

Scholarship

2012 Assessment Report

Technology

CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- provided evidence a clear definition of and in-depth exploration of an authentic issue and its ensuing challenges to be addressed and resolved during technological practice
- continually reflected on who would be using the outcome and the environment in which it was to be situated
- provided evidence of ongoing critical reflection on the pertinent knowledge gained from a variety of sources that impacted upon their practice and outcome development
- provided in depth justification for both their technological practice and how the outcome addressed the challenges of the issue and fitness for purpose
- demonstrated elegance and originality in both technological practice and the ensuing technological outcome.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically demonstrated:

- evidence of a genuine client with an issue that is sufficiently complex to allow the development of in-depth practice and a high quality outcome
- the ability to carry out on-going and in-depth investigation into the issue including the social and physical environment in which the issue is placed. For example, in-depth consideration of the issue, possible users and the environment
- a natural and logical flow in the progression of their practice
- justification of practice which includes giving clear and succinct reasons for actions undertaken
- flexibility and a willingness to adapt and alter their practice in response to the situation as it unfolds
- a willingness to pursue ideas outside of their preferred areas of practice
- the ability to synthesise and integrate pertinent knowledge, skills and ideas from level 8 of the Technology curriculum
- the ability to reflect on relevant information, knowledge, attitudes and/or practices of others and how these may influence, inform or guide the development of the outcome.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- did not explore in sufficient depth the issue or its context
- did not reflect on information, knowledge, attitudes, and practices of others to actively inform the development of their own outcomes
- included copious amounts of irrelevant information. Although candidates were not directly penalised for exceeding the 60-page limit, it will not be possible to exceed this limit in 2013
- <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications-standards/awards/scholarship/scholarship-subjects/scholarship-technology/#assessment>
- submitted digital files or apps that could not be accessed or read. Candidates who are using such applications need to make videos in a standard format thus ensuring all material is viewable

- presented insufficient or incoherent evidence which did not allow the examiner to understand or appreciate the issue or technological practice being undertaken
- had a predetermined outcome in mind which prevented any authentic exploration of the issue and as such, hampered creativity or innovation even though a high level of technical skill was demonstrated
- embarked on projects without setting realistic parameters and thereby limited the possibility of success.

From 2013 Scholarship requires candidates to demonstrate they have:

- critically analysed, synthesised, and integrated their technological experiences.

Technological experiences include all three strands from the Technology curriculum:

- undertaking technological practice to develop a technological outcome(s) that is justified as fit for purpose in the broadest sense and shows elements of elegance and or originality
- demonstrating understandings of concepts underpinning technological knowledge
- demonstrating understandings of the nature of technology.

Visit: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications-standards/awards/scholarship/scholarship-subjects/scholarship-technology/#assessment>