



**General Certificate of Education (A-level) Applied
June 2012**

Applied Science

SC16

**(Specification
8771/8773/8776/8777/8779)**

Unit 16: Ecology, Conservation and Recycling

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

General Comments

(Centres are advised to read and act on their own personal feedback reports on the unit entries made this year).

Centres are to be congratulated for preparing students well for the units in this award, and, as in previous years, some very high quality work was evident, resulting in good grades.

An increase in the use of Assessment Objective (AO) based mark grids by centres to support marking has been evident, and some centres (but by no means all) have also included good supporting annotation, including carefully checking calculations, identifying downloads and responding in detail to the requirements (marked #) for teacher evidence to support marks awarded. Conversely, some centres have no mark grids, no break-down of marks in AO3, little supporting annotation or any indication of having marked the scripts. Whilst many centres used mark grids appropriately and clearly cross referenced the descriptors with the portfolio evidence, some centres' use of mark grids indicated that marks had been applied very leniently and the significance of key words ('comprehensive', 'complete', etc) did not appear to be understood or were not applied appropriately.

A worrying trend is an apparent increase in the use of group work for the collection and recording of data which is subsequently used for calculations. Sometimes it seems that candidates have not carried out significant levels of practical work on an individual basis. In these cases, moderators have found some difficulty in determining candidates' levels of participation and the contribution of the individual to practical work. This made supporting centre assessments of candidates' abilities and skill levels more difficult in these centres. At its extreme, there was evidence that some practical work in some centres was little more than teacher demonstrations, making it almost impossible to award marks based on clear evidence for some assessment strands.

There is also clear evidence from some centres of increased levels of teacher guidance and direction. This is to be expected in a teaching context, but when producing portfolio evidence, over-guidance and over-direction of candidates' work detracts from opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their own skills. Over-guidance is often seen in the form of issued templates, or similar, for calculations. In such cases, candidates are unable to provide evidence of the application of their own knowledge and understanding and marks may be limited accordingly. Unfortunately, this style of centre approach can affect able students most. Candidates who find work challenging may be helped by 'scaffolding' sheets and work should be marked appropriately. However, able students may not actually require the help and may thus be marked down (by the centre) for help that was not required.

In most units there is a high demand for research, and material is often being cut and pasted and not reworked. SC01, SC04, SC06, SC07, SC12 and SC15 are particularly affected but so, on occasions, are others. Some candidates have openly acknowledged and referenced a large amount of downloaded material and their portfolios can have large sections which are little more than an accumulation of downloaded segments, referenced but not reworded by the candidate. Unfortunately, some centres have made no comment on this practice and awarded very high marks, giving the impression that they think it is acceptable. In a few cases, it has become apparent that centres are guiding candidates via the provision of extensive materials on a 'virtual learning environment' section of the centre website which is not accessible by moderators. Similarly, the availability of booklets, pamphlets and other written materials in centres which provide excessive levels of guidance needs to be questioned with regard to their effect on autonomy and research.

Centres can expect moderators' requests for clarification of the centre approach in this regard and for provision of details or examples of specific materials which students have used.

Risk Assessments (RAs) are an integral part of all units apart from SC01. The standard of RAs is widely variable, but few candidates actually manage to target all the materials used in terms of amounts and, crucially, state and concentration. As a result, the subsequent hazard identification can be wrong. Correct hazard identification, precautions for safe working, control measures and disposal are also appropriate to include. Some portfolios contained page after page (up to 16 pages for a single experiment have been seen) of simplistic considerations of the hazards associated with glassware and the like, often repeated several times where repeats or similar activities were carried out using the same or very similar materials. These are not necessary. However, for microbiology-based experiments, e.g. SC07, SC12, SC15, detailed risk assessments for investigations using bacteria of various types are very important, but these are often neglected or sparsely treated. Sometimes candidates mis-name bacteria and use the names for pathogenic forms when (it is hoped) non-pathogenic strains have been used. There seems to be the impression that school laboratory strains of bacteria are without risk. In fact a number of candidates actually stated this, when clearly it is not the case. All cultures should be treated as potentially pathogenic, since contamination could have occurred.

In most units, mathematical skill assessments are made. It is noted this year that there appear to be some weaker mathematical skills evident from some candidates and this goes across the mark ranges. It is really important that candidates are guided in the appropriate collection, presentation and processing of data. Where calculations are undertaken, the appropriate formulae should be displayed, the logic of calculations explained and the sources of numbers made clear. Appropriate precision should be used and values should be quoted to the appropriate number of significant figures. Candidates should be encouraged to consider the significance of any values calculated and where percentage error values are calculated, these should be used and related to the experimental values found. To simply calculate percentage errors and not use them in any way indicates a lack of appreciation of their significance. Candidates should consider the best way to display data using graphical techniques. They should show correct choice of scales, correct axis labels, correct units, correct plotting of points, correct lines of best fit, and anomalous points should be identified and ignored for line construction. Graph lines should not be double, 'jagged' or kinked if meant to be straight. A line of best fit/curve should be the line that best fits the pattern shown by points, ignoring clearly anomalous values. All these skills are expected and candidates should be guided in these conventional graphical techniques during the course.

