

Moderation Feedback

Assessment Panel:	Chemistry
--------------------------	------------------

Qualification area

Subject(s) and Level(s) included in this report	Chemistry Standard Grade Practical Abilities
--	---

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

The overall feeling of the moderation group was that the standard of candidate evidence was good except for diagrams which are still very variable.

Specific issues identified

Techniques

- 1 No old-style sheets were seen but a minority of centres did not indicate how the marks allocated were divided between safety, manipulation and write-up.
- 2 Diagrams were very variable with many centres presenting excellent material in stark contrast to centres which accepted very poor quality work.

The Arrangements document (page 17) states ‘candidates should be encouraged to draw clear **sectional** diagrams’. The question asked of a diagram is ‘would the experiment work as drawn?’.

Candidates should be encouraged to draw clear **sectional** diagrams using a ruler and a pencil.
- 3 There was widespread evidence of internal moderation which ensures a consistent approach to assessment of candidate evidence and streamlines the central moderation event; the material produced by these centres was of a uniform high standard. Many centres clearly indicate why marks have been awarded or deducted; this is of great help to moderators. Best practice is, however, to use red ink when adding comments to candidate evidence so they cannot be confused with information written by the candidate.
- 4 Technique D1 (titration). If a titration is not within the recommended variation of $\pm 0.2 \text{ cm}^3$ the candidate has not overtaken key ability 9. At the same time centres should not penalise candidates by demanding a variation of $\pm 0.1 \text{ cm}^3$.

Investigations

- 1 The number of different investigations used is decreasing with Detergents, Current/Voltage and Inks being carried out in the majority of cases.
- 2 A minority of centres had allowed candidates to investigate a variable which was not viable. The Arrangements (page 21) state ‘*a candidate who identifies a relevant aspect which cannot be investigated within the constraints of the school situation, the candidate should be directed to other alternatives without penalty.*’ Variables such as **shake, rattle and roll** (applied to Detergents) should not be regarded as relevant so candidates should be directed to other alternatives.

3 Marks are still being awarded for RR3d when the candidate has not indicated which variables have been kept constant.