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**Introduction**

This document has been prepared by the Chief Examiner and Principal Moderator; it is designed to be used as a feedback tool for centres in order to enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document is referred to when planning delivery and when preparing candidates for City & Guilds Technical assessments.

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance in both the synoptic assignment and theory exam. It highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the 2019 academic year. It will explain aspects which caused difficulty and potentially why the difficulties arose.

The document provides commentary on the following assessments:

- 8202-025/525 Level 2 Plumbing – Theory exam
  - March 2019 (Spring)
  - June 2019 (Summer)
- 8202-026 Level 2 Plumbing – Synoptic Assignment
Qualification Grade Distribution

The approximate grade distribution for this qualification is shown below:

Please note City & Guilds will only report qualification grades for candidates who have achieved all of the required assessment components, including Employer Involvement, optional units and any other centre assessed components as indicated within the Qualification Handbook. The grade distribution shown above could include performance from previous years.
Theory Exam

Grade Boundaries

Assessment: 8202-025/525
Series: March 2019 (Spring)

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the approximate distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment:

8202-025/525 March 2019
Grade Distribution

- Pass: 35%
- Merit: 37%
- Dist: 19%
- Pass Rate: 91%
Assessment: 8202-025/525  
Series: June 2019 (Summer)

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the approximate distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment:
Candidates performed well across a range of topics in the spring assessment, with 35% candidates achieving a Pass, 37% achieving a Merit and 19% achieving a Distinction.

The paper was set at the appropriate level being consistent with the test specification across the recall, understanding and applied knowledge questions. The terminology and technical content assessed across the question paper was standardised and comparable to previous series and set appropriately for Level 2.

Candidates overall performed well, showing in-depth knowledge and understanding across various areas. The areas in which candidates perform extremely well in were:

- Health and Safety and Industry Practices
- Plumbing Processes
- Sanitation and Drainage.

An area of weakness for most candidates was the understanding and applied knowledge questions associated with both the Cold and Hot Water units, however higher scoring candidates still achieved well in these areas. It would be a recommendation that delivery should reinforce the principles of Cold and Hot Water systems prior to assessment.

There was an increase in performance for applied knowledge questions compared to previous series and higher achieving candidates achieved high scores across the full breadth in their responses. Candidates that struggled to obtain marks in these questions were generally candidates who achieved lower marks overall.

The 12 applied knowledge questions allowed candidates to display both their breadth and depth of knowledge, and this enabled clear differentiation between Distinction and Pass learners.

More candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge through the applied questions, meaning there was an increase in the number of Distinction learners, compared to previous series, which is encouraging.

Due to the summative nature of this assessment candidates would benefit from revision sessions and formative assessments throughout the year to support the end point theory exam. Centres should also utilise the support material available on the City & Guilds website such as guidance support and past papers so candidates are familiar with the exam style.
Series 2 – June 2019

The June 2019 series exam paper was set at the appropriate level being consistent with both previous series exams and the test specification. The terminology and technical content assessed across this question paper was set appropriately for Level 2 and there were no issues with any of the content.

The overall performance of candidates has improved as centres are becoming more familiar with the content and the delivery.
A particular area of strength for the majority of candidates were the questions focussed on Health and Safety and Industry Practices. Questions around Central Heating were also answered particularly well by the majority of candidates.

An area of weakness for most candidates were the understanding and applied knowledge questions associated with the Sanitation and Drainage units, however the higher scoring candidates were still able to achieve well in these areas. It would be a recommendation that delivery should reinforce the principles of Sanitation and Drainage prior to assessment.

A further area of weakness was highlighted in the Plumbing processes unit, which is a concern due to the weighting this content holds within the test specification. Candidates were unable to identify common fixings that are used within the plumbing industry. Candidates also struggled on questions on the properties of refrigerants. Whilst this is a small section of the overall test specification, it is still an important area of the specification that candidates need to be aware of. Centres may need to ensure they have allocated an appropriate amount of teaching time to this area of the Electrical and Scientific Principles unit.

For questions based on the Cold Water and Hot Water units, mixed responses were given by the candidates. Candidates performed better on the A01, recall of knowledge questions in these unit areas as opposed to the applied knowledge and understanding questions. These are two areas that centres may wish to focus their revision on, utilising the support materials on the City & Guilds website.

Due to the summative nature of this assessment, candidates would benefit from revision sessions and formative assessments throughout the year to support the end point theory exam. As this exam takes place after the teaching and the synoptic assignment is completed, centres may wish to focus more on the revision of key the key areas noted above that candidates are consistently struggling on. Centres should also utilise the support material available on the City & Guilds website such as the exam guidance and the sample and past papers so candidates are familiar with the question styles.
Synoptic Assignment

Grade Boundaries

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel:

Assessment: 8202-026
Series: 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the approximate distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment:

8202-026 June 2019
Grade Distribution

Percentage of Candidates achieving Grade

Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Pass rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal Moderator Commentary

Centres worked well within the assignment guidelines and all centres achieved deadlines for uploading of materials and support evidence.

Candidates performed well across all Assessment Objectives with only student method statements for some learners highlighted as an area for development. In these cases, to improve candidates should use technical terminology as much as possible and justify why materials and equipment are used. Some pieces of written work would have benefited from typed formats as some learner and assessor handwriting made moderation of the content difficult at times.

The assignment performed well and candidates produced work that clearly identified where skills and knowledge are aligned, resulting in quality pieces of work submitted to the portal.
In some centres, the ability to modify the Installation to meet the centre needs resulted in a practical installation task that differed from the original design brief, however the moderators agreed that the skills performed by candidates were accurately recorded and awarded accordingly.

Most candidates were able to complete the tasks within the time allowed to varying degrees of accuracy. Candidates supplied good supporting evidence and quality method statements with higher performing candidates highlighting where clear understanding was evident.

The quality of the marking across the centres within the bands demonstrated that centres have clearly understood the synoptic assessment model and consistently applied marks across the range of Assessment Outcomes.
In the majority of cases, the supporting statements from the assessor justified the marks awarded across the qualification. The centres provided quantifying statements on the candidate’s performance that clearly support the marks awarded in the mark bands.

Centres, in the majority of cases, have performed very well in the conducting and recording of the assignment and associated evidence requirements. Some excellent practice has been developed by the centres to accurately record the evidence and allow the ease of referencing for the moderators. This outstanding practice and has been highlighted to the centres concerned.