

## Moderation Feedback - Visiting

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

Craft and Design. Intermediate II, Higher and  
Advanced Higher

## Visiting Moderation

### General comments on visiting moderation activity

Most of the visits which I carried out in the past school session were, in the main, a response to the Centres poor performance in the previous examination diet.

The Centres which had requested the Development Visits saw the obvious link between the performance in the Units and the candidates corresponding performance in the External Examination. This invariably proved to be the case because, in the course of my visits, I consistently found discrepancies and inconsistencies in the level of candidate performance across the Units.

The teachers were inevitably grateful for the visit and the advice given and I found that I was able to resolve most of the concerns raised.

In the course of the session I also carried out three Presentations to various groups.

### Specific issues identified

The root cause of the majority of problems I encountered appear to be three-fold:

1. Teachers misinterpreting or failing to understand the information contained within the NABs
2. Inappropriate judgment of candidate performance
3. Inexperience on the part of the teacher
4. A number of Centres were too generous in their marking of candidates' performance. For instance, in Designing for People in the area of design activity, there should be a clear distinction between the analysis of the brief and the investigation of the factors identified. Marks can only be awarded for accurate information pertaining to the product selected. In the written tests, there was evidence that marks had been awarded, in some cases, for responses which were too vague.
5. In Unit 1, Product Evaluation and Graphic Techniques it was apparent that some candidates had selected products which did not lend themselves readily to cover the full spectrum of evaluation factors contained within the NAB
6. In some cases it was difficult to give credit to candidates in the area of graphics. Not all candidates utilised a sufficient range of techniques in order to fulfill the criteria

## Feedback to centres

- Centres should ensure that they are up to date with the current requirements of the course by accessing the latest Update Letter.
- Centres should endeavour to adopt the practice of cross-marking. This approach can ensure a greater consistency in marking and moderation
- Products selected for evaluation in Unit1 should be selected with care. The product chosen should allow the candidate to investigate thoroughly the majority of factors listed in PC(a)
- In Unit1, Product Evaluation and Graphic Techniques, candidates should attempt to demonstrate a wide variety of graphic techniques in their pictorial sketches which could include orthographic, isometric, oblique, perspective and freehand sketching.
- In Designing for People, candidates should relate their analysis and investigation of factors to the design brief. General statements which could be applied to most products should not be given credence.
- In the marking of written tests, candidates responses should be succinct and relate to the question asked. Vague statements and/or answers which do not display an adequate knowledge of the problem should not be awarded marks.
- Candidate work drawn from the Design Assignment should be differentiated as work pertaining to the appropriate Unit.
- If Centres submit photocopied work drawn from the Design Assignment, every effort should be made to ensure the clarity of the photocopy.
- Centres must ensure that the appropriate Unit recording sheet is used and submitted along with the candidates work.
- The moderation Unit at SQA is always available and willing to assist Centres in any area of moderation and should be contacted whenever an area of concern arises.