



PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

**ENTRY PATHWAYS
MATHEMATICS**

SUMMER 2017

ENTRY PATHWAYS

MATHEMATICS

Summer 2017

The majority of centres presented evidence of units clearly referenced on the assessment sheet. The evidence should be arranged by unit not by candidate and in general this was the case for most centres this series. Moderation is a process of looking at teacher understanding of each assessment criterion within each unit, not the moderation of candidates.

In general, moderators were able to agree with the teachers. Best practice included clearly numbered pages referenced to Assessment Criteria recorded on the Assessment Record, annotated and work marked accurately. However, a few centres did not reference accurately.

The WJEC website, Entry Pathways Qualifications in Mathematics Units and Guidance includes examples of forms, including those used by moderators as a checklist. The secure website also includes exemplar materials.

When WJEC evidence worksheets are used, to show summarised evidence, it is important to check that all the required worksheets for the complete unit are included. There were occasions where centres had used these worksheets appropriately but had not referenced them against the Assessment Record; as a result there was not evidence for all the criteria. A missing summative worksheet could result in a unit not being passed by moderators. The use of these sheets as summative assessment is suitable evidence but if candidates make errors, there is a possibility that the evidence provided will fall below the minimum requirement.

A number of centres have developed good practice for internal moderation. However, a few centres did not indicate whether any internal moderation had taken place. There is a newer version of the Assessment Record on the WJEC website which gives three lines for signatures and dates. One for the teacher, one for internal moderator and the final one for the external moderation process. It was often found where evidence was missing for a particular assessment criterion, that internal moderation had not taken place. This was also true of miss marking work as correct, when in fact it was incorrect.

It is better to organise the evidence by skill in the order given in the Assessment Criteria if possible. This also helps with the internal moderation of the units.

Errors in marking were found on occasions, the accuracy of the work of candidates is checked during the moderation process. Where only minimal examples are presented for moderation this can impact on outcomes. It is acceptable to include incorrect work, provided there is sufficient correct evidence to meet the criteria.

Witness statements had been included for a number of oral or practical activities. The details were generally sufficient for the moderator to understand the nature of the activity and the type of questioning involved, together with the outcomes. Most of the witness statements were appropriate and thorough in the level of detail. It should always be made clear what the objectives of the task were against Assessment Criteria and the candidate response to each element. Annotating photographs is good practice. Witness statements should only be included if written evidence is not appropriate for the candidate. Having mentioned this however, there was some poor practice seen as well where the statement only listed the assessment criteria and not how the skills were demonstrated.

It was pleasing to see evidence, from a few centres, with activities that included context. The effort and creativity that some teachers have shown in order to ensure tasks are accessible to candidates with specific difficulties is much admired and appreciated by moderators. The engagement of these candidates with tasks is clear, benefiting from practical activities, including the use of models when appropriate, information cards, photographs, individual white board activities and games, rather than a diet of repetitive worksheets.

On a few occasions, moderators found that in the evidence submitted for Entry 2 there was in fact sufficient evidence for Entry 3, but the candidate had only been entered for Entry 2.

The reports to centres are drafted to offer comment and advice to aid the centre in the understanding of the requirements and the specific details of the Assessment Criteria. Consequently, it is important that centre leaders share reports with the internal assessors. If advice is acted upon, there should be no issues with further submissions; this should ensure that teachers have greater confidence as to what evidence would meet the Assessment Criteria. It is important to act on any advice suggested for future submissions. There was evidence that a few centres had read previous reports, which was pleasing to see.

Moderators are aware that assessors take time in collating and referencing evidence. The organisation of evidence takes time to reference, this is much appreciated.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk