

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

Craft and Design - Advanced Higher

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

Of the Centres selected, two had withdrawn their candidates and two had failed to complete the Units required of them on time. The latter Centres subsequently received a visit by the Senior Moderator. The number of Centres which remained to be moderated was eight and therefore, the moderation team consisted of two moderators plus the Senior Moderator. All three units which comprise the course were sampled although Unit D129, *Case Study* provided the largest sample. At the end of the moderation the overall opinion was that the standard of candidate presentation was an improvement compared to the previous year. As usual, the SQA support staff provided excellent backing to the moderation team and their willingness to provide assistance in any way is gratefully recorded.

Specific issues identified

In a number of cases the moderators found it difficult to relate the work presented in the folios to the requirements of the Units. At times, candidates tended to drift away from the guidelines contained in the NAB. This made the allocation of marks difficult to assign. Too many candidates fail to utilise the medium of graphics and photography to illustrate ideas and concepts. 3D modelling was also lacking in a number of cases. This was particularly evident in the *Product Development* Unit where its inclusion can be particularly beneficial. Some candidates take too long to explain their point and tend to 'ramble' too much. Candidates should select their products with care. A well chosen product which lends itself to scrutiny and criticism provides greater scope for Unit work than a 'Design Icon' which candidates find difficult to analyse and develop.

Unit D129, *Case Study*

- All Centres which had been selected for moderation in this Unit had marked their candidates' folios well
- Most candidates were able to describe in detail the evolution of their chosen product
- Some candidates, however, were unclear of the chronological development of their particular product and the inclusion of a timeline could have served to keep the candidates focussed and on the right lines
- Most candidates were able to identify and describe the critical stages of the products development; in several cases some very astute observations were made
- In Outcome 1, PC (c), the majority of candidates were unable to adequately evaluate the resolution of critical decisions

- In Outcome 2, most candidates had omitted PC (b) and PC(c) in accordance with the guidance on the

reduction of evidence requirements. A few candidates however, either by design or by accident, had completed all the PCs in this Unit

- In PC (a), the factors that may affect the future choice of materials and manufacturing processes were, on the whole, well investigated
- In PC (d), a number of candidates were ambiguous in their evaluation of external factors which have influenced the design development

Unit D130, *Product Design Analysis*

- All candidates moderated in this Unit had observed the reduction in evidence requirements.
- PC (a) and PC (b) in Outcome 1 posed few problems for the candidates moderated and there was evidence of good work in this area
- The evidence generated in Outcome 2, PC (d), was poorly researched and candidates seemed unable to assimilate the evidence gleaned from the Unit to formulate an evaluation of the effectiveness of the product
- The NAB tests of this Unit were marked well although, in some instances, a touch on the generous side

Unit 131, *Product Development*

- This Unit had been marked well by the Centres and the moderators were impressed by the accuracy of marking displayed by the teachers. Not all candidates had passed the Unit and this was reflected in the allocation of marks.
- Of the candidates who performed poorly in this Unit, the majority had failed to develop a practical range of concepts which could realistically be synthesised towards a solution.
- Subsequently, the same candidates performed poorly in their NAB Tests.

Feedback to centres

- The overall standard was better than previous years. There are indications that Centres and teachers are becoming more familiar and confident with the requirements of the course
- Centres should take cognisance of the reduction in evidence requirements
- Centres must select their Unit completion dates with care. They must ensure that their candidates have enough time to complete the Units in case they are requested for moderation
- Marking was inconsistent in some instances; cross-marking is a tool which can be utilised to ensure a common standard
- Candidates should endeavour to sectionalise their folios. Outcomes and PCs should be clearly labelled
- Candidates should try to be more concise in their use of text while utilising models and photographic evidence more
- Timelines should be employed in Unit 129, *Case Study*
- A common theme running through this year's moderation was the number of candidates who found it difficult to evaluate properly. Teachers should attempt to address this failing with their pupils by practicing evaluation techniques
- Centres should be more pro active in advising their candidates on the choice of product for Unit work
- Candidates should not be presented for NAB tests until they are properly prepared and have completed their folio work