

## Moderation Feedback - Central

**Assessment Panel:**

Chemistry

**Qualification area**

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

Chemistry; NQ

## **Central Moderation**

### **General comments on central moderation activity**

Centres generally showed a high standard of candidate evidence which had been marked carefully in accordance with national guidelines. A small minority of centres accepted O3 evidence which fell below the national standard.

## Specific issues identified

### Outcomes 1 & 2

The majority of centres moderated assessed O1 and O2 accurately and totalled the marks correctly. The following points are worth noting:

1. DO70 12 NAB 001 Q 15 a) a minority of centres accepted propanol for ½ mark; the mark scheme states propan-1-ol, 1 or 0 marks. In one centre, two candidates got 1 mark for propanol, one candidate got 0 marks for propanol and four of the sample got 1 mark for propan-1-ol.
2. DO69 12 NAB 001 Q 15 b) a small number of centres did not accept “larger surface area”, presumably insisting on the mark scheme answer “to *increase* the surface area”.
3. Some confusion still exists over DO7012 NAB 001 Q 18 a) Air/oxygen and phenol are needed for ½ mark, the second ½ mark is gained for the answer oxidation. A significant number of centres showed confusion on these points though the distribution of marks is clearly stated in the mark scheme.
4. Approximately 15% of centres seemed unaware of either the *Update on Chemistry NABs; Higher Chemistry or Marking Guidelines; General Information for Markers*. The latter were issued with NAB001, Unit 1 at each NQ level and the former were sent to all centres in 2000. The moderation team enclosed photocopies of the relevant documents with the feedback sent to each centre where these issues were identified.
5. DO69 12 NAB 001 Q16 a) a small number of centres accepted “exothermic” instead of “enthalpy of combustion” as stated in the mark scheme.

### Outcome 3

#### *Advanced Higher*

1. HSDU material produced for level 12 (Higher) gives helpful guidelines for assessment of O3. No such material is available at level 13 (Advanced Higher) and four centres submitted PPA reports which showed no sign of having been marked hence no indication of whether the centre considered that the candidates had achieved PCs b to f. Pages from the Arrangements document referring to AH Outcome 3: Teacher/Lecturer Guide were photocopied and returned to these centres with the Moderator Report Form. Moderators found several errors in the ‘unmarked’ reports.
2. Evidence from two separate centres contained PPA reports from two and three candidates respectively which were identical down to the last word.
3. Candidates from two centres did not use the past passive tense.
4. There was a general tendency to over-long procedures and weak evaluations.

### ***Higher and Int 2***

Only Unit 1 PPAs were moderated so the gulf between the best and the worst centres was amplified.

1. Higher and Int 2, Unit 1, PPAs 1&2, candidates are still quoting calculated rates to one or, at most, two significant figures. Centres should use these PPAs to emphasise the lower error in the longer time measurements and encourage the use of at least three sig. figs.
2. Graphs were the weakest part of many O3 reports. 'Joining the dots' was common. This leads to the inclusion of rogue results which would have been easily identified if a line of best fit had been used, as per the mark scheme.
3. Evaluations were often weak, e.g. PPA 1, PC(e) the response 'to make the experiment fair' is not appropriate at Higher level. PPA 2, PC(e) a common answer to 'why might it be difficult to get an accurate reaction time at room temperature' is 'because the reaction occurs too slowly'. An appropriate mention of colour change is essential to overcome this PC.
4. A very small minority of centres are accepting work from their candidates which is well below the national standard. In these cases O3 evidence includes incorrect calculations, incomplete tables, missing units and graphs where more than one point has been mis-plotted. The O3 evidence from these centres is described on the Moderator Report Form as barely acceptable.
5. An increasing number of centres showed evidence of internal moderation which ensures a consistent approach to assessment of candidate evidence and streamlines the central moderation event. Many centres clearly indicate why marks have been awarded or deducted; this is of great help to moderators and is an example of best practice. It would be very useful if a signature and date were added to the report to confirm internal moderation.

## Feedback to centres

### ***Outcomes 1 & 2***

Candidate evidence for Outcomes 1&2 was of a high standard. NABs were generally marked accurately and in line with national guidelines but a number of centres are not applying the *Marking Guidelines; General information for markers* or the *Update on Chemistry NABs; Higher Chemistry*.

### ***Outcome 3***

Moderation of O3 is now focused on PPAs from Unit 1 so any variation in the standards accepted by different centres are underlined. The vast majority of centres demand and get clear, accurate PPA reports from their candidates. A small minority of centres accept some O3 evidence which contains incorrect calculations, incomplete tables, missing units and graphs which have been plotted incorrectly. This could be avoided if centres adopt the best practice of internal moderation which ensures a consistent and accurate approach to assessment.