

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

Engineering

Qualification area

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

Electrical Installation Fundamentals - Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	25
---------------------------	----

Number of entries in 2004	28
---------------------------	----

General comments re entry numbers

Entry numbers continue to be relatively low. However, it is anticipated that numbers will increase over the next few years. This increase is likely to occur because the Electrical Installation Fundamentals course forms the second level of the Electrical section of the Scottish Progression Award in Building Crafts, the entry numbers of which are likely to grow in the coming years.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards

The percentage distribution of marks for the 2004 Examination is shown below. The figures in brackets are the corresponding 2003 Examination information.

Grade A (Band 1) – 7.1% (0%)
Grade A (Band 2) – 21.4% (8.3%)
Grade B (Band 3 & 4) – 35.7% (41.6%)
Grade C (Bands 5 & 6) – 28.6% (33.2%)
Less than 50% mark – 7.1% (16.6%)

Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

It is pleasing to report a significant improvement in candidate performance. For example, 28.5% of candidates achieved either an Upper or Lower A in 2004 compared with only 8.3 % of candidates in 2003. The number of candidates who obtain No Award (less than 50%) dropped from 16.6% in 2003 to 7.1 % in 2004. This general improvement in candidate performance is most likely due to the course becoming more 'bedded in' within presenting centres with both candidates and lecturers having a better understanding of the assessment requirements of the course.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	28.5	28.5	8	140
B	35.7	64.2	10	120
C	28.5	92.7	8	100
D				
No award	7.1	99.8	2	

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

Based on the performance of candidates the pass mark for the 2004 Examination was set at 50% and the mark at which a Grade A was awarded was set at 70%. These are the same a priori values as were used in the 2003 assessment.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Candidate work was in general of a good quality and consistent with Intermediate 2 standard. However, candidate materials often contained spelling mistakes and poor grammar which was not corrected by markers. Some diagrams could have been presented more neatly.

In most cases candidates did the Planning stage thoroughly and project implementation was practical. However, candidates' reasons for choosing between the garage and workshop project were very weak. There was a general improvement in the number of good practice Health and Safety points identified by candidates.

Candidates did the Development stage well and clearly enjoyed this part of the project the most.

The Evaluation stage continues to be the weakest of the three parts of the project although there was some evidence of improvement in candidate responses.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

As commented already in most cases the Planning and Development stages were areas in which candidates performed well. All elements of these stages were completed with some candidates scoring well in most elements

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

As noted above the Evaluation stage continues to be the weakest part of the project activity. Experience across a range of project based courses shows that candidates find evaluating project outcomes and what they have learnt from a project challenging. While the guidance given to Electrical Installation Fundamentals candidates on what they are expected to produce in an evaluation report is good there is little doubt that it could be further strengthened by the development of good case study materials.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

It is pleasing to report that centres continue to use fully developed marking schemes when assessing candidate work which helps to ensure consistency in marking. The Principal Assessor is confident that a national standard is being achieved.

The practice of deducting marks from a candidates' Planning mark, where the project is impractical, leads to the strange situation where a centre allocates a negative mark for this stage to a candidate. This is an unacceptable practice. It would be better to score candidates lower marks on each of the elements of the Planning stage. This deduction of marks should be removed from marking schemes.

It would be very helpful in the external moderation process if markers could provide more information on how they had arrived at marks in individual elements as the lack of this information made it more difficult to externally moderate candidate work.

Markers are encouraged to correct poor spelling and grammar.

Centres need to provide greater clarity on what they regard as good practice electrical installation points and what is just accepted practice.