



ENTRY PATHWAYS - SUMMER 2013  
MATHEMATICS

Chief Examiner: Linda Mason

Many centres presented evidence of units clearly.

A number of centres arranged the evidence by candidate, yet it is the units that are being moderated. It is helpful to arrange the evidence by unit as it is the **units** that are moderated, as detailed on the individual EP1 forms.

Generally evidence was detailed on the Assessment Record and often moderators were able to agree with the teachers.

Best practice included clearly numbered pages with reference to Assessment Criteria. In these cases, much of the evidence was clear and moderators were often able to agree with the centre marking and annotation. The cross reference details of the evidence helped both the centre and the moderator as a check that all of the evidence required was included. This is a useful technique, as evidence for all the Assessment Criteria is needed, as outlined in the guidance.

Best practice was from centres electing to include a variety of activities. This demonstrated that candidates had a variety of interesting activities to work on to enhance their learning. These candidates had opportunities to increase their confidence in mathematics through interesting and stimulating activities. Much of this type of evidence was via annotated photographs and photocopies of mini white boards, for example a photocopy or photograph of a successful card sort activity. An alternative form included witness statements with screen shots from the use of computer software.

The appropriate use of witness statements is valuable, particularly where practical or oral activities are undertaken. This includes measuring and weighing tasks and counting forward and backwards. Witness statements are appropriate where written evidence is considered unnecessary, in such cases the annotation needs to give sufficient details to ensure the moderator is clear which specific skills were demonstrated and how this occurred. It is extremely unlikely to have witness statements as evidence for an entire unit, this would not be good practice.

Entry Pathways encourages teachers to use appropriate methodologies of teaching and learning. Moderators found that there was mix of experience for candidates. Some evidence of units was entirely work sheet based. However, better practice was demonstrated where evidence was a mix of annotated work sheets, photographs and detailed witness statements.

Where moderators found problems, it tended to be related to incorrect work marked as correct, or that a candidate had not had sufficient opportunities to demonstrate a particular skill. Where a worksheet restricts the number of opportunities to the minimum requirement a candidate may make an error and then not meet the minimum requirement. Hence, the number of opportunities of demonstrating a skill should be greater than the minimum requirement.

Centres received individual reports, on which moderators noted a number of issues. These are worth checking before sending a sample of candidates work for external moderation to WJEC in the future. Most of these comments were requesting further exemplification of a skill, pointing out that there was evidence missing for a specific AC, and in some cases highlighting a misconception or misunderstanding of the AC.

These reports often included some reference some of the following issues.

- Evidence for giving and following instructions specifically with the use of the terms clockwise and anticlockwise.
- Labelling the axes on graphs, as often candidates missed off the specific label, for example 'colour of car', 'pet', or 'favourite sport'.
- No evidence of plan views of 3D shapes made from cubes, yet evidence of working with nets was included demonstrating that candidates are working with 2D and 3D concepts.
- Evidence of equivalent fractions was included, but no evidence that a candidate understands fractions making a whole, such as  $\frac{2}{2}$ ,  $\frac{3}{3}$ ,  $\frac{4}{4}$  or  $\frac{10}{10}$ .
- Calculate simple fractions of quantities in practical situations. Also the consideration of the remainder. For example, 5 people in each boat, 23 people, how many boats are needed? Four with remainder 3, does not fully answer this question.
- Checking for accuracy can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, for example checking a calculation involving addition by then working backwards with subtraction, or making an estimate before carrying out the calculation. Often the evidence of checking accuracy was not found in the evidence.
- In data handling, there was often insufficient evidence of making comparisons by reviewing information. It is expected that candidates demonstrate their skills with each of lists, tables, simple charts and pictograms. Some centres submitted evidence where a candidate had only demonstrated their skills with only lists, no evidence of comparisons with tables, simple charts and pictograms.