

## **Moderation Feedback**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Physics**

**Qualification area**

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

**Physics – Standard Grade**

## Central Moderation

### General comments on central moderation activity

- Some of the material to be moderated had been sent to Dalkeith by centres. This resulted in a member of staff from Glasgow having to collect this material so that it would be available for the second day's moderation. Fortunately this did not hold up the moderation.
- Several centres did not submit materials for moderation by the due date.

### Specific issues identified

- Arithmetical errors were found in the evidence submitted by 10 centres – this figure is broadly similar to that of previous years and represents about 18% of the centres moderated. The errors found in this category included incorrect summations of marks; incorrect transfer of marks to Assessment Record sheets and, in two instances, incorrect application of the mark-to-grade formula.
- Incomplete evidence was submitted by 14 centres. In the majority of these cases, this was because no evidence was supplied of candidates' attempts at Practical Techniques – simply a mark awarded out of 16 was given on the Flyleaf. In other instances, evidence did not show that candidates were given the opportunity to carry out all 8 Practical Techniques. One centre sent in a class record sheet that clearly indicated that one technique had not been achieved by any candidate. The Standard Grade Physics Arrangements document states that candidates must be "...assessed on **all** of the eight techniques...", that an assessment record which provides a "...summary of the candidate's attempts at the eight prescribed techniques..." should be used, and that this record is part of the "Evidence of a candidate's attainment of Practical Abilities..." (Paragraphs 5.6.2; 5.6.7; 5.6.8)
- In 2 cases moderators disagreed with the standard of assessment decisions made by the centre.
- Investigate Skills Objectives causing problems in some centres include:
  - G4(b) Some centres expect candidates to say how they intend to measure both variables – too harsh;  
Other centres accept a mention of only one variable to be measured – too lenient.
  - RR2 Graph plotting is still being marked too leniently in many centres.
  - RR3 (d) Candidates must state how variables were kept constant – many centres are too lenient here.
  - G1-4 Some centres allow candidates to continue with inappropriate Investigations. Centres can, and should, intervene at this stage to allow a candidate to continue. Any intervention should be indicated on the candidate's booklet.

## Feedback to centres

- Every year about 18% of centres fail to have the grades that they have awarded to candidates confirmed due to **arithmetic errors**. It would be helpful both to centres and the moderating team if the arithmetic used in arriving at candidates' grades were checked. Common faults include incorrect summations of marks awarded for investigations; incorrect transfer of marks to Assessment Record sheets and incorrect application of the mark-to-grade formula.
- Centres should ensure that the evidence submitted for moderation is complete. In particular, an Assessment Record should be maintained for all candidates, detailing their attempts at all 8 Practical Techniques. This Assessment Record must be submitted as part of the evidence to be moderated. See the 'Arrangements in Physics', paragraphs 5.6.2; 5.6.7 and 5.6.8.
- It is permissible, and in the interests of some candidates, for teachers to intervene at the generative stage of an Investigation so that a candidate does not proceed with an inappropriate Investigation. Such an intervention (which should be indicated on the candidate's investigation booklet) can often benefit the candidate in the later part of the Investigation – see the appendix, issued in March 2000, to the Standard Grade Arrangements document.