NZQA
New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship
Technology 2016

Standard 93601

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

- provided evidence of in-depth exploration and a clear definition of an authentic issue and its ensuring challenges to be addressed, either at the beginning or during technological practice, that required resolution
- thoroughly investigated, understood, and critically reflected on relevant aspects of the social environment (people, values, culture, trends, and emotional resonance) in which the technological outcome would be located
- pursued aspects of practice outside of their preferred areas of understanding
- critically reflected continually on where the outcome would be situated (physical environment)
- extrapolated – could hypothesise relevance of information and experiences into new contexts to inform the development of their technological outcome
- provided evidence of ongoing critical reflection on the pertinent knowledge gained from a variety of sources that impacted upon their practice and outcome development
- were forward thinking, which enabled seamless steps in their technological practice
- justified in-depth the technological practice they undertook and how the outcome addressed the challenges of the issue and fitness for purpose in its fullest sense
- critically reflected on focused and relevant functional modelling to ensure that the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- reflected and analysed others' processes and practices
- demonstrated elegance and originality in both technological practice and the ensuring technological outcome
- explored suitability of materials, processes, components based on their performance properties to ensure fitness for purpose
- understood socio-cultural and historical contexts through reading and reflecting on current research and views
- developed a complex outcome that showed their ingenuity and optimisation of materials, components and/or processes.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- were succinct in their report presenting reflections on their practice and limited copying of pages from their portfolio
- investigated a genuine issue that allowed them to explore relevant needs and opportunities and was sufficiently complex to allow the development of in-depth level 8 practice and a high-quality outcome
- demonstrated an ability to carry out on-going and in-depth investigation into the social and physical environment in which the issue is placed
- justified their practice which includes giving clear and succinct reasons for actions undertaken
- demonstrated a natural and logical flow in the progression of their practice through being flexible and a willing to adapt and alter their practice in response to the situation as it unfolds
- demonstrated the ability to reflect on relevant information, knowledge, attitudes and/or practices of others and how these may influence, inform or guide the development of the outcome
- analysed stakeholder feedback to gain insightful understandings of the situation which were used to inform their practice
- demonstrated creative problem solving abilities while undertaking their practice
- reflected upon the knowledge gained from functional modelling to ensure the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- synthesised in-depth knowledge and skills to ensure their technological outcome was fit for purpose
- could reflect and analyse on their own processes and practices
- limited their socio-cultural understanding to their immediate context and did not thoroughly investigate aspects relevant to the Nature of Technology and Technological Outcomes.

Other candidates commonly:

- did not explore an issue or context reducing their ability to identify authentic needs and opportunities
- undertook practice which was below level 8 of the curriculum
- started from a design and make perspective and consequently did not produce a technological outcome
- had a predetermined outcome in mind which prevented any authentic exploration of the issue and as such, hampered creativity and/or innovation even though they demonstrated a high level of technical skill
- did not demonstrate sufficient socio-cultural understanding of a context or make links drawing from understandings of the Nature of Technology strand
- did not use their reflection on information, knowledge, attitudes and/or practices of others to actively inform the development of their own outcome
- included unnecessary and/or irrelevant research that was not applied or reflected on in their practice
- presented insufficient or incoherent evidence which did not allow the examiner to understand the technological practice being undertaken
- presented work which was of such small font or print size, or which had been unclearly photocopied, and subsequently was unreadable by the examiner.

General comments

Candidates who worked together on joint projects must ensure that their reports are completely unambiguous as to what their individual contributions and reflections are. When this is not clear, the work presented cannot be fully assessed as the individual authenticity has not been established.

Candidates need to ensure there is sufficient evidence in their report that reflects all three stands of the curriculum.

Several candidates presented photocopied pages of their A3 portfolios; many of these only partially readable because of font size or clarity of the copy. Candidates should make sure that their reports are fully legible and not below the recommended font size so as not to disadvantage their students.

Candidates need to present work that is of a complex level, i.e. meets level 8 curriculum objectives working within all three strands (Nature of Technology, Technological Knowledge and Technological Practice).

Candidates who work with an authentic opportunity or client often find this provides the necessary complexity to the issue and situation that stimulates their practice.

Candidates who presented evidence that followed guidelines for competitions, shows or other technology awards often had their practice constrained by the requirements of a specification that did not allow them the opportunity to demonstrate either Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship performance.

Where a candidate's practice was guided by assessment against an implement standard rather than the level 8 curriculum objectives for Technological Practice, the candidate's outcome was often constrained. For example, the criteria for the implement standards often directs practice. This means that a candidate's direct practice rather than the issue and resulting specifications directing practice towards fully fit for purpose outcome.

Subject page
