



**Higher National Qualifications  
Internal Assessment Report 2013  
Computer Aided Technology**

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

A total of four HN verification/development visits took place in session 2012–13 in the Computer Aided Technology grouping. One of the visits was performed under the new quality assurance system.

All centres visited demonstrated a consistent understanding of the requirements of the national standards. This was partially evidenced by the use/intended use of assessment exemplars where available. The consistent use/intended use of exemplars has increased awareness of the national standards required throughout all centres.

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All assessors in all centres visited demonstrated a good level of familiarity with the relevant Unit specifications and exemplars. Where available, most centres were using or intending to use assessment exemplars, and all were aware of the most up-to-date versions of the Unit specifications.

## Evidence Requirements

A clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for Units was demonstrated at all centres visited. All centres are aware of the availability of assessment exemplars and they are being used consistently for Units where exemplars are available. Where centre-devised assessments are being used, they also demonstrated a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the related Units and were pitched at an appropriate level.

## Administration of assessments

All centres visited are using assessments at an appropriate level. Most are using the assessment exemplars provided by SQA. All centres demonstrated a robust internal verification system. The centre visited under the new quality assurance system demonstrated a greater effort in preparing the material for the verification visits.

## General feedback

All centres demonstrated consistent feedback to candidates. Most centres were found to have set aside time to provide constructive feedback.

Candidate feedback was positive in all instances where candidates were available for interview. Delivering centres should be making every effort to ensure candidate availability during visits. External Verifiers should be taking every opportunity to communicate with the candidates where possible, this should be addressed in the new session.

The new quality assurance system encourages a more proactive approach from centres to ensure that the External Verifier is given access to candidates.

All centres visited provided fair access to assessment.

## **Areas of good practice**

The following is a list of good practice extracted from the various external verification reports:

All centres were making good use of a virtual learning environment (VLE) for delivery and administration of the course material.

One centre has invested in excellent facilities for rapid prototyping. The candidates accessing these facilities are engaged with industry and schools on a range of CAD/prototyping projects. This serves to enhance and broaden the learning experience for the candidates by engaging them in discussion with outside stakeholders and working to client deadlines.

Candidate engagement with industry via work placements has been expanded in one centre. The work placements are enhancing the learning experience for the candidates, giving a real-world perspective on the content of the awards.

In addition, one centre is providing the candidates with the opportunity to design and build a 'curriculum house' in conjunction with BRE (Building Research Establishment). The candidates on the course are gaining exposure to real-life design problems, which address current sustainability issues within the construction sector.

## **Specific areas for improvement**

All centres visited were found to be working to national standards.

# Higher National Graded Units

## General comments

The following is a summary of the general points established from the external verification visit to centres delivering the following Graded Units:

Computer Aided Architectural Design and Technology: Graded Unit 1  
Computer Aided Architectural Design and Technology: Graded Unit 2

It was evident through the external verification visits that centres are aware of the documentation provided by the SQA for the delivery and support of the Graded Units. This is verified by the consistency in level across all centres and the quality of submission from the candidates. The quality of the work was considered to be good and consistent with the national standards in all instances.

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres visited are using the most up to date Unit specification. Evidence was provided by centres of candidates' use of centre-devised checklists reflective of the Unit specification checklist; this helped to establish consistency and ensured coverage of the main elements required by the specification.

Where assessment instruments for the Graded Unit are developed locally, it is recommended that these should be verified by SQA prior to delivery.

## Evidence Requirements

Candidate submissions provided clear evidence that centres are fully aware of the Evidence Requirements for the Graded Unit. Centres have developed marking schemes which clearly demonstrate their understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Graded Unit. The marking schemes are being used effectively and grades awarded were consistent and fair across all centres visited.

## Administration of assessments

It was evident from external verification activities in 2012–13 that centres are using the assessment exemplars provided by SQA. Overall, centres are demonstrating a robust internal verification system. Centres are setting a good standard and the work being produced by the candidates was reflective of the national standard.

## General feedback

At present there are no other significant issues with the delivery of the Graded Units within the Computer Aided Technology grouping. Feedback to candidates is satisfactory across all centres visited, although in some instances could be more formalised. The feedback from candidates interviewed was very positive in

all instances. Overall, the candidates were positive about the Graded Unit activity, both from a learning and assessment perspective.

### **Areas of good practice**

The following points highlight good practice evidence for Graded Units:

Graded Unit projects are candidate-generated and approved by the project supervisor — this harnesses the candidates' interests/hobbies giving good motivation.

One centre is providing candidates with an opportunity to showcase their project work at an end-of-year design show. Guests for the event include family members, former and potential candidates, and employers. The showcase provides a motivation for the candidates to complete the project work to the highest possible standards.

### **Specific areas for improvement**

Based on the verification activity for session 2012–13, there are no issues within the Computer Aided Technology grouping that require attention, at this time.