

Moderation Feedback — Central

Assessment Panel:

Mathematics and Statistics

Qualification area:

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

**Mathematics and Statistics:
Intermediate 1, Intermediate 2, Higher,
Advanced Higher**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

The majority of the units selected for central moderation were D321, D322, D323 and D324, across the levels 10, 11, 12 and 13. There were no units at level 09 (Access 3) selected. For the first time the specialist Advanced Higher units D326 (2 centres) and D327 (2 centres) were selected.

A few centres submitted "incomplete evidence"; the submission of incomplete evidence had either been discussed with the Moderation Officer, or a letter of explanation was included with the material.

With the exception of one centre, all centres moderated used National Assessment Banks.

All centres were "accepted", although a number of minor issues were identified and reported on.

Two new Moderators were welcomed to the team.

Specific issues identified

The following points, commented on to individual centres, were identified by the team as giving cause for concern.

- 1 Working subsequent to an incorrect answer – a few centres seem unsure of when credit should be given, and/or were consistent in giving credit to individual candidates within the same centre.
- 2 Transcription errors – a few centres seem unsure of when credit should be given, and/or were inconsistent in giving credit to individual candidates within the same centre.
- 3 Graph paper issued to candidates in some centres, when candidates were asked "sketch" ie blank paper required.
- 4 Oral responses – when appropriate, and at what levels?
- 5 Acceptance of a one digit answer when a co-ordinate is required.
- 6 Candidate answers written on question papers at Intermediate 2.
- 7 Unit D326 – working to 3 or 4 significant figures.

The following points are of a more general nature.

- 1 An increasing number of centres submitted evidence of internal moderation activity, often embedded in the candidates' scripts.
- 2 Centres where minor issues were identified eg poor marking, misinterpretation of the General Principles of marking or marking schemes etc, often showed little evidence of any internal moderation activity.
- 3 In the majority of cases centres adhered closely to the marking schemes, except for issues identified above.
- 4 Overall there was a clear indication of marks awarded on candidates' scripts, and nearly all centres submitted a table and/or grid of results for each candidate.
- 5 Centres made correct substitutions for unavailable candidate evidence where required to do so.

Feedback to centres

- Candidate evidence was well-presented.
- The submission of a table or grid of results, detailing National Assessment Banks used, marks achieved and the threshold for each outcome, and the pass/fail decision by most centres was appreciated by Moderators.
- Increasingly evidence of internal moderation activity is being submitted by centres, and this is welcomed.
- The issue of working subsequent to an incorrect answer, and the credit to be awarded, requires to be addressed by some centres. The advice in the General Principles of Marking within the National Assessment Banks should be followed.
- The issue of transcription errors, and credit to be awarded, requires to be addressed by some centres. The advice in the General Principles of Marking within the National Assessment Banks should be followed.
- When accepting oral responses from candidates, it would be useful to Moderators (both internal and external), if assessors/markers recorded more detail about the circumstances.
- In the vast majority of evidence submitted for moderation, National Assessment Banks are used as Instruments of assessment.
- All centres results were "accepted".