

## **Moderation Feedback**

**Assessment Panel:**

**PSE/SVS**

**Qualification area**

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

**PSE – Course Int. 1, 2 and Higher  
PSD – H.N. Units**

---

## **Visiting Moderation**

### **General comments on visiting moderation activity**

The presentation of candidate's evidence was of a high standard and well organised. In some instances a large proportion of candidates had been withdrawn, particularly in the case of the PSE course. In such cases, however, substitute candidate evidence was available. Generally marking of the internally assessed components of the PSE was of a high standard and articulated clearly within the marking guidelines. Like last year, moderation of the sample was a time intensive process and moderators spent a lot of time scrutinising evidence in conjunction with marking guidelines. The opportunity to meet with candidates during moderation visits was greatly appreciated by moderators.

A total of 32 HN visits from moderators were carried out over the period August 2001 to June 2002, many of which took the form of development visits. Evidence for moderation for these units was generally well organised and candidate portfolios were clearly cross-referenced against performance criteria.

### **Specific issues identified**

In one centre there appeared to be some confusion between 'self evaluation' and 'awareness and development technique' within candidates' folios of evidence. The relatively high incidence of this in one centre would suggest a teaching error, and there is, perhaps some requirement for ongoing staff development in this area. Generally feedback from centres indicated that although better than last year, the marking instructions were still too ambiguous and very difficult and time consuming to apply to candidates work. Again assessors commented on the over-abundance of paper work.

As in previous years there was a general lack of appreciation of what 'negotiation' entailed, particularly at Higher level within the Personal Statement. Minor differences in marking were identified in some centres. These were discussed and accepted by centre staff.

## **Feedback to centres**

Feedback given directly to assessors and SQA coordinators from moderators during visits was generally well received. Agreement was reached on any minor points of disagreement raised by moderators following discussion and explanations.

With regard to both development visits and moderation of materials, centres have generally received encouraging feedback, which has helped them move in the delivery of their PSE/PSD programmes. The requirement for candidate evidence to articulate clearly with performance criteria has been highlighted and centres have received positive feedback wherein examples of good practice has been recognised.