

Chief Moderator Report

Manufacturing

Summer 2006

Contents:

Introduction

Witness Testimony

Advanced Vocational Certificate of Education programme (6 and 12 units programmes)

Introduction

The Chief Moderator and one Principal Moderator moderated portfolios from three A/VCE centres. Each of the centres submitted work for small cohorts.

Because the moderating team was very small and there were very few portfolios submitted, the majority of the work was moderated by both the Chief and Principal moderator as part of the standardisation process.

Assessment was generally lenient, with assessors seeking to maximise the scores awarded to candidates. This resulted in the assessment of several of the units being not to National Standards.

Unfortunately there remains some misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the requirements of the unit specification. And many candidates produced generic evidence that did not relate specifically to the assessment criteria. Some portfolios contained typical class notes that were either non-specific or irrelevant to the evidence requirements of the unit. Candidates only receive credit for evidence that meets identified criteria stated in the assessment grid for a specific unit.

Some of the centres did not provide any indication of how assessors had awarded points scores often resulting in inaccurate assessment. The use of assessment front sheet is recommended since they can clearly indicate where specific evidence can be found in the portfolio, and also focus on the type of evidence required to meet selected criteria. This practice generally proved helpful to candidates.

There has been some misinterpretation of the '*Changes to the Assessment of Portfolio Units at Grade E/Pass Level*' effective from September 2002. In particular assessors have tended to award marks on a holistic basis where candidates have met some of the higher grade criteria. Assessment on a '*best fit basis*' is only appropriate when candidates have comfortably met **most** of the grade E criteria. The notice to centres also provide an example of a possible mark within the range of 10 - 12 being awarded if there was evidence towards grade C criteria even if a **small part** of the Grade E criteria is omitted. In some cases candidates did not provide any evidence to meet several grade E criteria and therefore the assessment was significantly lenient. The omission of whole criteria is not considered to be a small part.

Assessors should recognise that when grading candidate's evidence the following general qualities must be considered to distinguish between the different grades:

- Increasing depth and breadth of understanding
- Increasing coherence, evaluation and analysis
- Increasing independence and originality.

The moderators looked for evidence that demonstrated the above characteristics when considering work to meet the higher level assessment criteria.

Witness Testimony

The lack of detailed witness testimony once again detracted from evidence provided to meet assessment criteria which related to practical activities. The requirements of witness testimony are well documented in previous reports.

No centres provided portfolios for either Foundation or Intermediate programmes.

Advanced Vocational Certificate of Education in Manufacturing

Units 301, 302, 304, 306 and 309 were submitted for moderation. However in the vast majority of cases centres only presented work from very small number of candidates and it appeared that the majority of these candidates were resubmitting work in order to achieve a higher grade or complete a programme of study.

Unit M301P The World of Manufacturing

Evidence provided for this unit was frequently judged to be only just sufficient, meeting only some aspects of the assessment criteria.

Many candidates produced work of a general nature, e.g. notes on organisational structure, information flow and location, with insufficient evidence relating to the chosen company. Also, general 'class' notes were provided on scales of production with a lack of detailed information about one chosen product and schematic diagrams lacked specific annotations. Most candidates accessed and used statistical data and made reference to the GDP and sources of information were acknowledged.

Unit M302P Health & Safety & Environmental Impact

Candidates generally found this unit difficult, possibly because they were not able to receive the input from industry since they must produce a case study of a **manufacturing process**. This can only be undertaken to a sufficient degree if they have access to the company manufacturing the product and are provided with appropriate information.

A life cycle analysis must include the inputs and outputs of the process, the raw materials used, the fuel/energy used.

Candidates must show a consideration of the impact of the of the main energy sources on **human, natural and built environment** in terms of **quality of life, whether resources are renewable, pollution and local geography**.

Candidates must show a consideration of the main energy sources in terms of:

- **costs**
- **availability**

- **reliability**
- **maintenance**
- **environmental impact.**

Unit M304P

Unfortunately many candidates did not provide evidence that they had been provided with a **given product specification and a production plan** and often team meetings suggested that candidates chose their own product and developed their own plan. Therefore they had difficulty providing evidence to show that they had used information from the production plan to structure production. Photographs of candidates participating in the team activity, endorsed by the assessor provided useful evidence for many candidates. Where student process skills, including safe use of materials and components, tools and equipment, are being assessed, it is important that Witness Testimony is provided by assessors to authenticate student work and provide evidence that students have achieved the level of performance required in the assessment grid. Identification of safe working practices is not sufficient evidence to confirm that a student has worked safely.

Most candidates showed an understanding of quality assurance and some provided evidence that appropriate quality control techniques had been applied at appropriate stages of production.

Unit M306P

Most candidates showed an understanding of what the customer brief required of them. However few candidates provided a copy of the given brief and therefore it was difficult therefore for the moderator to ascertain if their interpretation was correct.

All candidates carried out some Market Research. However in many cases this was limited to a questionnaire, the results of which were not considered in depth to develop initial design criteria for the product.

Candidates generally carried out research into materials and manufacturing processes, but not all candidates used their research in the development of design ideas. Similarly, notes on legislation and regulations were included but not referred to by most candidates.

P S Higgs

August 2006