

## **Moderation Feedback - Central**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Technical Education**

**Qualification area**

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

**Technological Studies : Higher, Advanced Higher**

## Central Moderation

### General comments on central moderation activity

Of the 15 centres in the sample, 7 were accepted initially and a further 7 after Assessment Review. The sample covered the Applied Electronics and Systems & Control Units at Higher and Advanced Higher level. Responses to the document relating to the NQ Review reduction in the volume of internal assessment varied from not seen/ignored to seen but not fully understood. Most centres responded well to the Moderator's report and complied with the requirements of the Assessment Review.

The standard of pupil work (and teacher assessment) was generally good for the structured questions. However, as in previous years, the Practical Assignments varied from excellent to mainly very poor. The majority of poor responses were down to inadequate answers being accepted by the teachers and in too many cases no evidence of practical work being submitted.

### Specific issues identified

**NQ Review:** Most centres continued to submit complete NABS for the structured questions, using the original pass marks. Moderators extracted the relevant sections, applied the new cut-off scores and accepted the centre if the results were unaffected. The fact that centres had not followed the revised assessment requirements could either benefit or disadvantage pupils – some pupils had been reassessed by staff for “failing” work no longer in the assessment scheme.

The main problems arose from evidence of Practical Activities. For the Units moderated, the NQ Review reduced the amount of assessable work required but attempted to emphasise the need for *detailed* evidence to be submitted.

Unfortunately, none of the centres sampled had worked to the revised requirements. Therefore, even though the work and teacher assessment were OK, the centres had over-assessed the pupils but were accepted with advice to modify their assessments for future submissions. Several centres submitted no evidence of Practical Activities at all. Others merely submitted the pupils' responses ie Croc Clips printouts for Electronic Systems or program listings for Systems and Control without a preceding question or problem scenario or evidence of a planned sequence of design, construction and evaluation. Many centres obviously set the whole class the same practical assignment, resulting in identical multiple printouts of simulations or program listings.

There is now a clash between the revised assessment requirements for detailed evidence of fewer practical activities and the wording in the original NAB documents where a ticked-off checklist with no reference to the standard of problem tackled or details of the work carried out by the pupil is specified.

There were a few centres who used worksheets to log their pupils' practical work, covering all the elements of the design/problem solving activity required for assessment. Such examples of good practice should be circulated to centres to help to overcome the problems experienced by the Moderation Team.

## **Feedback to centres**

Centres should be reminded of the NQ Review letter on assessment reduction and encouraged to seek clarification on any points arising from it prior to assessing their pupils.

They should also be reminded of the difference between moderation and marking; too many centres submitted either complete sets of course work or incompletely marked NABS, leaving the moderators to sort out the relevant material.

The cut-off scores or pass marks are now based on a complete (although reduced) IA test and LO by LO assessment should not be carried out.