

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

**Construction Craft
and
Construction Technician**

Qualification area

Construction

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

Construction Industry Practice – Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	52
---------------------------	----

Number of entries in 2004	39
---------------------------	----

General comments re entry numbers

Although there were 89 entries for the May completion date, only 31 projects were submitted, from 3 centres. One further centre had submitted 8 projects in March 2004.

Although entry numbers continue to rise, the number of presenting centres has not increased. The number of projects submitted and marked has, for four years, remained at between 30 and 40.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards – based on external assessment project results only.

No. of candidates	39
A	7
B	0
C	3
D	1
No Award	28

Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

The pass rate (100 marks and above) fell sharply from 2003. This was mainly due to the extremely poor results from one centre. Only 4 candidates of 18 from this centre were awarded 100 marks or more (50%) for the project. Performance of the candidature has declined steadily since 2001.

Notwithstanding the above, the number of candidates awarded A and B grades increased from 2003. There were a number of excellent projects, and 7 candidates received A grade awards.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	17.9	17.9	7	140
B	0	17.9	0	120
C	7.7	25.6	3	100
D	2.6	28.2	1	90
No award	71.8	100	28	

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The same project specification as in previous years was used, therefore level of demand and corresponding boundary grades have remained the same. The characteristics of the candidature were largely unchanged, although a greater number of less able candidates, than in 2003, submitted projects.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

There was a substantial decrease in the level of performance of the candidate group from that of 2003, with noticeable decreases in the pass rate and mean mark.

The ability range within the candidate group was much wider than in 2003, with some very good projects, but a much greater number of extremely poor submissions. The number of candidates achieving A or B awards increased slightly from 16.0% in 2003 to 17.9% in 2004. However, the number of candidates failing to achieve an A, B or C award rose to 71.8 in 2004.

There were small decreases in the mean marks for the planning and evaluating components of the practical assignment, and a substantial decrease in the mean mark for the developing component. These are shown below.

	Planning	Developing	Evaluating	Total
2004	19.9	55.0	18.3	93.2
2003	20.8	60.9	18.8	100.5

As in previous years, the standards of presentation, sketching and drawing work were generally poor, although there was again considerable variation between centres.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Many candidates performed well in the planning stage of the project, and there were a number of good evaluation reports.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Results were generally poor for the developing stage of the project. Most candidates experienced difficulty with the quantities and costing tasks, which reinforces the conclusion that many candidates were less able than in previous years.

As in previous years, sketching and drawing were generally very poor, with little attention to presentation, layout and basic drawing practice. The standard of drawing continues to be well below that required by the course unit Drawing for Building.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

There was little evidence this year that centres provided feedback to candidates on the standard of submitted items of work. It is good practice in management of project work to provide candidates with the opportunity to improve written and graphical work. There were indications that insufficient time had been allowed for early completion of projects and that many candidates had submitted their portfolios at the last minute.

It is again recommended that, prior to submission of projects to SQA, teachers/lecturers look over candidates' portfolios to ensure that all items of evidence are included.

The standard of drawing work continues to be disappointing. Centres should remind candidates that good drawing practice must be demonstrated. This should include provision of borders, titles and dimensions.

As in 2003, one centre provided reliable video evidence that each candidate had played an important role in the team setting out of the construction project.

Centres are reminded that they should ensure that in all cases:

- the SQA flyleaf is attached to each project
- the current marks record is attached to each project
- the candidate and teacher/lecturer declarations are signed
- reliable photographic/video and written evidence of setting out activities is provided.