



CCEA Level 1 Qualification in Occupational Studies
CCEA Level 2 Qualification in Occupational Studies

(Summer Series) 2015

Principal Moderator's Report

occupational studies

Technology and Innovation

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's Level 1 and Level 2 Qualifications in Occupational Studies – Technology and Innovation 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

Contents

Principal Moderator's Report	3
Contact details	8

LEVEL 1 AND 2 QUALIFICATIONS IN OCCUPATIONAL STUDIES - TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Principal Moderator's Report

Introduction

The number of Occupational Studies qualifications cashed in for the summer series 2015 has increased by 5921 candidates when compared with the summer series 2014. The moderation team highlighted the excellent achievements of so many learners in this moderation series.

The candidate evidence must be presented in the following way:

Front cover

The front cover must include the following information:

- Pathway
- Unit name
- Candidate name and number
- Teaching centre name and number
- Administration centre name and number (where different from teaching centre)
- Completion date

It is good practice to include the following content within first few pages of candidates' evidence:

- Signatures to confirm authenticity (candidate and teacher/lecturer)
- Marking grid clearly demonstrating where marks are awarded under all 10 assessment objectives
- Unit specification

CCEA Support Structure

The percentage of centres adjusted this series has dropped considerably from 6.5 percent last year to 2.6 percent this year. One contributory factor to this is the increased attendance at Agreement Trials, and support provided through Portfolio Clinics and Centre Visits. The Moderation Team would strongly recommend that both new and existing centres make use of this support structure provided by CCEA.

Reports to Centres

The TAC6 report provides detailed feedback on each unit within the pathway submitted for moderation under the headings AO1, AO2 and AO3. These reports provide centres with detailed and constructive feedback.

Structure of Candidate Evidence

Centres need to fully comply with the new specification under AO1, AO2 and AO3.

AO1

The section should include candidates' evidence to comply with Health and Safety, Careers and related Environmental Issues. Opportunity must be provided for stretch and challenge to allow more able candidates to demonstrate their ability.

AO2

It is pleasing to see that an increased number of centres are including more photographs as part of their evidence. Unfortunately some centres are not providing a well-structured marking frame that sets out where marks are awarded. There is a lack of annotation by a large number of centres to justify marks awarded.

AO3

Evaluations are still very descriptive rather than evaluative, although marks awarded are more in line with the specification. Detailed reflections of personal performance that clearly identifies strengths, weaknesses and areas of improvement should be considered.

Internal Moderation/Verification

All units within a pathway must be internally moderated/verified. This was a major problem in some centres. Schools and colleges internally moderate/verify results within individual units or for related units across the pathway, however all units within a pathway must have the same rigor applied relating to learner outcomes. The negative impact of not doing this process correctly is that a unit which has been marked too high will have the results adjusted by the Moderation Team. These adjustments will pull down the overall marks for a complete pathway. Some of the adjustments to centres this year were the result of poor internal verification. It was also pleasing to note that some centres had made positive adjustment to marks as a result of internal moderation.

Bench Joinery

AO1 - the majority of centres have developed workbooks for this unit. There are still some who have marked leniently due to questions that are too basic and simplistic. Although these are marked correctly and given top marks, the questions sometimes do not cover the requirements of the specification or they are not sufficiently demanding to warrant the top band of marks. Care should be taken so that three careers are researched as required. More stretch and challenge questions should be used to differentiate between candidates. Environmental questions dealing with recycling and re-using as well as conservation of energy, should be considered. The tools and materials were covered well in most cases. The exemplar can be altered and added to as suits the requirements of the candidates.

AO2 - most centres covered the requirements of the specification. However, there are still some Centres that are not covering all of the joints in one product. The example given for this unit is a coffee table, and most candidates produced a very sound and competently manufactured end product. The photographic evidence is crucial for the moderation process, and it is not

sufficient to include just one photograph of the completed product. There should be supporting evidence of an annotated series of photographs of the construction process at various stages. There were also some very helpful annotated portfolios where the teacher has shown the candidate support and encouragement throughout the process. The quality of the practical work is, as ever, very impressive with some very well made products. The candidates also seem to enjoy the unit and are proud of their efforts.

AO3 - most of the candidates were only able to give descriptive responses to the evaluation questions. These were rather leniently marked and some more work on this section is advised. The candidates could make some qualitative response about how the end product could be changed or adjusted to improve its appearance, for example.

CAD

AO1 - the worksheets in this unit covered the requirements of the specifications, but there could be a greater use of stretch and challenge questions to differentiate between candidates. The Careers and Environmental Issues sections give a possible way for individual research and allow for differentiation. Environmental questions dealing with recycling and re-using as well as conservation of energy should be considered. Over lenient marking in this area was mostly due to the simplistic nature of the worksheets.

AO2 - this is only the second year that this unit has been available, and there are still some issues about the requirements of the specifications. The CAD product should only be in 2D and not 3D. There is an exemplar on the CCEA microsite, and this should be consulted if in doubt. Most of the issues around components/symbols library must relate to the drawings and not the CAD command symbols. The title on the drawing should be clear and concise and state the scale of the drawings. This is a popular unit and it is easy to see how the candidates can use the skills learnt in this unit in the future. It especially links with the Carpentry and Joinery and Manufacturing Units.

AO3 - the evaluations in this unit were rather descriptive and could be extended through questioning to see where the skill learnt in this CAD unit could be used in other Occupational areas.

