

Moderation Feedback – Central - 2005

Qualification area

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

HN Accounting Graded Unit 1

General comments on moderation activity

The work load with only five centres having presented candidates this year was manageable. However because of specific issues that arose once Moderators started to look at the materials, the time needed to complete the exercise was more than first envisaged at the start of the two day event.

Because this event was the first of its kind the team decided that it would be safer to take a sample of six candidates in principle and base a judgement on that rather than a sample of three. However, wherever the Moderator felt that it was safe to come to a conclusion based on a sample of three the above decision has been modified.

Specific issues identified

Two centres did not use the current version of the AEP. Moreover, these two centres made changes to either the questions and/or the marking scheme. This forced the Moderator to assess whether the AEP as it had been used in the centre was conforming to the unit descriptor before the candidate evidence could be looked at. This made the moderation event more time consuming than need have been.

Feedback to centres

Although SQA have endeavoured to make centres aware of the fact that it is good practice to submit locally devised assessment exemplars for prior moderation well in advance of any assessment event organised by the centre, there appears to be a need for this point to be brought to the centres' attention once more. This applies not only to completely new assessment exemplars, but also to any alteration of an existing exemplar, whether it is the question and/or the marking scheme.

Centres are reminded that it is good practice when marking computational questions in the subject area of accounts to make allowance for consequential errors.

Another issue to which centres should pay attention is to include a class checklist in the submission with not only the grades, but also the percentage marks for all the candidates. This is helpful for Moderators to determine the sample of scripts to look at. Assessors are reminded that they should show clearly on the scripts where marks have been awarded and how many.

The team feels that in some centres the candidates' answers in part 2, the narrative questions, suggest that the preparation for this part was not as thorough as it could have been. Also the standard of answer was not always commensurate with the level of the award. Unless there is a specific instruction to write notes on a topic, candidates should not present their answers as lists or in bullet point form when asked to: 'describe' or 'explain'.

Assessors are also reminded that the individual candidate assessment record has a section for overall comments on the candidate performance. This was not always used to the best advantage, particularly of the candidate.