

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Physics

Qualification area

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

Physics – Standard Grade

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

- For the first time, Central Moderation was carried out at the Glasgow Hilton. In contrast to previous years, there were no difficulties with the administration of the event.
- The material for moderation had all been received from all centres by the due date.
- Moderation staff at SQA were, as they always are, extremely pleasant and helpful.
- It is very pleasing to report that of the 36 centres moderated the grades awarded by 33 of these centres were confirmed. Of the three centres whose grades were not confirmed, one was because of arithmetical errors only. The grades of the other two centres were not accepted for a number of reasons, as detailed later in this report.

Specific issues identified

- There was more evidence this year than in past years of centres internally checking the arithmetic used to obtain grades. As mentioned above only one centre had a significant number of arithmetical errors (of various kinds).
- The benefits of carrying out internal moderation become apparent when it is noted that all three centres whose grades were not confirmed showed no evidence of internal moderation.
- The reasons why grades were not confirmed for the two centres that were failed on assessment grounds include:
 - Centre 1**
 - Wrong sample sent for moderation
 - Not all candidates given the chance to attempt all eight Practical Techniques
 - Incorrect addition
 - For one candidate there was no evidence submitted for any Practical Technique – this candidate had been awarded a grade 5 instead of no grade being awarded for the element (see Arrangements, Appendix IV, paragraph 1)
 - Evidence of group working at all stages of the Practical Investigations
 - Grading too generous for some criteria of Practical Investigations.
 - Centre 2**
 - Wrong flyleaf used, resulting in not all necessary information being recorded
 - Incomplete evidence – not all eight Practical Techniques marks available for all candidates
 - Inappropriate Practical Investigation for one candidate – two variables in the same Investigation
 - Grading too generous for some criteria of Practical Investigations.

Feedback to centres

- Continue the good practice that has become apparent in recent years of carrying out internal moderation. This ensures that any arithmetical errors are picked up as well as contributing to consistency of grading.
- Comments were fed back to three centres that had their grades confirmed. It is worth repeating these comments for the benefit of all centres
 - Some centres are still being too lenient in assessing some Practical Investigations criteria, in particular G1, G4, RR1(a), RR2, RR3.
 - While minor changes to the Investigations booklet are permissible, centres should not make any material changes that would give some candidates an unfair advantage. A change in the order of entries is not permissible, nor is the inclusion of a pre-printed table for completion. (See Arrangements, Appendix IV, paragraph 4)
- If a candidate has been given the chance to attempt a Practical Technique and has not been successful in demonstrating the technique (for whatever reason), zero marks should be awarded and an entry to this effect should be made in the Assessment Record for the candidate, along with the date. Leaving an entry blank is ambiguous – the moderator has no way of knowing whether the candidate has been unsuccessful in demonstrating the technique or has not been offered the chance to demonstrate the technique