

KEY SKILLS PILOT APPLICATION OF NUMBER 2007

Principal Moderator's Report

General Comments

Generally suitable activities had been chosen to enable most of the candidates to generate the required evidence at the appropriate level. There are however issues with the application of the criteria to the required standard at both Level 1 and 2. All assessors and moderators are encouraged to review the requirements of the standards for future submissions. Generally when a Portfolio failed to meet the requirements of the standards there was only one criterion which presented a problem however there are a range of issues across centres. Action Plans were generated for many centres.

Application of the Assessment Criteria

Level 1

N1.1: Many of the Portfolios did not contain suitable source material. At this level there must be evidence of information used from a table, graph, chart or diagram. The source material must be included within the Portfolio.

N1.2: Assessors must ensure that calculations are accurate and appropriately rounded before they are claimed as evidence. A minority of Portfolios contained inaccurate results or inappropriate rounding for money. For candidates to produce an answer to 2 decimal places he/she must have a value containing 3 decimal places before it can be rounded.

In all categories of N1.2 there is a requirement that results must be checked. The majority of portfolios did not show sufficient evidence of checking.

N1.3: When presenting findings the graphs or charts used must have suitable scales and clear labels. The presentation method used must be appropriate for the type of data. In some cases scales or plotting of values were inaccurate. Some portfolios did not contain any comment on the results of calculations or presentation methods.

Level 2

N2.1: Some of the candidates had not used a data set of an appropriate size, ie 20 items. In a minority of cases a graph or chart source was not used. A table cannot be claimed as a chart, examples of charts include; bar charts, pie charts, frequency polygons or pictograms. In a minority of cases the data extracted from the chart/graph was not actually used within the Portfolio.

N2.2: Generally suitable calculation evidence for N2.2a and b was provided. For N2.2c due to insufficient datasets the calculations for handling statistics were unacceptable in some cases. The comparison of data for N2.2c was not well addressed. In a minority of portfolios the evidence claimed for N2.2d was insufficient as the formula was not stated with clear substitution of values. In all categories of N2.2 the evidence of checking was often limited.

N2.3: Most portfolios contained suitable evidence of presenting findings using appropriate method however interpretation was not always provided to the required standard.

Annotation

Assessors within all centres annotated the evidence claimed however in some instances the calculations were inaccurate or the evidence inappropriate.

Desktop Tasks

Generally the marking of Desktop Tasks was of a good standard however errors have been made in a minority of cases. The mark schemes must be adhered to. Notation for probability and money must be appropriate.