Carpentry and Joinery

AO1 - although the majority of Centres have used the exemplar booklet as a starting point, they have made adjustments which make questions too basic and simplistic. Although these are marked correctly and given top marks, the questions sometimes do not cover the requirements of the specification or they are not sufficiently demanding to warrant the top band of marks. Care should be taken so that three careers are researched as required. More stretch and challenge questions should be used to differentiate between candidates. Environmental questions dealing with recycling and re-using as well as conservation of energy should be considered. The tools and materials were covered well in most cases. The exemplar can be altered and added to as suits the requirements of the candidates.

AO2 - most centres covered the requirements of the specifications. However, there are still some centres that are not covering all of the joints in one product. The example given for this unit is a birdhouse, and most candidates produced a very sound and competently manufactured end product. The photographic evidence is crucial for the moderation process, and it is not sufficient to include just one photograph of the completed product. There should be supporting evidence of an annotated series of photographs of the construction process and stages. There were also some very helpful annotated portfolios where the teacher has shown the candidate

support and encouragement throughout the process. The quality of the practical work is, as ever, very impressive with some very well made products. The candidates also seem to enjoy the unit and are proud of their efforts.

AO3 - most of the candidates were only able to give descriptive responses to the evaluation questions. These were rather leniently marked, and some more work on this section is advised. The candidates could make some qualitative response about how the end product could be changed or adjusted to improve its appearance, for example.

Digital Imaging

AO1 - the exemplar from the CCEA microsite was mostly used, and the marking was appropriate. There were some good examples of careers research in the Digital Technology sector.

AO2 - the specifications require the candidates to know about and be able to use a digital camera. They should be able to take their own photographs of the different genres and also to manipulate their own photographs. However, some centres had relied on downloading stock images and changing these using the software. Although the skill of using the software is evidenced, it would be much more practical for the candidates to use their own photographs. There should be screen dumps and annotations by the candidate and teacher/lecturer for each of these to show the learning process and the skills mastered. The candidates did show very competent use of Photoshop in the majority of cases. It is not acceptable for all of the candidates to use the same images, as there should be some evidence that the candidates have chosen their own photographs to work on. The final montage was generally good, but it was not always evident that these had been put on display and evaluated by other viewers such as their peers or a general audience. A hard copy of all work would be very useful for moderation purposes.

AO3 - there were very good evaluations by quite a number of candidates, but generally the weaker candidates made little or no attempt to evaluate their end product. More support through worksheets and leading questions should be included for the weaker candidates.

Digital Music

AO1 - this section was mostly well covered, but the use of simple quizzes does not stretch the more able candidates, and these should be supplemented with more individual research questions to allow for the higher range of marks. This can be done through the Careers and Environment sections.

AO2 - the candidates were very able and produced some good musical products. The candidates obviously had fun while completing their assignment tasks. The end product should be submitted as a CD for moderation with hard copies of the planning and production process.

AO3 - this was very leniently marked in some cases and care should be taken to allow the candidates to use peer evaluations as well as their own reflection on the process, skills learnt and the quality of the end product.

Manufacturing Hand Fitting/Manufacturing Sheet Metal

Both of these units seemed to be taken together by the majority of candidates. The candidates also used identical workbooks for the two units. However, separate portfolios should be produced for each unit, and if possible different questions in the AO1 section to allow for the different occupational requirements.

AO1 - this section was generally well covered, especially the tools and materials. However, there still need to be more stretch and challenge questions to allow for differentiation of the candidates. At present almost all candidates get full marks in this section where there should be opportunities for the better candidates to get higher marks.

AO2 - it is important that the requirements of the specification are followed for each unit. There are examples of the product that could be constructed in the specifications and these should be followed. Generally the work and standard of the final product was very good. However, there needs to be more annotation by the teacher to justify the marks awarded, and also the inclusion of photographic evidence of the stages in the production/construction process. The photographs should show the details of the quality of the product.

AO3 - the candidates gave evaluations that were very basic in most cases, which were descriptive rather than reflective. There was little evidence of reflection on the quality of the end product. The candidates should be encouraged to reflect on the use of the object, whether it is fit for purpose and whether it could be improved in appearance.

Sound Production

AO1 - this was generally well done with appropriate worksheets. More work on investigating three Careers through individual research would allow for stretch and challenge.

AO2 - there were some very competent pieces of work produced that showed a good standard of skills. The CD of the final product should be accompanied by hard evidence of the planning and research stages.

AO3 - these were mostly leniently marked, but there was some evidence of reflective and evaluative statements from some candidates. The use of questionnaires and peer evaluation was effectively used in some centres.

TV and Film Production

AO1 - this section was generally well completed by all centres and there were some examples of good practice and accurate marking. The Health & Safety and Careers part of the specification was well covered by the candidates.

AO2 - there was a good quality of work produced by the candidates that chose this unit. The topics were sometimes a little macabre but this genre is very popular with this age group. The moderators became accustomed to the hauntings and murders by the end of moderation. There were some very good pieces of evidence for storyboarding and action planning in some portfolios, but in some it was not clear if these were individual action plans or team efforts.

AO3 - this unit showed some of the best evaluations in the pathway, the film making process lending itself to reflection and evaluation.

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)
- Officer with Subject Responsibility: Dawn Agnew
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension 2445, email: dagnew@ccea.org.uk)