

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

Craft and Design. Intermediate II and Higher.

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

Five moderators plus the Senior Moderator took part in the Moderation event. Four of the moderators were very experienced moderators having moderated for a number of years. One new moderator came on board and, although he was new to the team, he was experienced in the field of Craft and Design.

The day began with a practice moderation of two Units, *Product Evaluation and Graphic Techniques* and *Designing for People*. The reduction of evidence requirements for *Designing for Manufacture* rendered a practice in this Unit redundant. The moderators worked in teams whilst reviewing their first folio then swapped partners for the second. There were a number of problems: we had only two days in which to complete the moderation exercise; we were two moderators short although all those present, with one exception, had completed this exercise in every previous year.

The tried and tested strategy of asking the moderators to work in pairs and rotating partners after every session was once again employed. This approach worked very well and ensured a high level of consistency in marking.

The two day event ran very well, although time was extremely tight and the moderation ran over time on the final day.

The decision to separate Advanced Higher moderation from Higher and Intermediate 2 was extremely successful and allowed the Senior Moderator to devote more time to the different levels.

The accommodation this year was far better than in previous years and, without exception, the team was fulsome in their praise of the facilities.

The Senior Moderator would like to express his thanks to the SQA staff in attendance for their forbearance and the fact that they also stayed late in order to assist in the completion of the event.

Specific issues identified

- Overall, there was a marked improvement in the quality of Units submitted for moderation this year and that was extremely heartening to see
- In general, the quality of work, particularly in the form of folio work, was superior to previous years and the presentation of candidates' work was much better organized
The reasons for this could be many fold but there is no doubt in my mind that the significant number of Incomplete Evidence Visits, Development Visits, Regional Seminars and Conferences which I have attended over the past year has had a big influence on this. I also believe that more Centres are reading and acting upon the advice contained in the annual Senior Moderator's report
- Only three Centres failed moderation this year and all were in the *Product Evaluation and Graphic Techniques* Unit. The reasons for their 'Not Accepted' verdict were exclusively due to two factors, namely the inappropriate judgment of standards and failing to adhere to Unit guidelines
- The Centres which had submitted work for moderation in *Designing for People* all had their moderation accepted. In many cases the candidates' folio work was very good and the majority of candidates had a fine understanding of analysis, investigation and how to development solutions
- The moderation of the *Designing for Manufacture* Unit presented few problems. The revised Internal Assessment requirements reduced the requirements of the Unit to Outcome 1, the Investigation and Outcome 2, the NAB test. All Centres selected for moderation in this Unit passed with ease
- A large number of Centres tended to be generous with their marking, especially with regard to folio work. This is a natural occurrence but, in some instances, cross marking within the department could have alleviated this problem
- In the written tests, a number of Centres were inconsistent with their marking. Marks were frequently awarded for vague or ambiguous answers
- A small number of Centres had failed to implement the reduction of evidence guidelines which meant unnecessary work had been done by both candidates and teachers
- Overall, the work presented at Intermediate II level across the Units was very good
- It was heartening to see a big reduction in Centres submitting Unit work drawn and photocopied from the *Design Assignment*. This made the moderator's job more straightforward and the clarity of graphics made the moderation exercise easier
- The moderators were pleased to find that, with one or two minor exceptions, all Centres had completed the relevant paperwork in accordance with SQA requirements.

Feedback to centres

A large number of Centres should be congratulated on the quality of their candidates' Unit work and of the manner in which they so diligently presented their candidates' work for moderation.

It is difficult to be specific with regard to feedback this year because, as a result of the NQ review in Craft and Design (now changed to Product Design), many of the issues raised during the moderation exercise will not be pertinent in the future.

The advice given below can therefore only be of a general nature.

- Centres should build on the experiences gained in previous moderation exercises in Craft and Design and utilize this good practice in marking the Units of the new course
- Centres should read carefully the requirements of the Unit and in particular the instruments of assessment
- To ensure accuracy and to avoid missing out relevant documentation, it is strongly recommended that, in this inaugural year, a system of cross marking be employed whenever possible. This should hopefully alleviate errors and ensure a good chance of a successful moderation
- In the first year of Product Design, the SQA will endeavor to be as supportive as possible to Centres whilst still adhering to national standards. In this regard Centres are encouraged to contact the Moderation Unit within the SQA to seek assistance whenever they encounter difficulties with assessment of the course.