



## External Assessment Report 2009

---

Subject	Architectural Technology
Level	Higher

**The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.**

**This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.**

## **Comments on candidate performance**

The standard is much improved with 8 candidates scoring 80% or over and only 8 below 50%.

There is evidence of candidates being better prepared for the exam.

Generally candidates performed to the same level in both project and exam ie those who did well did so in both areas.

## **Areas in which candidates performed well**

Candidates showed a good understanding of Building Design and the Technology involved.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

There are still a number of candidates who have problems with the basic numeracy involved in Site Surveying.

Sketching was very poor.

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

Focus on candidates with numeracy problems.

Concentrate on candidates ability to sketch the required details.

Centres seem to be using the past papers in preparing for the exam – this reflects in the high exam marks.

Project work could be improved by using the good practice exemplified. This would also increase the candidates enjoyment of the whole design process.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2008	65
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2009	62
------------------------------------	----

## Statistical information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 200				
A	21.0%	21.0%	13	140
B	27.4%	48.4%	17	120
C	11.3%	59.7%	7	100
D	1.6%	61.3%	1	90
No award	38.7%	100.0%	24	-

## General commentary on grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- Each year SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.
- The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.
- SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.