Scholarship

2011 Assessment Report

Technology

CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- provided evidence of in-depth exploration and understanding of an authentic issue in a complex situation
- analysed the issue they were addressing with an in-depth understanding of who would be using the final outcome and where it was to be placed
- provided reflective explanations about the complexities of the situation encountered
- provided evidence of critical reflection on knowledge gained from a variety of sources across a range of contexts, which impacted on their practice
- demonstrated elegance and originality in undertaking their technological practice to create elegant and original technological outcomes
- provided comprehensive justification of their technological practice, including justification that their outcome was fit for the intended purpose.

SCHOLARSHIP

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

- presented a reflective report
- provided evidence of investigating an authentic issue prior to deciding upon the nature of the solution
- undertook an in-depth analysis of the location where the developed outcome was to be placed
- presented evidence demonstrating sound technological practice that underpinned and informed the development of their final technological outcome
- demonstrated advanced skills in the production of their outcome
- reflected on the practices of others during their own undertaking of technological practice, and demonstrated how understandings gained from this reflection informed the development of their technological outcome(s)
- identified and maintained ongoing interaction with key and wider community stakeholders
- fully developed a brief with measurable specifications that were continually tested throughout their technological practice to justify that it described a technological outcome(s) that had the potential to resolve the defined issue
- undertook ongoing analysis of information and understandings throughout the development of a technological outcome(s)
- presented a comprehensive selection of credible and valid evidence that exemplified the synthesis and integration of their technological experiences, including: photographic evidence, explanations, analysis of research, findings from testing and trialling design ideas, and undertaking functional modelling
- provided a logical justification for the technological practice they undertook within their reflective report
- demonstrated, through testing a prototype of their technological outcome(s) in situ, that it was 'fit for purpose' or if not, provided reasons why it was not, and made suggestions for its improvement.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship typically:

- did not provide evidence that they were working at technology curriculum level 8
- did not work in a context that was authentic or that provided an opportunity for constructive and honest feedback from a range of stakeholders
- presented work that reflected a design and make process rather than a technological process
- decided upon the nature of the outcome and/or producing the outcome without fully exploring the issue or consulting stakeholders to fully understand their needs
- demonstrated a sound understanding of technological practice but did not provide clear evidence of how this was synthesised and integrated to allow their final outcome to be realised
- did not interact with other technologists, or reflect on, analyse and/or evaluate the practices of other technologists to inform their own undertaking of technological practice
- used experts principally as decision-makers for the technological practices they undertook and/or the design of their technological outcome, instead of as resource people
- did not present a report that demonstrated the required critical analysis and/or reflection on their technological experiences
- did not provide evidence that their developed technological outcome was 'fit for the purpose' or did not suggest areas for improvement when not 'fit for purpose'
- did not justify that their brief (including its specifications) described a technological outcome(s) that would resolve the defined issue within its physical and social environment
- presented insufficient evidence to allow the examiner to understand the technological practice they undertook
- presented a reflective report, but did not submit supporting evidence that authenticated the comments made in their report.

OTHER COMMENTS

Successful candidates demonstrated an ability to synthesise and critically analyse their technological experiences. To support the reflective comments made in their reports, evidence of a quality outcome was also submitted in the form of a digital presentation e.g. DVD, CD, online website, digital diary, or portfolio material. Candidates provided robust and comprehensive evidence that fully supported their practice and thoroughly demonstrated how their technological outcome was fit for its intended purpose, or if not, why it wasn't and how it could be improved.

Candidates had resolved an authentic issue for a real client, and demonstrated their ability to interact across a diverse range of stakeholders, including practicing technologists from of range of contexts. It was clear that the opportunity to work within an authentic context helped these candidates to comprehensively explain and justify the practice they had undertaken to resolve the issue. Those who set out to resolve complex problems were better placed to extend and challenge their thinking, thus enabling them to seek a broader range of information to help guide and enhance their practice.