National Qualifications 2006

Senior Moderator Report

Subject: Technological Studies SG

Assessment Panel: Technical Education

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on moderation which has taken place within National Qualifications in this subject.

STANDARD GRADE

ELEMENT / COURSEWORK MODERATED

APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY ASSIGNMENT

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

General comments:

Evidence from the sample moderation indicates that the assignment is well understood by teachers and candidates alike. In most cases, each AT sub-element was covered effectively with the candidates' work presented in such a way that it could be easily judged against the assessment criteria.

Grades were accepted in all of the sample schools and, in most cases, the moderator agreed closely with their marks for each sub-element.

In the centres sampled, there was a pattern of all candidates carrying out the same assignment, presumably because it is easier to manage by the teacher. This practice was perfectly satisfactory.

Teachers' comments on the flysheet were generally helpful to the moderator although they often gave comments on how much help/prompting/correction was needed in each sub-element. This is only essential in AT3, where the degree of independence affects the mark.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

In terms of marking and grading the reports, all centres were satisfactory. Comments were generally helpful to the moderator. Please continue to write comments on the flysheet relating to the assessment criteria, candidates' performance in achieving these and how the evidence has been interpreted.

In terms of candidate performance, a good understanding of the process was shown in all centres moderated and by most candidates.

Best performance was in:

AT2 Producing a specification from a given brief – generally getting most criteria;
AT3 Generate a possible solution to a given problem – often thoroughly done with little help;
AT5 Use computer simulation software – these were mostly worked through to completion, but not always with adjustment of range parameters (e.g. light levels, speeds, voltages, etc.);
AT6 Develop/build and test a solution – most solutions were built but test results against the criteria were not always present.

Further development is possible in the following areas:

AT1 Although most candidates used systems diagrams well, only a very few identified the opportunity for feedback loops where they existed;
AT4 Devices and components were usually identified but justification was not always given on why one particular component was used rather than another (voltage rating, compatibility, etc.)
AT7 There was often little or no reference to what the solution was designed to do i.e. solve the problem by satisfying the specification and performance criteria within it.