

Principal Assessor Report 2002

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

Craft and Design – Standard Grade

Statistical information: update

Number of resulted entries in 2001	15,148
------------------------------------	--------

Number of resulted entries in 2002	15,218
------------------------------------	--------

General comments re entry numbers

Number of candidates continues to increase.

General comments

The feedback from markers confirms my own feeling that candidates performed well across all three levels.

Candidates were more appropriately entered for Credit/General and General/Foundation level papers with a greater percentage of candidates achieving a pass at the higher paper entered.

Grade boundaries

The percentage for grades were as follows:

Credit

1 68

2 50

General

3 60

4 48

Foundation

5 63

6 43

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

We have for the first time in my experience realistic cut-off scores at General level.

Credit and Foundation cut-off scores are also satisfactory.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The better differentiation between the Credit and General papers has resulted in a greater number of candidates gaining at least a General level pass. Although there are geographical differences, candidates did perform well at all three levels. I am pleased to report that two candidates achieved full marks in the Credit paper. Although the situation is improving, there are still a number of candidates who are clearly Foundation are being presented at General/Credit levels.

Overall I feel that there has been an improved performance by candidates.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Credit Paper

- Question 1: Was well answered although several candidates confused “average” with 5th to 95th percentile. Some very good extended answers by candidates.
- Question 5: A significant number of candidates scores well. The term “malleable” was well understood by the majority.
- Question 6: Candidates responded well to all areas being examined.
- Question 7: Apart from naming an adhesive this question was well answered.
- Question 8: With the exception of (b) “Analysis” candidates were well prepared at Credit level, candidates scored heavily on the “Design Knowledge” question.

General Paper

- Question 2: Very well answered question with the exception of naming a cross halving joint.
- Question 3: This proved to be a standard question for most candidates.
- Question 7: Again this question was well answered.

Foundation Paper

Question 1: Well answered.

Question 2: Apart from (h) “Aesthetic Appeal” this question was well answered.

Questions 3&4: Well answered.

Question 5: Some confusion between through and stopped housing otherwise well answered.

Question 6: This was one of the few metal based questions to be well answered.

Questions 7, 8, 9: These were all well answered.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Credit Paper

Question 1: A great number of candidates thought “cost” was a property of a thermoplastic.

Question 2: Few candidates could name the tool for cutting profile B. Although “metalwork” was highlighted some candidates described a woodwork situation.

Question 3: Many candidates could not name the first tap used.

Question 4: Sketching a fluidiser and labelling the main parts proved difficult although most candidates scored one mark.

Question 7: Naming an adhesive proved too specialised for most.

Question 8: A mixed response to “Analysis” as part of the design process.

General Paper

Question 1: Candidates confused between Try-Square and Engineer’s Square.

Question 2: Candidates seemed unfamiliar with a halving joint.

Question 4: Many candidates did not realise a materials specification was given. The centre drill although examined in a recent paper could only be identified by a few. A good number of candidates had seen a Micrometer and knew its purpose but could not name it.

Question 5: Confusion between mortise gauge and marking gauge.

Question 6: Although similar areas have been examined in the recent past candidates still had difficulty with the metalwork aspects of the question.

Question 8: Many candidates could not state two human dimensions. The reason for a long handle on a turning tool proved too specialised.

Foundation Paper

No particular areas of difficulty.

Areas of common misunderstanding**Credit Paper**

Question 2: Confusion between woodwork and metalwork lathe.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

- ◆ Although most candidates continue to give one word answers I was encouraged to see an increase in the number of candidates who offered extended answers.
- ◆ As in past years questions relating to metalwork were least well answered.
- ◆ A number of candidates still do not read the question properly resulting in a needless loss of marks.
- ◆ Although improving a significant number of candidates were entered for the wrong papers.
- ◆ Candidates should take time when asked to include a sketch in their answer.
- ◆ The vast majority of candidates were well prepared for the examination taken.
- ◆ Design knowledge questions at Credit level were particularly well answered.