NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2007

Technology

Assessment Report

Technology, Scholarship, 2007

Commentary:

The Scholarship Performance Standard for Technology (90601) required candidates to submit a report that demonstrated critical reflection on their technological experiences in developing a technological outcome(s). This reflection required candidates to demonstrate that they had brought together knowledge, skills and ideas in order to:

- explain the complexities of the situation(s) that they had developed a technological outcome(s) for, in terms of how these situation(s) were identified and explored
- justify the way in which their practice and outcome(s) addressed problem(s) identified for the situation(s)
- demonstrate how their own technological practice was informed through analysing and critiquing the practice(s) of other practising technologists (including their peers) from a range of contexts that were linked to their technological outcome(s).

Reflections presented in a candidate's report needed to demonstrate a high level of synthesis, integration, and critical reflection. To support the reflective comments made by candidates in their reports, evidence of their undertaking technological practice to develop a quality technological outcome(s) also had to be submitted for assessment. Successful Scholarship candidates had generally resolved an issue for a real client, and demonstrated that they could interact with a wide range of stakeholders in order to do this. Such client / stakeholder interaction provided candidates with a range of genuine complexities to explore and provided them with an authentic opportunity to justify the way in which their practice and outcome(s) resolved the issue.

Candidates whose Scholarship report demonstrated critical reflection on their technological experiences were able to justify the technological practice they undertook and critically reflect on their experiences when their practice:

- clearly defined the issue(s) to be addressed and the problems requiring resolution
- investigated widely around the issue(s) and the specific problem(s) that were identified
- explored widely the nature of others' technological practice and used this to inform their own practice
- analysed the social and physical environment in which their technological practice would be undertaken and the location into which their outcome(s) would be finally placed / used
- justified conclusively the technological practice they undertook
- interacted with their client, and key wider community stakeholders throughout their technological practice
- used planning to reflect on their previous technological practice and inform their future practice
- documented clearly and precisely the technological practice that they undertook.

Again in 2007, some candidates presented evidence of undertaking technological practice to develop a technological outcome(s) but failed to present a report that demonstrated the necessary critical reflection on their technological experiences. Others wrote a report without submitting the supporting evidence of the practice they had undertaken. In both cases candidates did not present sufficient evidence to be considered for award of a Scholarship grade.

Analysis and critique of the practices of practising technologists by candidates to inform their own technological practice was generally well done by Scholarship candidates in 2007. Those candidates who were able to further develop the evidence they submitted for assessment against the level 3 knowledge standards by demonstrating how they used this knowledge to inform their own

technological practice, were in a better position to be able to access, use and reflect on the knowledge of other technologists. This enhanced their submission for scholarship.

The analysis and critique of practising technologists' practices was frequently focused on technologists who were working in a context(s) similar to the candidates (eg if the candidate was developing a fashion garment, then the practising technologists used were practising fashion designers). Candidates are also encouraged to look at the practices of practising technologists who work in contexts other than those directly related to the candidates own practice. Where candidates were seen to do this in 2007, they generally demonstrated highly developed analytical skills and were able to clearly distinguish the similarities and differences between the technologists' practices. These candidates were also able to justify the knowledge, skills and / or practices that they incorporated or modified into their own technological practice, and those that were rejected. They also generally provided evidence of innovation in terms of how they used their developed understandings to inform their own technological practice.

Although this was not as prevalent as previous years, a number of candidates in 2007 presented evidence in different media that was simply a repeat of that found in another media form – for example, video footage of a candidate reading notes out of their Scholarship report and / or their portfolio of evidence of technological practice. Where different media are used to present evidence for assessment, the evidence presented in each of them should ***add*** to the candidate's overall evidence, not just represent it in a different format.

Evidence, in photographic form, of the use of mock-ups and models to test, analyse, and justify the potential of a technological outcome or its component parts was often not evident in candidates' supporting material submitted for Scholarship assessment in 2007. Evidence of this nature, that supports statements made by candidates about their technological outcome(s) being "fit for purpose", needs to be presented in the supporting evidence of undertaking technological practice presented for assessment.

Candidates are encouraged to present their evidence for assessment in a manner that makes it easily identifiable and accessed by assessors. Scholarship reports need to be clearly labelled to ensure that the assessors are able to identify them amongst the submitted supporting evidence of undertaking technological practice. Where information is used from sources outside of the candidates own practice, then this needs to be clearly referenced to distinguish it from the candidates own work. Clearly labelling CDs to indicate the files that assessors should find on them and the programme(s) that was used to create these files is also important.

The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- had generally resolved an issue for a genuine client, and demonstrated that they could interact with a wide range of stakeholders in the resolving of the issue
- were able to identify the knowledge, skills and / or practices that could be incorporated or modified for inclusion into their own undertaking of technological practice – when understandings of knowledge, skills and / or practices, which are gained from analysing the practices of practising technologists are modified and / or rejected, candidates are encouraged to discuss this in their Scholarship report
- presented evidence of critical reflection throughout their practice to develop a technological outcome(s)
- were able to explain the nature of this reflection in their Scholarship report.

Candidates who did NOT achieve Scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and in addition they:

- presented evidence of undertaking technological practice to develop a technological outcome(s) without a report that demonstrated the necessary critical reflection on their technological experiences, as described above
- wrote a report without submitting the supporting evidence of the practice they had undertaken.

Note

In 2007, there were a number of instances where a candidate's Scholarship report was difficult for examiners to identify. In order to avoid this in the future, where a Scholarship report is presented within a portfolio of evidence and / or alongside other evidence which is being presented for assessment against external technology achievement standards, candidates (and teachers) need to ensure that the Scholarship report is clearly labelled.