

## Moderation Feedback – Postal - 2005

**Assessment Panel:**

**Chemistry**

**Qualification area**

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

**Chemistry;  
Higher, Intermediate 2, Intermediate 1.**

## General comments on moderation activity

Within the sample, an increase was seen in the best practice of internal moderation, this eliminated many O1&2 assessment errors. A number of centres are also giving sensible advice to candidates on redrafting O3 reports.

## Specific issues identified

A range of performance was seen within the sample moderated. There was a marked improvement in the materials submitted by these centres, all the candidate evidence had been internally moderated and a number of assessment errors had been corrected in the process. Two centres showed accurate and rigorous assessment of candidate evidence, thorough internal moderation had taken place in both centres.

Several specific issues were identified.

- The Moderation Sample Form was not always completed correctly.
- Advice given in *Update on Chemistry NABs: Higher Chemistry(2000)* and *Marking Guidelines: General Information for Markers* was not always followed.
- Ten of the eleven centres assessed Outcomes 1&2 accurately and carefully. One centre was inconsistent in its assessment judgments.
- Outcome 3 often causes problems at moderation as the standard of candidate evidence varies considerably. Problems seen during this event were:
  1. Incorrect scales and incorrect plotting of points on graphs.
  2. The use of the origin as a point in graphs drawn for Higher level, Unit 1, PPA2 “Effect of temperature on rate of reaction”.
  3. Graphs drawn by ‘joining the dots’ though the mark scheme requires a line of best fit.
  4. Incorrect and/or inconsistent rounding of calculated values for rates.
  5. Several candidates from the same centre recording temperature values of 30°C, 40°C, 50°C etc. in the report for Higher level, Unit 1, PPA2; these exact temperatures must be difficult to achieve in the lab.

## Feedback to centres

### Outcomes 1&2

- There is increasing evidence that centres are adopting the best practice of internal moderation. Moderation is simplified when internal moderators use a different colour of ink, sign and date the evidence and explain clearly why decisions have been made.
- A significant number of centres did not complete the Moderation Sample Form (MSOO) correctly.
- Half marks awarded in NAB tests are rounded up, i.e. 17.5/30 is rounded to 18/30. Centres should ensure that they consult *Update on Chemistry NABs: Higher Chemistry(2000)* and *Marking Guidelines: General Information for Markers (NAB 001, Unit 1 at each level)*.

### Outcome 3

- Outcome 3 evidence for each candidate, i.e. a PPA report from Unit 1, must be included in the materials sent for moderation. PPA report proformas were revised in 2000. As core skills are embedded in the revised PPAs via evaluation, candidate evidence which uses unrevised proformas cannot be accepted.
- Moderation is simplified when comments on the PPA reports explain why marking decisions have been made.
- Inconsistent/incorrect rounding of calculated rates can reduce the accuracy of the data used to plot graphs, e.g. one candidate rounded 0.0239 to 0.024 but rounded 0.00976 to 0.009.
- Care should be taken in the marking of graphs. Errors in plotting points and labelling axes require the candidate to redraft. This is also the case when the marking scheme requires a line of best fit and the candidate draws the graph by 'joining the dots'.