

# Assessment Report

## New Zealand Scholarship Technology 2017

### Standard 93601

#### Part B: Report on performance standard

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

- explored and selected their own context which resulted in student passion leading to motivation to explore deeply
- articulated independence in critical thinking and the development of both technological practice and outcome
- defined an innovative, creative or highly relevant and authentic issue that had the potential for complexity and scope to support exploration and the production of a high quality technological outcome
- used a wide range of media to visually present the capability and intent of the outcome. This was essential in conveying the elegance and/or innovation of the outcome in situ
- provided evidence of in-depth exploration and a clear definition of an authentic issue and its ensuing challenges to be addressed, either at the beginning or during technological practice
- managed their project independently leading to an organic rather than formulaic practice which allowed them to meet the criteria
- used past experiences and understanding gained from previous rich learning in technology education
- incorporated all three curriculum strands and technological literacy
- thoroughly investigated, understood and critically reflected upon relevant aspects of the social environment (people, values, culture, trends, and emotional resonance) and applied this knowledge to where the technological outcome would be situated (intended environment)
- demonstrated a willingness to pursue new areas of practice outside of their preferred areas of understanding and incorporated these into their own practice
- demonstrated critical reflection and ensured decisions would impact positively on the physical and social environment of their outcome
- extrapolated – could hypothesise relevance of information and experiences into new contexts, to inform the development of their technological outcome
- allowed their project to evolve in a logical manner
- provided evidence of on-going critical reflection on the pertinent knowledge gained. This was normally from a variety of sources that enhanced 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 the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- reflected on and analysed other's processes and practices and selected and applied relevant aspects
- understood socio-cultural and historical contexts and made connections from these to their own practice
- demonstrated elegance and originality in both technological practice and the ensuing technological outcome
- explored suitability of materials, processes and components based upon their performance properties to ensure fitness for purpose
- developed a complex outcome that showed their ingenuity and optimisation of materials, components and/or processes.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- commenced with an introduction that outlined the project and the issue that was explored
- began without a predetermined context, issue or outcome in mind
- selected and identified a context which allowed them to investigate a genuine issue
- explored the issue accurately and thoroughly highlighting many of the complexities of the situation which were addressed throughout the portfolio
- demonstrated their ability to carry out on-going and in-depth analysis and investigation into the social and physical environment in which the issue and the potential outcome was placed
- justified their practice, which included giving clear and succinct reasons for actions undertaken as they related to the issue and context considerations
- analysed the findings of trials and modelling and made determinations that were used to inform future decisions
- demonstrated a natural and logical flow in the progression of their practice through being flexible and willing to adapt and alter their practice in response to the situation as it unfolded
- 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
- obtained timely stakeholder feedback and analysed this 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 technological modelling to ensure the outcome had the potential to be fit for purpose
- reflected on and analysed their own processes and practices
- synthesised in-depth knowledge and skills to ensure their technological outcome was fit for purpose
- developed a high quality outcome and communicated this through clear photographs, diagrams or working links to demonstrate fitness for purpose in its intended environment
- were succinct in their written report presenting reflections on their practice and from their portfolio of work or combined the report within the portfolio evidence
- ensured their on-going technological practice was routinely informed by the issue and brief.

#### Other candidates

Candidates who were **not** awarded Scholarship commonly:

- did not sufficiently explore a real issue or context reducing their ability to carry out authentic technological practice
- interpreted the complexities of the situation to be limited to those of a technical nature when producing the outcome
- undertook practice which was below level 8 of the curriculum
- had a predetermined outcome in mind which prevented any authentic and/or in-depth exploration of the issue. This hampered creativity and/or innovation even though the candidate demonstrated a high level of technical skill
- did not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the socio-cultural considerations of the context and the issue
- ignored stakeholder feedback
- did not seek sufficient or relevant stakeholder feedback
- did not adequately reflect on information, knowledge, attitudes and/or practices of others to actively inform the development of their own outcome
- presented a running commentary on what they did rather than explaining the purpose of their actions and justifying their practice
- included unnecessary and/or irrelevant research that was not applied or reflected on in their practice. Whilst fitness for purpose should be broad, it is more important that it is relevant
- presented insufficient or incoherent evidence which did not make clear the technological practice being undertaken
- presented unclear or unreadable work that did not meet specifications
- used evidence that was repetitive: often it conveyed lower order thinking and/or generic information that bulked out the submission but diluted the evidence quality and coherence of the technological practice.

#### General comments

Many candidates exhibited insufficient understanding of the importance of the context at this level and how this determines the authenticity of the candidate's practice and outcome.

There has been an increase in the quality of both photographic and video evidence in that it has enabled candidates to demonstrate the outcome's functions and also helped to portray both the preventive and corrective actions during the production of the final outcome.

To ensure authenticity candidates must investigate and include considerations of the intended physical and social environment prior, during and after development of the outcome. Technological practice is not a theoretical exercise.

Technological practice does not just refer to the designing, trialling and construction of an outcome, it is also the ongoing iterative process and problem solving as the candidate interacts with their stakeholders and reflects on their intended environment to make decisions and address the issue.

While group work is valid for certain technological projects, and reflects what is often done in industry, candidates can be disadvantaged when their individual contribution is not very clear.

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. Candidates should not send duplicate reports provided for competition purposes.

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

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

Where a candidate's practice was guided by the assessment criteria for specialist knowledge and skill achievement standards, it often constrained their ability to undertake technological practice.

---

## [Subject page](#)

### **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 189KB\)](#)

---

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority