

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

- ◆ The material for moderation had been received from all centres by the due date (although not all evidence was complete — see later in this report).

Specific issues identified

- ◆ Arithmetical errors were found in the evidence supplied by 13 centres. This is an increase of three on last year and represents about 24% of the sample compared to about 18% last year. The errors found in this category include incorrect summations of marks awarded for investigations, incorrect transference of marks on to Assessment Records, and in three instances incorrect application of the mark-to-grade formula.
- ◆ Incomplete evidence was supplied by 7 centres. In the majority of these cases, this was because no evidence was supplied of the attempts at Practical Techniques by some or all of the candidates — simply a mark awarded out of 16 was given on the Flyleaf. In other instances, there was no evidence that candidates were given the opportunity to carry out all eight Practical Techniques. Some centres sent in Class Record Sheets that seemed to indicate that one or more of the Practical Techniques had not been offered to any candidate.
The Arrangements indicate that an Assessment Record should be used to record the outcome of the assessment of all eight Practical Techniques by all candidates, and that this Assessment Record is required to be submitted as evidence of a candidate's attainment of Practical Abilities (paragraphs 5.6.2; 5.6.7; 5.6.8).
- ◆ In only two cases did the moderator disagree with the assessments made by the centre sufficiently to exceed the trigger of greater than 6 discrepancy points in the sample of 12.
- ◆ Centres can, and should, intervene at stages G1 to G4 of an investigation, to allow a candidate to continue where necessary. (An indication of intervention on the booklet is helpful.) Some centres allow candidates to continue with inappropriate Investigations, without intervention.
- ◆ Some centres awarded marks to candidates who refer back to G4 as an answer to RR3. This is not acceptable since the candidate may have used a completely different method to that outlined briefly in G4.
- ◆ There is still a tendency with some centres to award marks in RR3(d) to candidates who list the variables that were kept constant, rather than saying **how** these variables were kept constant.
- ◆ There was some evidence of internal cross marking, although less than in previous years. However, in some instances this left some ambiguity regarding the final mark awarded for an Investigation.

Feedback to centres

- ◆ This year, 24% of the centres moderated failed to have the grades that they awarded to candidates confirmed on moderation, due to arithmetical errors. It would be helpful both to centres and to the moderating team if the arithmetic used in arriving at candidates' grades was checked by the centre. Common arithmetical mistakes include incorrect summations of marks awarded for investigations, incorrect transference of marks on to Assessment Records, and incorrect application of the mark-to-grade formula.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that the evidence submitted for moderation is complete. In particular, an Assessment Record should be maintained for all candidates, detailing all of the candidates' attempts, both unsuccessful and successful, at all eight Practical Techniques. This Assessment Record must be submitted as part of the evidence to be moderated. See the Arrangements, paragraphs 5.6.2, 5.6.7 and 5.6.8.
- ◆ It is permissible, and is in the interests of some candidates, for teachers to intervene at the generative stage of an Investigation. Such an intervention (which should be indicated on the candidate's Investigation booklet), can often benefit the candidate in the later part of the Investigation.
- ◆ When centres carry out cross marking they must ensure that the final mark being awarded is clearly indicated. One centre indicated that they carried out a cross marking exercise on the evidence of all candidates where the mark awarded fell within four marks of a grade boundary. This seems to be a good compromise between the rigour of cross marking the work of all candidates, and the time constraints in a busy department.