

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Social Sciences

Qualification area

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

**NQ Sociology – Higher (Units: D43212 and D43312)
and Intermediate 2 (D42911)**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

- The Central Moderation process took place by post with some concerns raised for some centres.
- The paperwork submitted with the candidate scripts was variable, with some centres presenting clear and helpful feedback with others presenting very limited or no feedback for candidates.
- Feedback was not always consistently applied in some centres.
- Some centres produced very good or excellent examples of feedback for candidates and accompanying paperwork (eg Internal Moderation records).
- Internal Moderation was not evident in all centres.
- Centres 'Not Accepted' during Central Moderation addressed the issues expediently and appropriately, which is to be commended.

Specific issues identified

- In some centres scripts were marked in accordance with the requirements set out in the NAB Marking Guidelines. This was not a unanimous approach, however.
- Whilst marking was consistent in some centres, it was either inconsistent or inaccurate in other centres. Marking Guidelines in the appropriate NABs was not always consistently applied and, in some cases, not applied.
- Written feedback to candidates continues to be inconsistent across centres, with some providing excellent examples of good practice. This includes providing sufficient written feedback to candidates to enable them to build on their strengths and address their weaknesses. Some centres provided inconclusive, incorrect or no written feedback.
- In some centres, no reference to opportunities for remediation was cited.
- In one centre, one candidate was passed and another made to remediate, despite the passing candidate providing a much weaker response than the candidate requiring remediation.
- The lack of marks allocated to questions or parts of questions in some centres would make it very difficult for candidates to determine their individual progress and for Examiners to determine the validity of an Appeal without having to effectively 'mark' the assessments themselves.
- One centre provided passes for most Higher candidates and made some comments relating to the candidates passing parts of the essay assessments that were not actually addressed by the candidates. This mainly related to the application of studies to essay questions.
- One centre provided assessment cover sheets for HN rather than NQ assessments.
- Remediation/reassessment was not always conducted with an alternative instrument of assessment.

- Marks attributed by one centre veered a little from slightly too lenient to slightly too strict, with marks for one candidate being excessively lenient. However, the overall marking was good.
- For Intermediate 2, in one centre the cultural examples provided were insufficiently comparative – eg compared Islamic culture with Saudi Arabian culture.
- In one centre, grades were recalculated after remediation, which does not present an accurate illustration of candidate achievement. In such circumstances, attribution of ‘Achieve/Not Achieve’ would be more appropriate.
- In one centre, evidence of remediation having been carried out only existed for one candidate, despite a number of candidates being directed towards remediation. One candidate was passed after incomplete remediation and another passed with no evidence of the remediation that was required. Another candidate should have been indicated as an ‘Achieve’ but was required to remediate.

Feedback to centres

- The overall standard of assessment was not consistent across centres and was occasionally inconsistent within centres. The NAB relevant to each Unit should be more effectively applied as the benchmark for achievement.
- There is a lack of clarity in some centres regarding remediation/reassessment. Candidates need to be made aware of the process for remediation/reassessment.
- There needs to be a more consistent approach to Internal Moderation and maintenance of records of evidence for Moderation and Appeals purposes.
- Centres should provide clear and consistent feedback to candidates and this should be evident for Appeals and Internal and External Moderation purposes.
- Centres responded quickly and appropriately to Moderator feedback, which is commendable.