Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2008

Technology

COMMENTARY

The Scholarship Standard for Technology requires candidates to submit a report that demonstrates critical reflection on their technological experiences in developing a technological outcome(s). This reflection requires 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 technological 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 practicing technologists (including their peers) from a range of contexts that were linked to their technological outcome(s).

Reflections presented in candidates' reports needed to demonstrate a high level of synthesis, integration and critical reflection. To support candidates' reflective comments, evidence of undertaking technological practice to develop a quality technological outcome(s) also had to be submitted for assessment. This technological practice needed to include evidence of undertaking brief development, planning for practice, and outcome development and evaluation. Successful candidates resolved an authentic issue(s)/opportunity for a genuine client. To do this, they interacted with a wide range of stakeholders to fully explore the client issue/opportunity and determine the specifications that needed to be met by a successful technological outcome. Such stakeholder interaction and exploration of the client issue/opportunity allowed candidates to justify the way in which their practice and the resulting technological outcome(s) resolved the issue/opportunity.

The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following:

- a critical reflection on their technological experiences that justified the technological practice they undertook to develop a technological outcome(s)
- clear definition of the issue(s) to be addressed and the problems which required resolution
- description of the wide investigations that occurred around the issue(s) in order to identify the specific problem(s) that required resolution
- evidence of the understandings gained from exploring others technological practice and explanation of how these understandings were used to inform their own practice
- evidence of the understandings which were gained from analysing the social and physical environment in which their technological practice took place and the location into which their outcome(s) was placed
- conclusive justification of the technological practice they undertook
- explanation of the interactions they had with their client, and key and wider community stakeholders, and evidence of the outcomes of these interactions throughout their entire technological practice
- explanation of how reflections on their prior technological practice were used to inform their planning for future practice
- clear references back into their in their portfolio evidence of having undertaken technological practice to resolve the identified issue
- referenced sources of information.

Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the above and/or they:

- failed to present a report that demonstrated the required critical reflection on their technological experiences

- presented a report without submitting portfolio evidence of the practice they had undertaken to develop a technological outcome(s)
- failed to present evidence of their having analysed and critiqued the practice(s) of practicing technologists to inform their own undertaking of technological practice; this meant that they were often unable to justify the knowledge, skills and/or practices that they incorporated in their own technological practice, or those which they rejected.

General Comments

The majority of candidates presented hard copy reports with supporting portfolios or CD/DVD evidence of their technological practice. Entries were in most cases clearly labelled with the candidate name and NSN.

A number of candidates presented evidence in a different medium, which simply repeated evidence that had been presented in another form - for example, DVD footage of their reading notes out of their scholarship report and/or explaining evidence, which was already provided within their portfolio of technological practice. Where different media are used to present evidence for assessment, each of them should add to candidates' overall evidence, not just repeat it using another medium. 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 still often not evident. Evidence of this nature, that supports statements made by candidates about their technological outcome(s) being "fit for purpose", should have been presented in their supporting evidence of undertaking technological practice.

Candidates should present evidence in a manner that makes it easily identifiable and accessible to the assessors. The scholarship report should be clearly labelled to ensure that the assessors are able to identify it amongst the submitted supporting portfolio evidence. Where evidence is presented in a number of folios/clear files and/or media, these should be numbered to indicate the sequence in which assessors should read/view them. Where information is presented that informed the candidates' undertaking of technological practice and this information came from sources outside of their own practice, this information needed to be clearly referenced to distinguish it from the candidates' own work. This applies to such information as teacher provided class notes, textbook quotes and internet downloads. Clearly labelled CDs/DVDs that indicate the files that assessors should find in them when they are opened and the programme(s) used to create the file(s) are important.

Where candidates present a website as the technological outcome which they have developed, it is suggested that they keep it "live" until the end of the assessment process (December) due to assessors' needing to visit the site to check that indicated links do function and their compatibility with web browsers.