

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

**Technological Studies: Intermediate 2,
Higher and Advanced Higher**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

There were 15 centres in the sample for moderation, eight accepted initially and a further six after Assessment Review, the sample covering the Units on Applied Electronics and Systems & Control at Intermediate 2, Higher and Advanced Higher level.

The non-accepted centres generally responded well to the Moderator's report, complying with the requirements of the Assessment Review, the 15th centre was eventually deemed to be acceptable more to avoid disadvantaging the candidates than an indication of satisfactory standards of assessment.

The centres considered acceptable in the initial moderation activity generally submitted work and assessment of a very high standard.

Specific issues identified

There were two specific issues, neither of them new:

- (a) Failure to comply with the NQ review reducing the volume of assessment.
- (b) The quality of evidence submitted for the Practical Activities.

In addition there were still schools who obviously failed to grasp the principles of the assessment and moderation procedure — submitting all of the coursework attempted by the candidates throughout the course.

- (a) The revised assessment requirements reduced the amount of assessment needed, most schools were still submitting complete NABs and/or using LO by LO cut-off scores. In addition to making moderation more difficult, particularly when a sample included work at two or more levels, it often gave false results, pupils resitting a NAB they had not failed.
- (b) Evidence of Practical Activities was still of a very poor standard, in some cases none being submitted.

The NQ review emphasised the need for detailed evidence, ie a problem scenario followed by a planned sequence of design, (simulation), construction and evaluation, this is an NQ course and the assessment tasks set should reflect this. Most schools did not submit work of this standard and many set candidates identical tasks making individual or team working difficult to distinguish.

This problem will continue as long as SQA depend on individual centres reading and understanding the NQ review memo then modifying the material and instructions in the original NAB documents.

Feedback to centres

All centres must apply the modifications specified in the NQ Review memo on assessment reduction and seek clarification on any points of doubt *prior* to setting any assessment tasks.

Particular attention should be paid to the specific evidence required for Practical Activities, setting tasks suitable for final *assessment* of the Unit (dependent on the level) not the simpler coursework assignments used for teaching purposes. Emphasis should be placed on documenting the practical work done, many successful centres doing this using simple pro forma or worksheets with headings identifying the stages in the design/problem solving process, prompting a full response from the candidate.