



**Standard Grade 2012
Internal Assessment Report
Technological Studies**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Standard Grade qualifications in this subject.

Standard Grade

Titles/levels of Standard Grade qualifications verified:

Technological Studies
Application of Technology assignment

General comments

The assessments of all centres verified were Accepted. In most cases the assessments were very closely aligned to national standards.

Candidates from most centres completed all sub-elements of their assignments.

In one centre, where the sample contained a number of assignments which were not completed or of very poor quality (and awarded grades 4 or 5), the assessment of the few assignments awarded grades 1 and 2 was too lenient. If all of the reports from this centre had been awarded credit grades, the centre would not have been Accepted. However, because it is very difficult not to confirm grades 4 and 5, the overall assessment was within acceptable tolerance.

Administration of assessments

All centres verified, used appropriate instruments of assessment and applied the marking scheme from the SQA document: *Guidance on Assessment — Application of Technology Assignment*.

In most centres there seemed to only be one assessor, which is understandable, as there is likely to be one teacher responsible for teaching the Course in most schools where it is presented. One centre verified did have evidence of two assessors and their assessments were closely matched, which implies good internal verification procedures.

Most centres submitted evidence from only one assignment, all candidates solved the same problem. In two centres there was evidence from more than one assignment. In these cases it is not clear whether candidates had a choice or were allocated different assignments.

Areas of good practice

In all centres, candidates seem to have been effectively prepared for the assignments, evidence was logically presented and clear. Where this was not the case for individual candidates, the grades reflected the quality of their responses.

There was evidence this year of a more thorough technical approach to the selection and justification of resources for the solution than in previous years.

Many candidates established the important performance criteria and structured the rest of their reports around them. This seemed to make it easier for them to score well in most of the sub-elements.

Specific areas for improvement

There were patterns of candidate response from individual centres, often in the way systems diagrams or flowcharts are presented. This can be explained by how these topics are taught.

In one centre, none of the candidates showed a complete systems diagram, which limited the candidates to two marks for that sub-element as they showed no links between the sub-systems.

In the use of computer simulation software, few candidates attempted to adjust range parameters prior to simulation.

Frequently, evaluations were scant and lacked detail. Internal assessment did not always reflect this.