

## Moderation Feedback – Visiting - 2005

**Information Systems and Computing**

**Qualification area**

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

**See Appendix A**

---

## General comments on moderation activity

### HN Units

Reports from 7 moderation visits to 6 further education (FE) colleges were submitted. One of the centres had had a “hold” placed on **A6AM 04: Information Technology Applications 1**, due to errors and omissions in the evidence presented. The centre has made appropriate and acceptable rectification and therefore this “hold” has been lifted/released. All other FE college activity was accepted. Moderators made comments on the quality of the material(s) produced by candidates, which met unit specifications and was, in general, of a high standard.

There was evidence of standards being maintained across different delivery groups and in general the centre internal moderation procedures are being used effectively.

## Specific issues identified

### HN

Some units delivered in this moderation group still use MERIT statements and moderators drew to the attention of centre delivery staff that instruments of assessment(s) should be revised to ensure that they provided sufficient opportunity to demonstrate meritorious performance.

SQA Unit Exemplar packs were being extensively used, where available.

Centres were also advised to ensure that implementing and conducting assessments, using VLEs, complied with the centre’s stated internal moderation (IM), assessment and evidence recording/retention policies.

Where stated, moderators were using sampling rates in excess of 25% per unit per group.

Moderators again commented, at Moderation Group meetings, on the inaccuracies within the current Product Lists. This can cause difficulties when arranging the details of moderation visits, particularly which units are to be chosen for moderation. It is not advisable, or perhaps acceptable, for awarding body representatives to ask centres for details of their delivery portfolio prior to identifying samples for moderation. However this in some cases is the only way to construct a viable moderation sample.

---

## Feedback to centres

Moderators highlighted that there were still inconsistencies across centres in the way candidate evidence is marked. Some centre assessors were providing very detailed comments and marks on candidate scripts backed up by checklists. In other centres, assessors were providing results lists only and it was difficult for the moderator to see evidence that candidate scripts had actually been visited by the assessor, as no annotation or marks were provided on the scripts presented for moderation.

Moderators were encouraged to be supportive in their feedback to centres. This meant that sufficiently detailed comments were required in reports to be of use to centres and to any other potential audience for the report. In general good practice was identified and recognised within reports.

Where appropriate, centres were encouraged to make their internal moderation systems more robust and transparent – good practice identified included the stamping of scripts, which had been the subject of IV activity.

There were continued concerns over the quality and quantity of information entered on candidate evidence by assessors. Centres were advised to clearly show **where** and **why** credit was being given to particular aspects of candidate submissions, and not to simply provide an overall mark or result.

In general, moderation team were satisfied with the assessment decisions made by centres and are confident that national standards are being maintained.

**Good practice** points recognised by moderators in reports included:

- Good quality candidate feedback comments (volume)
  - Well produced checklists – allowing clear recording of candidate performance
  - Internal moderation records easily available
  - Quality and standardisation of (unit) control folders
  - Candidate scripts clearly annotated to show where assessors have awarded marks – see above
  - Realistic scenarios for project briefs and detailed candidate instructions
  - Innovative use of ICT particularly VLEs, for candidate assessment use and recording systems
  - Guideline folders provided to assist delivery especially in case of change in staff
-

Appendix A

Units covered by this Report

Unit Number	Unit Title
D4FB 04	Publishing on the Internet
D4F9 33	Introducing the Internet
A6AM 04	Information Technology Applications 1
A6AN 04	Information Technology Applications 2
A6SW 04	Introduction to Desk Publishing Techniques
D7XG 35	Internet Theory and Practice
D7LW 34	Communication: Using Information Technology and Desk Top Publishing
A6AW 04	Network Technology
D2EV 04	Human Computer Interface

---