

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Business Services**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

**Administration – Intermediate 2**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	2830
<b>Post appeal</b>	2832

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	3339
<b>Post appeal</b>	

### General comments re entry numbers

The number of candidates presented at Intermediate 2 level this year has risen from last year (+507) predictably by a smaller number than the previous year's increase (+1879) as most centres are now familiar with the course.

### General comments

It would appear from the distribution of awards at Intermediate 2 level this year that some candidates would have coped better at Intermediate 1 level. Candidates who were well prepared for the external assessment coped very well with the wide spread of skills tested in this year's paper.

## Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

MARK(lowest)

UPPER A

90

LOWER A

79

B

66

C

54

### General commentary on grade boundaries

*Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade*

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries.

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

Upper A – lowest mark 90. In order to demonstrate excellence across the range of skills and knowledge and understanding tested, a candidate had to score at least 60% of possible knowledge and understanding marks (75% of marks can be achieved in the practical tasks).

C – Candidates had to score more than half marks to achieve a pass. This is a reasonable expectation bearing in mind the potential for accumulating marks due to the process based nature of the question paper.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

There was a wide range of marks with candidates presented at the correct level performing very well. This was evidenced by performance in practical tasks in particular. Candidates who were well prepared and presented at the correct level interpreted and carried out instructions correctly.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Task 1 (word processing) was extremely well done by many candidates. Many candidates achieved high marks in task 2a (spreadsheet) and task 2b (database) was generally well done.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Task 1 (word processing): Some candidates were not familiar with manuscript correction signs. Many candidates actually keyed in the “#” sign instead of inserting a space. A few candidates still having difficulty with 24-hour clock.

Task 2a (spreadsheet): Where this task was poorly done candidates had difficulty in extracting the required information from the given source.

Task 2b (database): Searching the database posed difficulty for some candidates.

Task 3 (Knowledge and Understanding): Very few candidates were able to name the piece of legislation – The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 – asked for in question 4a. Question 6 was misinterpreted by many candidates who did not relate the use of electronic diaries to arranging a meeting. General advantages of using electronic diaries were given instead.

The standard of written English in terms of spelling and grammar was very poor and some scripts were almost illegible. It is worth noting that candidates are allowed to key in their responses to knowledge and understanding questions. Overall answers to task 3 were not well structured and explanations lacked depth.

### Areas of common misunderstanding

Task 2a (spreadsheet) – Poorer candidates seemed to have some difficulty in following instructions and were unable to extract the required information from the given source performing badly in this task as a result. Many candidates misinterpreted question 6 and did not answer the question asked.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

Candidates presented at the correct level performed particularly well in the practical tasks. IT skills seem to be improving with many candidates having completed Standard Grade Administration.

Knowledge and understanding questions still require more in-depth responses. One word answers are not acceptable at Intermediate 2 level. Candidates need to read questions carefully and ensure that they are answering the questions asked.

Some centres did not include printouts of prepared files in each return envelope.