



**Higher National Qualifications  
Internal Assessment Report 2013  
Electronics and Instrumentation**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Higher National Qualifications in this subject.

# Higher National Units

## General comments

Seven centres and a sample of 18 Higher National Units were verified in session 2012–13. All the centres that were visited were experienced with delivering the Units in the verification group (group 232) and were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the national standards. In part, this is due to the maturity of the qualifications, the experience of the delivering centres and communication through the relevant Qualification Support Team (QST).

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Centres, in the main, used SQA assessment exemplars or modified assessment exemplars to suit resources.

## Evidence Requirements

All centres have a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements as given in the Unit specifications.

## Administration of assessments

All centres have sufficient internal verification (IV) procedures in place; however, some centres have a more robust interactive approach to internal verification than others. Internal documentation sampled ranged from Internal Verifiers placing a tick on a form with no detail, through to extensive documented comments and discussions between assessors and Internal Verifiers.

It was sometimes difficult to trace an audit trail of candidates' remedial assessments. Where candidates are permitted a rework of an assessment, the documentation should be clear as to what is required and when it is required. There should also be evidence of remedial assessments.

Some centres are still not stating control conditions on assessments. It is essential that control conditions are clearly stated.

## General feedback

In addition to the points listed above, similar to last session, there were variations in the amount of feedback given to candidates. Some centres have specific candidate feedback sections written into assessment material, but there were differences in the amount of specific feedback offered by assessors. Other centres use an oral feedback system which can be difficult to audit.

## **Areas of good practice**

Some centres have developed central share-point facilities for all assessment, verification and registration purposes. These can be effective in ensuring consistency and continuity of standards.

More than one centre now operates a dual-marking system in addition to internal verification procedures.

One centre is encouraging candidates to use an online blogging system with photographic evidence to replace logbooks required for practical activities.

## **Specific areas for improvement**

Centres must clearly state and adhere to the conditions of assessment stipulated under the Evidence Requirements of each Unit to ensure a standardised approach across all centres.

The amount of feedback given to candidates was minimal in some instances.

# Higher National Graded Units

DG2T 34	Electronics Graded Unit 1
F013 34	Measurement & Control Engineering Graded Unit 1
DG2V 35	Electronics Graded Unit 2
F014 35	Measurement & Control Engineering Graded Unit 2

## General comments

Five centres were verified in session 2012–13, either by visiting or central verification. Each of these centres delivered at least one of the above awards. Most of the centres were experienced with delivering the Units in this verification group (group 232) and were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the national standards.

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Graded Unit 1 is set within the relevant QST and all candidates sit the same assessment. There are clear marking guidelines which are prior verified by SQA. Graded Unit 2 is a project and reflects the client group and resources of each centre.

## Evidence Requirements

All centres have a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements as given in the Unit specifications.

## Administration of assessments

With regard to Graded Unit 1, strict control conditions are in place and adhered to by each centre. In addition, all centres have sufficient IV procedures in place; however, some centres have a more robust interactive approach to internal verification than others. It was not always clear to External Verifiers that sufficient internal verification had taken place.

With regard to Graded Unit 2, the amount of feedback given to candidates was found to be variable.

## General feedback

Once again, not all centres are using proper examination paper for Graded Unit 1 and this can lead to mistakes being made in marking. There were big variations in the amount of feedback given to candidates by centres.

## **Areas of good practice**

With regard to Graded Unit 1, the following good practice was noted:

- ◆ Good use of proper examination paper
- ◆ Clear and detailed assessor and Internal Verifier comments
- ◆ Some evidence of double-marking

With regard to Graded Unit 2:

- ◆ One centre is encouraging candidates to use an online blogging system with photographic evidence to replace logbooks
- ◆ Candidates in employment are encouraged to develop projects in line with employer requirements where possible

## **Specific areas for improvement**

Not all centres are using proper examination paper for Graded Unit 1 and this can lead to mistakes being made in marking.

There were big variations in the amount of feedback given to candidates by centres.

In one centre, a candidate's answers had been partially typed and the centre offered no explanation as to why this was different to the submissions of other candidates. In addition, this candidate's marks were not entered on the front page of the examination paper in the same way as the marks for other candidates were entered. The same centre had also made an error in transferring a candidate's marks from the examination paper to form VS00 resulting in an incorrect grade being entered. This was picked up by external verification. There was no direct evidence of internal verification at this centre.