Some centres seem to be unaware of what constitutes MB4 work, and are awarding high marks for work attributed to different assessment objectives when there is little in-depth quality science evident. Centres are advised to compare their portfolios with exemplar and standardisation materials, and/or consult their portfolio adviser if they are uncertain, but, clearly, a correct sub-heading with just a few lines of basic content will not be worthy of marks in the higher mark bands. For consideration in MB3 and MB4, work has to demonstrate both depth and breadth and demonstrate understanding commensurate with high grades at GCE Advanced Level. This must be borne in mind at all times and for all strands in each assessment objective. Marks awarded consistently in MB4 are likely to be representative of a good 'A' grade candidate's work. Centres are advised to consider whether marks at this level are realistic when considering the overall picture of work seen and the likely performance of particular candidates.

Accredited centres can sometimes demonstrate a degree of 'drift' in marking standards, and there may have been changes in the assessor for individual units. This 'drift' is apparent for some centres which were part of the random sample of accredited centres, not all of which are found to be in tolerance. Accredited centres are advised to monitor the standards applied throughout the accreditation period and it would be worth considering obtaining and examining the most recent teacher standardising materials for the appropriate units prior to assessment of work and submission of centre marks.

Format of portfolios

AQA does not specify how portfolios should be constructed. However, experience has shown the following points will be of use to candidates:

- Construction to match specification unit layout aids coverage of the required aspects of study by candidates, and can help avoid omissions of required aspects.
- Use of sub-headings to match specification requirements aids coverage and helps to produce a logical progression through the work.
- Over-large portfolios are problematic. A number of centres continue to produce very large portfolios despite being given advice that this is not good practice. These portfolios take students far too long to produce, make monitoring, review and draft marking very time consuming and make moderation overly lengthy. Production of large portfolios can demonstrate an inability of the candidate to decide what is and is not important to include and can be a measure of the candidates' Quality of Written Communication (QWC) skills. Centres are requested to discuss portfolio construction with candidates and determine what a reasonable size is; a portfolio should not simply grow as students find more and more potentially relevant information but should be well constructed, containing relevant and sufficient details to cover the unit well but not becoming unmanageable.
- It would aid candidates' QWC if they fully checked their portfolios before submission. Many have duplicated pages, pages out of sequence or inverted, pages not numbered, work not proof read or spell checked. Many also need to learn the correct use of superscript and suffix functions on their computers.
- Plastic A4 wallets (poly-pockets) are not acceptable. It is best to secure portfolio pages by treasury tags. The use of numbered pages should be seen as a routine matter.
- Word-processed portfolios are much easier to read than handwritten documents. Candidates should balance legibility against font size and line spacing, use of double sided printing, 'white-space' and resultant effect on portfolio size.

Comments on Individual Unit

Centres should note that reports for previous years are still available on the AQA website and that their content is still valid, as the same concerns are evident every year in a small number of centres.

SC16

Some centres are using more than one type of habitat, e.g. a pond and then a woodland survey. This is not a requirement. Centres are advised to consider strategies which will allow greater breadth of survey techniques to be used and the collection of more extensive data.

Food chains, food webs and energy flow are not always linked back to the habitat and to the data collected, but some good attempts to link biotic and abiotic data were in evidence. Some candidates had only very restricted abiotic data and marks are limited in various strands as a result. Frequently candidates do not use the abiotic data collected to try to account for the distribution patterns of organisms identified.

Recycling

The science supporting the chosen recycling process often lacks detail e.g. candidates should give a clear account of what actually happens in the recycling process of the chosen material and this should then be supported by chemical equations, structures, theory and principles as appropriate. This lack of detail can result from a lack of good research, as only the basics tend to be considered on the most popular sites and candidates can seem reluctant to research more extensively.

The economic and environmental issues tend to be generalised and not necessarily linked to the chosen material, and evaluations do not always take into account the negative as well as the positive aspects of recycling.

Some good accounts regarding environmental change and damage and conservation, e.g. mining or quarrying, were in evidence and the choice of global effects in this context is waning with resulting increases in marks in this area. Many candidates had clearly visited the areas concerned and were able to write in detail, particularly about the effects on the habitat concerned and how conservation measures relate to that same habitat.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.