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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;

- 7905-003/503 Level 2 Bricklaying – Theory Exam
  - March 2019 (Spring)
  - June 2019 (Summer)
- 7905-004 – Level 2 Bricklaying – Synoptic Assignment
Qualification Grade Distribution

The grade distribution for this qualification during the 2018/2019 academic year 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.
Theory Exam
Grade Boundaries

Assessment: 7905-003/503
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>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment.
Assessment: 7905-003/503
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>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the approximate distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment.
Chief Examiner Commentary

Qualification Title: 7905-003/503 Level 2 Bricklaying -Theory Exam
Series 1 – March 2019 (Spring)

This is the third series for the Level 2 Bricklaying theory exam. The paper fully met the requirements of the qualification.

Most candidates attempted all questions in the time allocated. Overall the cohort performed well across the two units and the different categories of questions AO1, AO2 and AO4.

Candidates did better at answering the AO2 understand questions this series, with only a few questions showing a lack of knowledge from the candidate. These were primarily on unit 202, topics bonding and building single leaf masonry with stretcher bond and building cavity walls. Candidates had a good grasp of welfare facilities as this question was well answered.

The AO1 recall knowledge questions were generally well answered and candidates did well in answering the questions on the Principles unit (201) with only a couple of questions showing weakness. These were around team communication and floors. It was good to see an improvement in responses to this unit because this is generally a weak area for candidates as it covers a broad spectrum of the construction trade industry which can be unfamiliar to some candidates.

The AO1 questions in unit 202 were answered fairly well, but there seemed to be a lack knowledge in some areas especially around preparing materials, forming opening, building cavity walls and forming openings in cavity walls.

The applied knowledge questions AO4, were well received and answered well, there was evidence to suggest that where higher order of knowledge was required candidates struggled. Out of the 12 questions presented to candidates, candidates struggled with 5 of these, mainly around unit 202, forming openings, information sources and preparing materials. Candidates need to ensure they fully read and carefully analyse the applied knowledge questions by breaking them down into parts and reading all the options before making their selection.

The main areas across this paper where candidates lacked knowledge were building cavity walls and forming opening as well as unit 202 in general. Candidates may benefit from applying similar emphasis on this unit as well as unit 201.

It is worth noting that past papers are available on the City and Guilds website for training purposes and to familiarise candidates with the various styles of questions they will encounter during their formal test.
There was a low number of candidates sitting the theory exam this series. The paper covered a range of questions from unit 201 and 202. The paper is structured to test Recall of Knowledge (AO1), Understanding (AO2) and Applied knowledge (AO4).

Generally recall questions gained a reasonably good level of correct responses, however where understanding or applying theory to a given situation was needed, the responses were generally poor.

Questions on unit 201 Principles of Construction were well answered with a few of the understanding and applied knowledge questions on topic 4.1 substructure, 5.1 floors and 5.3 roofs, proving challenging to all candidates.

Health and Safety questions were generally well answered by all candidates but many candidates showed a lack of basic knowledge of terminology especially on bonding.

Recall questions on unit 202 were well answered, with some questions challenging candidates on topic areas
- 1.1 Information sources
- 2.1 Bond and build single masonry walls with stretcher bond
- 3.2 Calculate quantities
- 4.2 Build cavity walls

Candidates struggled with the AO2 and AO4 type questions, this was across all of the topics within unit 202, with a handful of questions gaining a reasonable level of response, and these were on topics
- 4.2 Build cavity walls
- 4.3 Form openings in cavity walls
- 4.4. Protect work environment

The paper will always cover the above units and question styles will be similar. Centres and candidates should familiarise themselves with these questions and practice using the past papers provided on the City and Guilds website.
Synoptic Assignment

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

Assessment: 7905-004 Level 2 in Bricklaying
Series: 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>Pass mark</th>
<th>Merit mark</th>
<th>Distinction mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment.
Principal Moderator Commentary

The assignment this year was to build a cavity wall with partial fill insulation. The tasks were completed to a high standard with most candidates able to complete.

Candidates approached the tasks from setting out to completion well, and it was evident that some tasks were challenging, i.e. plumbing of the attached pier and internal quoin, but majority of candidates completed the work within the time. The weakest point was task 1, the scaled drawings. Many candidates were unable to draw to scale and did not include the tapered arch joints.

The assignment this year was being treated as a test, which needed setting, and fully loading out before building the model. Majority of centres use new bricks and this was reflected in the quality of the finished work produced by the candidates.

AO1 Recall
Setting out of the model was generally completed with confidence and within tolerance. The length of the main wall allowed for the variation in brick sizes throughout the country and allowances were made for these variations. The drawings of the arch did vary between centres even though the assignment required a scaled drawing. Various questioning techniques were used to assess the candidate’s knowledge.

AO2 Understanding
This was the understanding necessary to complete the assignment in a logical and organised way. As expected, some candidates performed better than others but most were able to complete the work without assistance. This was reflected in the range of marks and tutors comments. The model seemed to be well interpreted and developed throughout the centres without confusion.

AO3 Practical skills
The quality of work was generally very good, working within the set tolerances and most gaining middle to higher grades.

AO4 Bringing it all together
It was evident that candidates were able to use their knowledge, understanding and skills in order to complete the assignment, in a safe manner, within the recommended time. Most models were completed with some candidates rushing to complete therefore quality was compromised.

AO5 Attention to detail
The evidence indicated that the attention to detail, checking the quality of finish and working within tolerances, were all evident, however the degree of accuracy does vary between candidates. Safe working areas were maintained at all times. Also loading out prior to commencing the task proved beneficial to candidates allow them to produce fit for purpose models in a timely manner.

Summary
The setting out, including the first course laid were beneficial to candidates. The front elevations and rear elevations of the completed wall including name board and date made it easier to differentiate between candidates. There was some excellent detail and justifications within the candidate record and practical observation forms, with some assessors being very thorough, giving detailed reasoning for the marks, they had allocated and other assessors were brief, with little justification of the marks.