

Moderation Feedback – Visiting/Postal - 2005

<u>Qualification area</u>	Social Sciences
Subject(s) and Level(s) included in this report	HN Psychology – D7J6 34, D7J7 34, D7J8 35, D4EC 04, D610 04, A4YG 04, A4YK 04, A6V3 04

General comments on moderation activity

It was useful in a number of Centres to have visiting moderation, as the Centres used this to aid their development. The Centre staff made themselves available and asked questions relating to other Units and future delivery.

Specific issues identified

General Comments

There is still a tendency in some Centres to use half marks. This inflates results and is against SQA policy.

Feedback to centres

General

Generally, marking was consistent and to national standards at both HN and NQ levels. Candidates were usually given good written feedback, which was helpful. Occasionally assessors were reminded to give written feedback as this is good practice (or to provide evidence of oral feedback).

It would be useful to have individual checklists for candidates to show where marks were gained for each question and overall totals on each candidate's work. Although most Centres provided this, some did not. It is good practice to have this.

It was good to see evidence of Internal Moderation taking place (in the form of checklists or minutes of meetings).

Well presented material in most Centres made the moderation process much easier.

HN

At HN level marking instructions should be provided for all assessments. Centres should not use half marks. This inflates results and is against SQA policy.

The Unit D4EC 04 Client Psychology and Communication seemed to give a number of Centres problems. This was mainly with level of answers from candidates. Often the psychological principles were not applied but rather a simplistic, common-sense answer to questions that should be dealing with concepts such as operant and classical conditioning or cultural norms.