

**Moderation Feedback — Visiting 2004**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Social Sciences**

**Qualification area**

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

**Social Sciences Higher National Award  
— 366**

## Visiting Moderation

### General comments on visiting moderation activity

Four Units were examined across 14 Centres plus UHI.

Visiting moderation was used primarily for the project D891V 34 and D88N 35. Where this was unavailable moderators looked at the exam D81T 34 or D81W 35 (if complete). Visiting moderation was carried out between February and June 2004 (negotiated with each Centre).

Central moderation was carried out on two dates in June 2004. Exams (D81T 35 and D81W 35) were looked out. Also, the projects that were unavailable at visiting moderation were also moderated at the central event.

This year's moderation showed improvements across a number of Centres in terms of organisation and applying national standards. This is encouraging. Good practice was highlighted in several reports. Many Centres had well organised materials. This made the moderation task easier. Some Centres had good written feedback on work.

### Specific issues identified

Most Centres included evidence of Internal Moderation having taken place. It would be useful to have this for all Centres.

Occasionally severe or lenient marking — highlighted in Centres' feedback report.

Marking guidelines were not always as helpful in terms of apportioning marks. More detail in how marks have been gained in each question would be helpful. Some Centres did not use any form of checklist. It is good practice to have this separately for each candidate to ensure coverage and to show how marks have been apportioned. Most Centres had prior moderated IAs but not all.

Occasionally, a Centre has given half marks. This should be avoided as it inflates a candidates overall score.

Occasionally weak evidence of evaluation was noted, both in projects and exams. This is an area that colleges should emphasise. Marking was sometimes lenient in this area.

On one or two occasions, a Centre has not shown a breakdown of marks, giving only an overall total for each question. This is not appropriate and makes it difficult to moderate.

## Feedback to centres

It would be useful to have evidence of Internal Moderation have taken place (a sampling sheet or noted on candidate responses etc) from all Centres.

Occasionally severe or lenient marking — highlighted in Centres' feedback report. Marking guidelines were not always as helpful in terms of apportioning marks. More detail in how marks have been gained in each question would be helpful. In particular, weak evidence of evaluation was noted, both in projects and exams. This is an area that centres should emphasise in teaching and learning. Marking was sometimes lenient in this area.

All Centres should show clearly how marks have been allocated in each question in the exam and throughout the project. Global totals are not helpful.

The use of half marks should be avoided as it inflates a candidate's overall score.

Some Centres did not use any form of checklist. It is good practice to use checklists for each candidate to ensure coverage and to show how marks have been apportioned. Samples are included in exemplar packs for the new HN award Units, so would be easy to adopt.