

Moderation Feedback — Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area:

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

Technological Studies — Standard Grade

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

This was the first year of the Application of Technology assignment. Previously moderation has been carried out on the Problem Solving element of the course. Schools are issued with a bank of assignments from which they can select the most appropriate for their candidates. Exemplar assignments were issued early in the session.

44 centres were identified for moderation. The moderation team took two days to complete the exercise. The evidence was generally accessible and to a good standard; the format of the assignment leads candidates and teachers to present the evidence in an appropriate format.

Moderators selected appropriate samples from each centre and visited the work using the assessment criteria. The Guidance on Assessment was clear and particularly easy to use.

The assessments of all centres were accepted as being to an appropriate standard, however there were some issues identified which are mentioned below.

Where possible, comments were issued to all centres, even those who were accepted. This is a change from previous years when comments were only given to centres whose assessment had not been accepted.

There are seven sub-elements, each scoring from 0 to 4 marks. The final grade is allocated depending on the total number of marks for all sub-elements.

In some centres, a number of different assignments were submitted, while in others, all candidates attempted the same assignment.

Three centres were late with their submissions and one further centre submitted incomplete paperwork. Moderation of these was carried out after the central moderation event.

There were concerns about the close similarity of work of candidates from one centre, with suspicion of copying. This was submitted to the appropriate SQA section.

One centre had used the exemplar assignment instead of one of those issued for this exercise. Although the assessment criteria had been properly applied, the matter was submitted to the Moderation section for further investigation.

Specific issues identified

AT1:

In some centres, there was a general lack of detail in the system diagrams. This led to the conclusion that these candidates did not fully understand the use of such diagrams. Care should be taken in the teaching of system diagrams prior to the assignment.

AT2:

This area was generally well done but some of the assignments gave all the necessary specification in the description or brief. Care should be taken by the Setters in the preparation of the briefs to allow candidates the opportunity to do more than just rewrite the problem.

AT3:

Generally good responses to this sub-element.

AT4:

There is no guidance to the amount of justification required for selection of devices or components. Some candidates made statements like “I chose a bulb because I needed light” while others referred to technical data sheets to indicate appropriate components. Further guidance needs to be provided by SQA regarding the level of complexity and detail required otherwise the four marks will become almost automatic to all candidates.

AT5:

There did not seem to be a general, clear understanding of the term “range parameters” as there was little evidence of them being adjusted for simulation purposes.

AT6:

Test evidence was not always present.

AT7:

While there was a range in the quality of evaluations, the evidence was easiest to find in the work of candidates who evaluated against the specification and criteria in a logical and well-ordered manner. Having obviously put a lot of work into their assignments, some candidates let themselves down with minimal evaluations.

Teachers' Comments

In general, there were very helpful comments from teachers which assisted the moderation process by indicating what evidence had been considered for assessment, however:

- ◆ In a number of cases there were little or no comments, leaving the moderator to make difficult judgements about the relevance of some work.
- ◆ This is particularly important in AT3, where the mark allocated depends on whether prompts have been given during the assignment.

Feedback to centres

Individual feedback was provided to all centres which were moderated at the central event.

General feedback could be given to all centres by publishing the contents of the **Specific Issues Identified** section.