

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Social Sciences

Qualification area

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

**Sociology, Higher Still Units : D429; D430; D431;
D432 ; D433; and D434**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

The Central Moderation process took place by post and the process did not raise any problems.

Overall across the Centres, the scripts were marked consistently and the moderation process did not reveal any discrepancies between the markers at each of the Centres and the external moderator.

The paper work (e.g. student cover sheets, etc.) that accompanied the scripts was an improvement on previous years.

Specific issues identified

- Written feedback to students across Centres continues to be somewhat inconsistent, with some Centres giving appropriate feedback on the scripts, enabling students to build on their strengths and address their weaknesses, while other Centres providing little or no written feedback.
- With one exception - where there were two scripts with a very slight discrepancy (i.e. one to two marks), between the marker and the external moderator, in marks allocated on specific questions- in general, there was no discrepancy between the markers and the external moderator, demonstrating consistent marking practice across Centres.
- The scripts were marked in accordance with the relevant unit specifications and Centres, on the whole adhered to the SQA guidelines with regard to procedures for marking and moderation.
- In the case of one Centre all the scripts submitted for external moderation (12 in all) were fails. The high failure rate seems puzzling. A number of students had difficulties addressing specific Outcomes, especially related to the evaluative aspects of the question/s, which was in fact picked up by the tutor.
- The system for remediation and re-taking assessments was not always clear in the case of a small minority of Centres.

Feedback to centres

- In general, the overall standard of assessment was consistent and valid with Centres adhering to the specified standards of the Units delivered.
- Staff in most Centres (especially those that provided written feedback) clearly picked up on issues that students had not addressed effectively and /or were not meeting the required standards.
- Written feedback continues to be inconsistent across Centres. Some Centres have been giving excellent written feedback (identifying strengths and areas for improvement) and others giving no written feedback. Centres should provide clear written feedback to students or at the very least should make clear how feedback is provided to students, as without this it is difficult to judge how students are expected to improve on their performance.
- The system for remediation and reassessment was not always clear across Centres. Centres do need to ensure that the procedures are clearly set out, documented and communicated to students. In addition, some Centres do need to adopt a system for recording remediation and reassessment attempts to allowing for tracking student progress.