

Principal Assessor Report 2005

Assessment Panel:

Engineering

Qualification area

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

**Electrical Installation Fundamentals
Intermediate II PBNC**

Statistical information: update

Number of resulted entries in 2004	26
---	----

Number of resulted entries in 2005	31
---	----

General comments re resulted entry numbers

Entry numbers continue to remain low with the anticipated increase in numbers not having occurred to date. It was hoped that the numbers for the Electrical Installation Fundamentals course would increase as the intake into the SPA (Scottish Progression Award) in Building Crafts increased. However, it must be assumed that candidates are pursuing other Level II Construction routes in the SPA rather than Electrical route.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Course award data

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 200	-	-	-	-
A	16.1	16.1	5	140
B	19.4	35.5	6	120
C	22.6	58.1	7	100
D	0.0	58.1	0	90
No award	41.9	100.0	13	

Course assessment data

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates
A	22.6	22.6	7
B	29.0	51.6	9
C	35.5	87.1	11
D	6.5	93.5	2
No award	6.5	100.0	2

Explanation of difference between Course award data and Course assessment data

To achieve a Course award, candidates must pass the Course assessment and pass all Unit assessments. Any difference between Course award data and Course assessment data is influenced by candidates not completing Unit assessments or the achievement of Unit assessments not being notified to SQA.

Comments on any significant changes in distribution of awards/grade boundaries

The level of entries makes comparison with previous years' results unreliable.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

As in previous years, candidate work was in general of a good quality and consistent with Intermediate 2 standard although in the case of some of the candidates identified in the Distribution of awards table the standard of work was particularly high. Some candidates work contained spelling mistakes and poor grammar which was not corrected. Some diagrams could have been presented more neatly.

As in previous years most candidates did the Planning stage reasonably well and project implementation was practical. There was evidence this year that candidates were giving more thought as to the reasons why they chose between the garage and the workshop for their project. There were some good examples of good practice Health and Safety points but there were also points which could only be regarded as normal working practices. Candidates did not include within their documentation any paperwork for recording progress as project implementation progressed.

Candidates continue to do the Development stage well although a number failed to include site plans and not all two way lighting wiring diagrams worked when checked.

The Evaluation stage was done a little better than in previous years but the level of evaluation continues to be quite limited with too little attention being given to how the planning process can be improved or what new knowledge and skills the candidates gained from the project.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

As noted already most areas of the Planning and Development stages were done well. With regard to the Evaluation stage one centre incorporated a requirement for the candidate to move a socket at the request of the client. This requirement enhanced Evaluation in terms of getting candidates to comment on the impact of changes to the original work plan.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Under the Planning stage Aims and Objectives of projects were often weak. Candidates also either failed to include timescales at the Planning stage or were rather vague and imprecise with any timescales included. As mentioned previously candidates did not include any documentation for recording progress.

Under the Development stage while candidates often identified risks and their minimisation no attempt was made to give an assessment of risk in terms of say, high, medium or low priority. Candidates always included power and lighting wiring diagrams but seldom the corresponding circuit diagrams. As noted previously many good Installation practices were, in fact, just routine working practices. In most cases earthing arrangements were not dealt with in sufficient detail and there was a lack of reference to information sources.

As noted earlier Evaluation continues to be quite narrow with a lack of questioning of the Planning/Development/Evaluation process and a lack of identification of new knowledge and skills the candidate has acquired as a result of undertaking the project.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

It is pleasing to report that most centres continue to employ their own fully developed marking scheme when assessing candidate work which helps to ensure consistency of standards. The PA's fellow external assessor has developed a very useful marking scheme which has helped to confirm that national standards are being maintained. SQA will distribute a copy to centres for reference/use.

Centres are encouraged to get candidates to record progress throughout the project as this may help when for example the candidate comes to write up her/his evaluation report.

Centres should also get candidates not only to identify the nature of risks associated with their projects but also to assess the level of each individual risk identified. This is important as it is the view of the PA and his fellow external assessor that proper Risk Assessment is not currently taking place.

Centres may also wish to encourage candidates to pay more attention to earthing arrangements associated with the garage or workshop as this section is not well answered at the moment.

While it is recognised that the Evaluation section is probably the most difficult part of the award the PA believes that centres should challenge candidates more in terms of getting them to answer such questions as: How could the planning process be improved? What additional knowledge and skills have you gained from doing the project (not just narrow technique skills but wider personal skills) and What other questions could have been asked?

Centres should encourage candidates to correct poor spelling and grammar.