

Principal Assessor Report 2002

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

Craft and Design - Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of resulted courses in 2001	646
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted courses in 2002	773
------------------------------------	-----

General comments re entry numbers

The above stats, which are a course analysis, include candidates who:

- achieved a grade 1-9 in the external assessment and passed all internal units (course pass)
- achieved a grade 1-9 in the external assessment but did not pass all internal units (course fail)

Candidates who had a 999 in the external assessment are not included unless they completed the External Assessment elements last year and completed the units this year.

General comments

The year on year increase in uptake of the subject, at this level, is very positive.

Year 2000 had 512 candidates so entry levels have steadily increased over 2 years.

This year we definitely do have some genuine, “new” candidates who might have been turned away in the past because likely success at the Higher was far beyond them.

The numbers next year may be considerable if schools are moving the course down into S3 and S4.

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

Boundaries were as follows:

Maximum mark attainable: 150

Upper A	127
A	105
B	91
C	77

There is no Compensatory award at Intermediate 2 in this subject because Intermediate 1 does not exist.

Thus Band 7, 8 and 9 are all No Award.

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 grade boundary of 77 at level C equates with 51.3% for a C “pass”
The grade boundary of 91 at level B equates with 60.7% for a B “pass”
The grade boundary of 105 at level A equates with 70.0% for a A “pass”

The slight increase over the past 3 years (74, 76, 77) in the C boundary will hopefully be addressed next year in the marking scheme for the examination with a view to pulling that boundary back to 75.

I do not, however, wish to pre-judge the responses of next years’ candidates, but grade boundaries of 50%, 60% and 70% would be the ai of the PA, Veters and Setters.

There was a definite feeling within the examining team that there were a few candidates achieving this award who were really no better than a Standard Grade General candidate. The slight increase to 77 as the cut-off score for a “pass” goes a little way towards addressing this.

At the top end of the scale, the feeling was that there were 20 or so candidates who could realistically have achieved a pass at Higher level and they have been awarded an Upper A.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Performance was not dis-similar to previous years.

There are obviously some candidates who had not followed the Design Assignment assessment criteria and / or they were provided with little advice as to what is required by the SQA for this aspect of External Assessment.

(*Design Assignment Guidance document has again been revised and should be in schools before the October break).

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Candidates performed well in aspects of both the DA and the examination.

DA: Section 1 and 2

Exam: Questions 4, 6 and 8

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

DA: Section 3, 4 and 5

Exam: Questions 1, 5 and 7

Areas of common misunderstanding

DA: Section 4

Exam: Question 5

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

In the DA, candidates still produce:

- ◆ Too much *irrelevant* work for Section 1
- ◆ Too little *relevant* work for Sections 3 and 4

It is only necessary to do what is requested in the DA Guidance. This must be shared with candidates who will need some help in interpreting it.

In the examination:

Q1 The introductory question about evaluating a training shoe was badly answered by most candidates; the average score being 1/4.

Candidates were unable to describe a product evaluation technique and this is perhaps because it is included in a Unit which many schools teach very early in the course.

Q5 Candidates seemed to know only one idea generation technique and virtually every script described some version of a spider diagram which was then given one of two names: brainstorming or mind-mapping.

Q7 The question about ergonomic aspects of a hand blender was poorly answered with many candidates being confused between the 3 sub-divisions of that topic; physiology, psychology and anthropometric data.

On average, candidates achieved over 50% in all other questions.