NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2006

Technology

Technology, Scholarship, 2006

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); and
- demonstrate how their own technological practice was informed through analysing and critiquing the practice(s) of other practicing technologists (including their peers) from a range of contexts that were linked to their technological outcome(s).

Reflections presented in a candidate's reports 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 genuine client, and demonstrated that they could interact with a wide range of stakeholders in the resolving of the issue. 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.

Analysis and critique of the practice(s) of practicing technologists by candidates to inform their own technological practice was far more prevalent in the 2006 scholarship submissions than it was in 2005. This analysis and critique was frequently focused on technologists working in similar context to the candidates themselves. From such analysis and critique candidates were able to demonstrate their analytical skills in identifying similarities and / or differences between technologists' practices.

A number of candidates in 2006 presented video evidence, as well as their scholarship report and a portfolio of evidence of their undertaking of technological practice. While this practice is not discouraged, candidates do need to take care that they are not just representing the same evidence in another media in adopting this practice. Where different media (including DVDs) are used to present evidence for assessment, then the evidence presented in each of them needs to ***add*** to the candidate's evidence, not just represent it in a different format. Evidence, in photographic form, of the use of mockups 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 that was submitted. Evidence of this nature that support statements made about the potential viability of a technological outcome(s) presented in candidates' scholarship reports needs to be presented in candidates' supporting evidence of undertaking technological practice that is presented for assessment.

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 those knowledges, 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 are gained from analysing the practices of practicing technologists are modified and / or rejected, candidates are encouraged to discuss this in their scholarship report

- usually 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 2006, 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.