

# **Scholarship**

## **2009 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 with 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 them to comprehensively explain and justify their practice 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:**

- demonstrated elegance, sophistication and originality in the technological practice they undertook to develop their technological outcome(s)
- provided evidence of ongoing critical reflection of their own technological practice as well as where appropriate, the consideration of findings about the practices of others from across a range of contexts.

## SCHOLARSHIP

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

- 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
- addressed a clearly defined issue which had an authentic problem(s) to resolve
- made thorough investigation of the issue and its context, including:
  - exploration of the needs of a technological outcome that resolved the issue
  - identification and ongoing interaction with key and wider community stakeholders
  - investigation of the physical environment where they would undertake their technological practice
  - 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) which 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 problems identified in the issue
- demonstrated that the technological outcome(s) they developed was 'fit for purpose' or if not, provided reasons why it was not, and made suggestions for its improvement
- presented credible and valid evidence which exemplified the development of their technological outcome(s), including photographic evidence, explanations, and resulting findings from testing and trialling of conceptual design ideas, and the developed technological outcome(s) through the use of technological modelling
- provided a logical justification for the technological practice they undertook within their reflective report.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

### **Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:**

- 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 their comments
- did not interact with other technologists, or reflect on, analyse and 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 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'
- 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.