



**Standard Grade Qualifications 2011
Internal Assessment Report
Technological Studies**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Standard Grade Qualifications in this subject.

Standard Grade

Titles/levels of qualifications verified

Standard Grade Technological Studies

Application of Technology Assignment

General comments

All centres verified had their internal assessment confirmed.

In most cases there was close agreement with centres' assessments which show a clear and accurate understanding of the expected standards. The quality of candidate evidence varied greatly but assessment of this was generally accurate and appropriate.

Although most centres had only one assessor (only one signatory on the Flyleafs), in the one centre verified which had two different assessors, their marking was not totally consistent. Internal verification must take place to ensure that assessment decisions are consistent and correct.

Candidates seemed to be well prepared for the assignment and, in the main, laid out their evidence in an orderly, logical fashion.

Administration of assessments

The assessment criteria and procedures are uncomplicated and well described. It is clear from the verification process that centres follow these procedures closely and well.

The Flyleaf allows assessors the opportunity to comment on the marks they give for each sub-element and these are often completed, but not always. Comments are most helpful in the verification process if they relate to the marking criteria and how the assessor has interpreted the evidence.

Comments on AT3: Generate a possible solution to a given problem

It is essential to show how much assistance has been given in this process.

Areas of good practice/areas for improvement

It is likely that, in all cases, the centre's assessor will be the class teacher. In verifying the assessment of the evidence it is impossible not to review the evidence as well. What is assessed reflects what has been taught and how it has been taught to be presented. Individual teacher styles become evident when looking at the candidates' work.

In most cases, candidates have been very well prepared for the assignment. Their evidence is appropriate, logical and well ordered. There seems, generally, to be good practice in the teaching and assessment of AT1, AT2, AT4 and AT6.

AT1 Create appropriate system diagrams to analyse a given problem

Candidates generally achieve high scores. Most are able to show systems that link the inputs, outputs and sub-systems; many identify error-detection and feedback loops. Assessment of this sub-element is consistently accurate.

AT2 Produce a specification from a given brief

Candidates mainly score well in this sub-element. Most can identify measurable criteria and many create full specifications. Teachers tend to be very consistent in their marking of this area.

AT4 Select and justify the use of appropriate components to meet the specification

There is continued improvement in the number of candidates giving appropriate, technical justification for the components they select. Assessment of this sub-element is also improving.

AT6 Develop/build and test a solution

Evidence of testing against the specification is increasing and improving. Pupil scores in this sub-element continue to rise.

Where the performance criteria from the Unit specification are used logically to drive the assignment, candidates seem to find it easier to achieve high marks across the whole assignment.

Specific areas for improvement

Given that only one centre has not had its internal assessment agreed since the development of this assignment, there is not really much improvement needed in the assessment of the evidence. There are, however, some aspects of candidate work which seem to limit possible attainment:

AT5 Use computer simulation software

Most candidates manage to produce an effective, working simulation but stop there and do not bother to adjust any range parameters. This limits their possible score to 2 marks. It is not unusual to see assignments from whole centres where this is the case. Simply adjusting timing, speed, sensor inputs, etc would show that candidates have a wider understanding of the effects of varying inputs, etc on their simulation. Some assessors incorrectly give full marks where the adjustment has not taken place.

AT7 Evaluate the solution

Some candidates do not complete enough work for this sub-element, even when they have made appropriate comments in other parts of the assignment that would improve their marks if it had been presented as part of the evaluation. Often very comprehensive, detailed reports had only a general evaluation statement.

Where a well structured approach is adopted, evaluating against the performance criteria, candidates score highly.