

## **Moderation Feedback – Visiting/Central - 2005**

<b><u>Qualification area</u></b>	<b>Social Sciences</b>
<b>Subject(s) and Level(s) included in this report</b>	<b>HN Social Sciences: Integrative Assessment (exam) HN Social Sciences: Integrative Assessment (project)</b>

---

## **General comments on moderation activity**

Generally, Centres are providing well presented materials that are well labelled and easier to work through than previously.

Overall, marking is to national standard, with a slight tendency in a few Centres to be lenient at the 'A' grade. This may be because of the complexity of the current project and exam requiring integration beyond that expected in University courses.

There were better responses overall this year. This may be because we are giving better advice to our candidates as we now have experience with the Unit requirements. There is also evidence of more 'Social Science' based responses, rather than 'common-sense stories'.

A number of Centres gave good written feedback highlighting strengths as well as weaknesses of the candidates' responses. This is good practice.

## **Specific issues identified**

In one Centre half marks were being used, which inflated results. This has been pointed out before. Centres must avoid the use of half marks.

One Centre had allowed the use of notes in the exam. This inflated results by at least a grade. The Centre was not accepted until grades were reduced (or a new exam sat) as it is clear in the unit specification that the use of notes is not allowed.

## Feedback to centres

Generally, Centres are providing well presented materials that are well labelled and easier to work through than previously.

Centres should be aware that candidates are being asked to write in an integrated way in the exam – there is no need to separate ‘knowledge’ from ‘understanding and linking’ in their answer. We may do this in the marks (as per exemplar) but students should be writing a complete answer without headings.

In one Centre a reassessment was just a re-do of one question. This is unacceptable as it is clear that a separate paper should be used. The exam is marked across the three questions, with a 50% pass rate overall. There is no need for the candidate to pass every question.

There is still a tendency for candidates to write too much on the ‘topic’ in question 3 rather than on each discipline’s ‘treatment’ of the topic. The focus should be on how each discipline is involved in broadening our understanding of the topic. There will be some work on theories (or research or concepts) from each discipline relating to the topic but the bulk of the answer should be about how each discipline deals with the topic – similarities and differences etc.

Many Centres were giving good written feedback on projects and in the exam (highlighting strengths and weaknesses). However, a minority did not provide written feedback and therefore it was difficult to be sure why certain marks were given (this must be confusing for candidates too).

Overall, marking is to national standard, with a slight tendency in a few Centres to be lenient at the ‘A’ grade. This may be because of the complexity of the current project and exam requiring integration beyond that expected in University courses.

It was good to see evidence of Internal Moderation taking place in most Centres.

All Centres should provide evidence (checklists, notes, meeting minutes etc) of Internal Moderation.

Prior moderation of assessments (exam) made the moderation process easier, as problems were ironed out at that stage. We would recommend that Centres use this service for the exam and re-sit where possible.