

# **National Qualifications 2006**

## **Senior Moderator Report**

**Subject: Chemistry; Standard Grade**

**Assessment Panel: Chemistry**

## STANDARD GRADE

### ELEMENT / COURSEWORK MODERATED

#### PRACTICAL ABILITIES; TECHNIQUES AND INVESTIGATIONS

### FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

#### General comments:

The majority of centres assessed candidate evidence accurately and rigorously to a slightly higher standard than seen last year. In the main these centres showed evidence of best practice of internal moderation. Poor diagrams and inaccurate observations were penalised in technique write-ups, marking of Investigations was accurate and data entered onto the SQA flyleaf was accurate.

No non-standard Investigation booklets were seen and almost all centres used a pro-forma for techniques which showed clearly where and why marks were awarded.

There was uncertainty about selection of candidates for the verification sample. A centre presenting >50 candidates sent evidence for only ten rather than the twelve required and other centres made incorrect selections.

A minority of centres showed inconsistencies in the standard of work accepted. In the same centres an unusually high number of errors were seen, i.e. transcription errors from pupil evidence to the flyleaf and arithmetic errors on the flyleaf.

One centre included teacher checklists awarding marks for safety and manipulation where four candidates in the sample of twelve had no evidence to confirm some of the marks, e.g. in one case, 6 marks were awarded for both D1 and E1 but no pupil evidence was submitted for either technique.

A continuing trend in the Investigations is to award marks for RR3(d) when the candidate has not mentioned all the variables which must be controlled.

One centre where assessment was accurate, rigorous and well above the national standard submitted pupil evidence most of which had not been either initialed or dated by the class teacher, to show that it had been marked.

#### Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

Central moderation events have shown that 70 to 80% of centres across all the regions are secure in their assessments and conform to national standards. These centres are aware of the requirements for internal assessment and have established procedures for departmental discussion of standards and internal moderation.

In a minority of centres procedures for the internal moderation of standards have not been set up. This results in inconsistencies and errors in the centre's assessments and often means SQA requirements are not met. Recent annual reports on moderation have provided advice to centres; such advice continues to be relevant.

Advice to centres on the selection of the moderation sample from the form *Standard Grade Estimates and Assessment Grades*, (SGEROO) needs to be clarified.