

## Principal Assessor Report 2004

**Assessment Panel:**

**Engineering**

**Qualification area**

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

**Manufacturing Higher**

### **Statistical information: update**

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	3
----------------------------------	---

<b>Number of entries in 2004</b>	2
----------------------------------	---

### **General comments re entry numbers**

This higher has been offered in examination diets for the past 5 years. This year there was a reduction in uptake of one candidate, so that in Diet 2004 only 2 were presented for the examination.

## **Statistical Information: Performance of candidates**

### **Distribution of awards**

At pre appeal stage the pass rate was 0%.

### **Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards**

Owing to the small number of candidates it is not possible to comment on any significant changes in the distribution of awards.

## Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	0.0	0.0	0	70
B	0.0	0.0	0	60
C	0.0	0.0	0	50
D	0.0	0.0	0	45
No award	100	100	2	

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

No change from previous years. The grade boundaries were set at the *a priori* values of 70, 60 and 50.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

A general analysis of candidate performance is not possible with only 2 candidates.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

Those candidates who sat the exam performed well in questions relating to description of manufacturing methods.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

Candidates performed less well in questions relating to analysing statistical information to establish costs for manufacturing methods.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

Given the very small uptake in this subject it is likely that there is insufficient interest in this Higher to continue with a presentation.