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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 2018 academic year. It will explain aspects which caused difficulty and potentially why the difficulties arose.

The document provides commentary on the following assessments;

- **4292 – 021 - Level 2 Technical Award in Vehicle Technology – Synoptic Assignment**
  - no evidence submitted this year.
- **4292 – 020/520 - Level 2 Technical Award in Vehicle Technology – Theory exam**
  - March 2018 (Spring)
  - June 2018 (Summer)
**Qualification Grade Distribution**

The grade distribution for this qualification is not yet available as the qualification is run over two years.

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: 4292-020/520  
Series: March 2018 (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>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no grade distribution as no candidates passed the Spring series of the theory exam.
Assessment: 4292-020/520
Series: June 2018 (Summer)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Marks Available</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>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4292 – 020/520 - Level 2 Technical Award in Vehicle Technology - Theory exam

Series 1 – March 2018

The general standard of work presented in this first series of the theory exam was below expectations and no candidate achieved the recommended pass mark of 40%.

In many instances core knowledge was lacking and most marks were gained by candidates partially answering a limited number of questions.

The subject areas that demonstrated a weaker breadth and depth of knowledge included electrical principles, drive train layouts and their applications as well as chassis and engine and charging system component identification and purpose.

With regard to the extended question few candidates offered a sufficient comparison between different system types and the justification for their choices was limited. Not all candidates attempted the extended question with those that did only attaining the lower grade boundary marks.

Candidates frequently did not look to provide recommendations within their responses therefore they were unable to access higher marks. Candidates responded with a list of bullet points describing a process rather than discussing.
The general standard of work presented in this second series of the theory exam was below expectations. Only one candidate achieved the recommended pass mark of 40%.

It is apparent that the candidates were either unfamiliar with the topic areas questioned on or did not understand the question put to them. In many instances core knowledge was lacking and most marks were gained by candidates partially answering a limited number of questions in a seemingly random fashion. Candidates could have picked marks had they given a rational for their statements thus indicating a potential scope of understanding.

The subject areas that were weakest included electrical principles, drive train layouts and their applications as well as simple chassis and engine component identification and purpose.

With regard to the extended question no candidate offered a fully sufficient comparison between the different system types and the justification for their choices was extremely limited. Not all candidates answered the extended question with those that did only attaining the lower grade boundary marks.