

**CCEA Entry Level in Science  
(March Series) 2018**

# **Principal Moderator's Report**

science



## Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's Entry Level Qualification (ELQ) in Science for this series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk).



## **Contents**

<b>Principal Moderator's Report</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Contact details</b>	<b>4</b>



# ENTRY LEVEL SCIENCE

## Principal Moderator's Report

Compared to last year, there was a broadly similar number of portfolios entered for moderation (782). It was noted that more special schools were now taking this specification.

The compilation of evidence in the portfolios was mainly well presented and reflected the levels claimed for the candidates. However it was noted that some new centres had not attended the agreement trials which may have accounted for work submitted not being of sufficient standard to receive the grade claimed. Two centres were adjusted this year.

The majority of centres were submitting sufficient units for a cash in to produce a final award. A small number of centres submitted a few units so that their outcomes could be banked and additional units added for cash in next year.

### Areas for Attention

For some candidates, there were gaps in the evidence for a level being claimed. This usually meant that an adjustment to the level below was made or in some cases it was not possible to award a level. In a few cases there were levels claimed but the bulk of the evidence was at a level above the ones being claimed. Sometimes evidence or tasks completed did not match the assessment criteria, and teacher annotation did not match the material produced by the candidate. It is not good practice for candidates to be awarded a level by default without checking their work submitted against the criteria for that level.

### Use of Witness Statements

Witness statements could have been more widely used to provide full details of the practical activities observed, where the students documented work does not on its own provide clear evidence for having met the criteria. Some witness statements used merely restated the assessment criteria and said that candidates had achieved them. This was not sufficient as no descriptions of the activities that candidates engaged in, with specific reference to the candidate were included.

### Administration

Many centres used Tracking Records and the notes and page numbers on them greatly assisted the moderation of the Portfolios. The use of these also helped to ensure that there were no gaps in the evidence when building portfolios.

Generally, the candidates' work was well annotated with the use of assessment criteria numbering the best practice observed.

Internal standardisation needs to be more rigorous in some centres. All centres should attend agreement trials

## Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- **Specification Support Officer: Nuala Tierney**  
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2292, email: [ntierney@ccea.org.uk](mailto:ntierney@ccea.org.uk))
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Gavin Gray**  
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2270, email: [ggray@ccea.org.uk](mailto:ggray@ccea.org.uk))