Scholarship

2013 Assessment Report

Technology

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- provided evidence of in-depth exploration and a clear definition of an authentic issue and its ensuring challenges to be addressed, either at the beginning or during technological practice, that required resolution
- understood and critically reflected on the social environment (people, values, culture, trends, and emotional resonance) in which the technological outcome would be located
- critically reflected continually on where the outcome would be situated (physical environment)
- extrapolated – were able to hypothesise relevance of information and experiences into new contexts so as to inform the development of their technological outcome
- demonstrated a willingness to pursue ideas outside of their preferred areas of practice
- provided evidence of on-going critical reflection on the pertinent knowledge gained from a variety of sources that impacted upon their practice and outcome development
- were forward thinking which enabled seamless steps in their technological practice
- justified in-depth the technological practice they undertook and how the outcome addressed the challenges of the issue and fitness for purpose in its fullest sense
- critically reflected on focused and relevant functional modelling to ensure the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- were able to reflect and analyse others processes and practices
- demonstrated elegance and originality in both technological practice and the ensuring technological outcome
- explored suitability of materials, processes, components based upon their performance properties to ensure fitness for purpose
- understood socio-cultural and historical contexts through reading and reflecting on current research and views
- developed a complex outcome that showed their ingenuity and optimisation of materials, components and/or processes.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- investigated a genuine issue that allowed them to explore relevant needs and opportunities and was sufficiently complex to allow the development of in-depth level 8 practice and a high quality outcome
- demonstrated their ability to carry out on-going and in-depth investigation into the social and physical environment in which the issue is placed
- justified their practice which includes giving clear and succinct reasons for actions undertaken
- demonstrated a natural and logical flow in the progression of their practice through being flexible and a willing to adapt and alter their practice in response to the situation as it unfolds
- demonstrated 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
- analysed stakeholder feedback to gain insightful understandings of the situation which were used to inform their practice

- demonstrated creative problem solving abilities while undertaking their practice
- reflected upon the knowledge gained from functional modelling to ensure the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- synthesised in-depth knowledge and skills to ensure their technological outcome was fit for purpose
- were able to reflect and analyse on their own processes and practices
- limited their socio-cultural understanding to their immediate context.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- did not explore an issue or context reducing their ability to identify authentic needs and opportunities
- started from a design and make perspective and consequently did not produce a technological outcome
- had a predetermined outcome in mind which prevented any authentic exploration of the issue and as such, hampered creativity and/or innovation even though they demonstrated a high level of technical skill
- did not demonstrate socio-cultural understanding of a context
- did not use their reflection on information, knowledge, attitudes and/or practices of others to actively inform the development of their own outcomes
- undertook research that was not relevant to the situation
- presented insufficient or incoherent evidence which did not allow the examiner to understand the technological practice being undertaken.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Candidates whose work significantly exceeded the 60-page limit did not have all their work marked. In future submissions must not exceed specifications so as not to limit a candidate's grade.
- Candidates need to ensure there is sufficient evidence in their report that reflects all three stands of the curriculum.
- When candidates submit pages from their portfolios, these should be selected for their relevance to the report and presented so that markers can read them.
- Candidates need to present work that is of a complex level, i.e. meets level 8 curriculum objectives working within all three strands (Nature of Technology, Technological Knowledge and Technological Practice)
- Candidates who work with a client often find this provides the necessary complexity to the issue and situation that enhances their practice.
- Candidates who presented evidence that followed guidelines for competitions had constrained their technology practice. Competition briefs do not allow the candidate to explore thoroughly an issue or the social and physical environment. Similarly, for students who developed outcomes for a show were also unable to fully engage in an issue.
- Where candidate's practice was guided by assessment against an implement standard rather than the curriculum objectives for technological practice at level eight the candidate's outcome was constrained. For example, the criteria for the implement standards, directs practice rather than the issue and resulting specifications directing practice leading to a fully fit for purpose outcome.