=	50%
B	=	60%
Lower A	=	70%
Upper A	=	85%

### 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

There was no need to change any of the boundaries from the normal a priori range.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

The paper covered all parts of the course as laid down in the course arrangements document. Some candidates seemed unaware of the detail contained in the course document and subsequently under-performed. Others seemed better prepared for the format of the paper and realised the importance of noting the marks weighting for each question and providing an appropriate amount of detail to match the weighting.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

The questions on weld procedures, specifications and NDT were well answered by the majority of candidates.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

Candidates could have answered the question on pre-heat temperatures better and gained more marks by showing the intermediate steps to the final answer. The questions on weld symbols and work hardening were not well answered.

### **Areas of common misunderstanding**

Candidates should be encouraged to give more detail where explanations or descriptions are required. Too many candidates tend to give one-word or short statement answers and as a result are penalised for a lack of detail.

The drawing/sketch was not interpreted well by the majority of candidates. The interpretation of graphical material is an integral part of Fabrication and Welding Engineering and is also covered and assessed in the units.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

Candidates should be encouraged to take time to read what the Question Paper is actually telling them. For example in the interpretation of the sketch only one candidate appreciated that the component was manufactured by forming.

The questions on materials and their properties were not particularly well answered. Centres should pay more attention to this area.

Generally candidates have improved the quality of the sketches in their answers and this should be encouraged.

Centres could offer more guidance to candidates on the layout and information to be inserted in the operations sheet. This question has a high mark allocation and by paying more attention to detail there is scope for candidates to improve their grades.