



**National Qualifications 2013  
Internal Assessment Report  
Business and Administration**

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

# National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified:

DM3P 10, 11, 12 — Administrative Services

DM3T 10, 11 — Presenting and Communicating Information

DM3R 10, 11 — Information Technology for Administrators

DM3V 12 — Information Technology for Management

## General comments

Centres had included all necessary documentation as requested. All sample evidence was as requested and it was very clear from the VS Form which candidates had passed or failed. Also, appropriate substitute evidence had been included where necessary.

Instruments of assessment from the National Assessment Bank were used to generate evidence.

It was clear that candidates had a good knowledge of the Units at all levels and that centre staff had been effective in preparing candidates for assessment.

Marking schemes were included and annotations were made to show where the centre had awarded marks for additional points not covered in the original marking scheme. Marking schemes were applied correctly to candidates' work and applied in line with national standards.

The clarity of marking was easy to follow. It was easy to see where marks had been allocated. Some centres used brackets to indicate where marks were awarded. This is good practice and is in line with the practices used during external examination marking procedures.

In many centres there was excellent evidence of a robust internal verification system being used. This is good practice and helps to ensure consistency in marking and standards. It is good practice to internally verify candidates' work as it strengthens the assessment process and identifies any issues during the assessment process. It is also good practice to internally verify material using a different colour of pen so that any differences between the original assessor and the Internal Verifier are obvious. Some centres record their internal verification decisions formally on separate forms.

It was sometimes not obvious from the scripts whether any internal verification had taken place. Some evidence simply had two signatures on it and this is not really sufficient. Internal verification requires a thorough check of the original assessment decision and where appropriate, amendments to be made.

Internal verification is seen by most centres as standard practice and is to be encouraged as it supports the assessment process. On some candidate scripts

there was inconsistent application of the standard and this could have been identified with a robust internal verification system.

There was also some good use of formative assessment. Unlike external assessments, comments can be written on internal assessments for formative purposes to show candidates why marks were/were not awarded. This can be particularly helpful in preparing candidates for re-assessment or for external assessment.

## **Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials**

Centres sampled showed a good understanding of the Unit specifications. There was a high level of consistency with the national standards in assessment.

Instruments of assessment from the National Assessment Bank were used to generate evidence.

### **Evidence Requirements**

It was clear that candidates had a good knowledge of all the courses and centre staff had been effective in preparing candidates for assessment.

Centres had a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for each Unit.

National Assessment Bank material clearly indicated the Evidence Requirements for each Unit.

### **Administration of assessments**

Evidence was well presented and well assessed.

All sample evidence was as requested. All necessary documentation was included, as requested, from centres. It was very clear from the VS Form which candidates had passed or failed. The VS Form also indicated which NAB had been used for each candidate. Appropriate substitute evidence was included where needed.

See internal verification comments in the General Comments section above.

### **Areas of good practice**

- ◆ All sample evidence was supplied as requested.
- ◆ Appropriate substitute evidence was included where needed.
- ◆ All necessary documentation was made available as requested, eg marking schemes.
- ◆ There were some excellent examples of very effective internal verification which supported the assessment process.

- ◆ The clarity of marking was easy to follow. It was easy to see where marks had been allocated. Some centres used brackets to indicate where marks had been allocated.
- ◆ There were some good examples of formative assessment comments. This is particularly helpful in preparing candidates for re-assessment and for external assessment.

### **Specific areas for improvement**

It is recommended that all centres adopt a robust system of internal verification to support the assessment process.