



Higher National Qualifications Internal Assessment Report 2015 Electrical Installation

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

During session 2014–15 two centres received external verification visits in HN Electrical Installation. Both centres were further education colleges. Both visits were conducted by the same external verifier. The external verification events were conducted using SQA's new approach to quality assurance.

The HN Units were as follows:

DN41 34: Inspection and Testing of Low Voltage Electrical Installations (1)

DN3T 34: Electrical Systems in Potentially Explosive and Gas Hazardous Environments (2)

DN4A 35: Utilisation of Electrical Energy in Buildings (2)

FY7L 35: Electrical Installation Design (2)

The number in brackets after each Unit title indicates if the Unit was externally verified in one or both centres.

Both centre were successful at verification was successful with overall outcome ratings indicating that they had significant strengths in HN Electrical Installation.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Assessors made use of a combination of SQA assessment exemplar materials and centre-designed internal assessment instruments. All assessments instruments reviewed were found to be valid, reliable, equitable and fair.

Evidence Requirements

On reviewing assessment instruments and candidate evidence in both centres it was found that assessors and internal verifiers had a clear understanding of the evidence requirements in the above HN Units.

Administration of assessments

Both centres had highly developed and well-documented assessment and internal verification policies and procedures which assessors and internal verifiers were following. The external verifier saw clear evidence of internal verification taking place typically in the form of second marking of candidate scripts, internal verifiers initials and dates on the front covers of candidate sampled scripts, and completion of centre internal verification documentation. Sampling rates were normally in the range of 20–30%.

General feedback

In both centres the external verifier had good access to accommodation, candidate registers, assessment materials, internal verification forms, candidate work, and staff to perform external verification.

In one centre the quality of written feedback given to candidates regarding their reports was excellent. This feedback was specific, accurate and comprehensive. In the other centre, feedback to candidates was mixed: feedback in one Unit was very good whilst in other Units it was limited.

In one centre the external verifier reported that it was encouraging to see that centre staff were trying to help candidates to improve their report writing skills. First draft reports were returned to candidates to improve report formats, expand on content or eliminate errors. Candidates were also encouraged to write in the third person.

Areas of good practice

In both centres, master folders were comprehensive containing all relevant documentation. In one centre, master folders were stored electronically on the centre's information and communication system making access to master folders for approved staff straightforward.

In one centre, candidates are made aware of the consequences of academic malpractice during induction. Any evidence of copying and pasting of materials is dealt with at an early stage during the course in the hope that candidates do not repeat such practices. The external verifier saw no evidence of copying or plagiarism in either centre.

The external verifier was impressed that in one centre the outcomes of external quality reviews were shared electronically with all staff. This leads to a more open and transparent approach to dealing with quality problems/issues.

Specific areas for improvement

The only issue identified during the two visits was that the quality of written feedback to candidates in certain Units delivered in one of the centres could have been more detailed. It is important to remember that even in summative assessment detailed and constructive written feedback from assessors can provide valuable learning for candidates.