

# **Scholarship**

## **2010 Assessment Report**

### **Technology**

## COMMENTARY

Successful candidates demonstrated an ability to synthesise and critically analyse their technological experiences. To support the reflective comments made in their reports, evidence of undertaking technological practice to develop a quality outcome was also submitted in the form of a digital presentation (e.g. DVD, CD, online website, digital diary), or as portfolio material. They 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.

Most 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 a 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.

## SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

**Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- addressed a clearly defined issue which had an authentic problem(s) to resolve
- demonstrated **elegance, sophistication** and **originality** in the technological practice they undertook to develop their technological outcome(s)
- provided evidence of **critical** reflection of others' practice from across a range of contexts and used understandings gained from this reflection to inform their own technological practice
- provided evidence of ongoing **critical** reflection of their own technological practice
- presented evidence of undertaking technological practice to develop a technological outcome which included a reflective report that came from a robust Level 3 technology programme.

## SCHOLARSHIP

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

- presented **portfolio evidence** of undertaking technological practice to develop a technological outcome along with a **reflective report** that came from a robust Level 3 technology programme
- made a thorough investigation of an issue and context, including:
  - exploring the needs of a technological outcome that resolved an authentic issue/problem
  - identifying and maintaining ongoing interaction with key and wider community stakeholders
  - investigation of the physical environment where they would undertake their technological practice
  - undertaking an in-depth analysis of the location where the developed outcome was to be placed
- undertook ongoing critical analysis of **their** technological practice throughout the development of a technological outcome(s)
- fully developed a brief with measurable specifications that was continually tested throughout their technological practice to justify that it described a technological outcome(s) that had the potential to resolve the defined issue

- critically reflected on the practices of **others** throughout their own undertaking of technological practice, and demonstrated how understandings gained from this reflection informed the development of their technological outcome(s)
- clearly and precisely documented the technological practice they followed to achieve a technological outcome(s) that resolved the problem(s) identified in the issue, including providing:
  - detailed descriptions of the functional modelling they undertook to trial and test their design ideas
  - explanations of reasons for conducting trials and tests
  - an explanation of the implications of their findings from tests and trials on their developing technological outcome
- presented credible and valid evidence which exemplified the development of their technological outcome(s), including photographic evidence, explanations, and the findings from testing and trialling design ideas, and the developing technological outcome(s) through the use of technological 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 or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- did not present a report that demonstrated the required **critical analysis** and/or **reflection** on their technological experiences
- presented insufficient evidence to allow the examiner to understand the technological practice they undertook
- presented a reflective report, but did **not** submit supporting portfolio evidence which authenticated the comments made in their report
- 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
- did not work in a context that was authentic or one which provided an opportunity for constructive and honest feedback from a range of stakeholders
- 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 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
- did not provide evidence that they were working at technology curriculum level 8.