

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Engineering**

**Qualification area**

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

**Fabrication and Welding Intermediate 2  
Practical Assignment**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	4
<b>Pre appeal</b>	4
<b>Post appeal</b>	4

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	4
<b>Pre appeal</b>	4
<b>Post appeal</b>	4

### General comments re entry numbers

The entries to date have been from one centre only. However with the additional support materials and the changes made to the project format there should be an increase in the number of centres submitting candidates in the future.

There were four entries this year and four entries last year.

### General comments

The external assessment for this subject is based on a project involving a practical assignment. The candidates are required to manufacture an artefact based on a given design brief. The assessment is based around the planning, development and evaluation of the assignment. This is the first year that candidates have been required to produce an artefact as part of the assessment process. In previous years this was not required. However after discussion with and feedback from centres it was decided to amend the assignment specification to include its manufacture. SQA also provided a marking scheme this year which helped centres focus on key areas of the assignment and provided candidates with better guidance.

In year 2001 all candidates' marks were within the band range 'B'. This year the marks are spread as follows:

- One candidate at grade 'upper A'
- Two candidates at grade 'B'
- One candidate at grade 'C'

Apart from the candidate at grade 'A' the level of responses was similar to last year. Candidates performed well in the development stage of the assignment and not so well in the planning and evaluation stages. An improvement in the development stage this year could be put down to the introduction of the practical aspect of the assignment where the candidates had to manufacture the artefact. This type of assessment is more suited to candidates from the Fabrication and Welding discipline.

A review of the course units has identified the need to replace the Sheet Metal Forming and Joining Process: Non Thermal unit with the Material Preparation and Forming Skills unit. This revision will be made in the longer term, if possible for session 2003/2004. The changed unit content will reflect better the changes already made to the format of the practical assignment and will provide candidates with more practical experience should they choose to undertake the component units.

An improvement was also evident in the layout of candidate's work. This could be attributed to better guidance being provided by SQA. The introduction of a marking scheme was also a benefit to centres.

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

Boundaries were:

Grade C	50
Grade B	60
Grade A (lower)	70
Grade A (upper)	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 grade boundaries from the normal a priori range.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

The assessment evidence is subject to visiting assessment. A report was produced and forwarded to the centre and SQA. In the main the standard of the candidates' work is reflected in the distribution of the marks. All candidates produced an acceptable artefact which was fit for purpose and met all the requirements of the design brief.

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

The assignment was in three stages, planning, development and evaluation. Candidates who performed well in one stage tended to perform well in the other stages. This tended to average out over all three stages. There was a welcome consistency in performance across the three stages.

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

One candidate had difficulty with the evaluation stage. The standard of the working drawings submitted by candidates could have been better. Not enough detail was given on these drawings.

### **Areas of common misunderstanding**

Candidates were not aware that they had to evaluate the timescales they had set for completion of the assignment.