



# **National Qualifications 2015 Internal Assessment Report Information Systems**

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

# National Courses

Titles/levels of National Courses verified

C216 12 Information Systems (Higher)

## General comments

Centres were selected for verification at Higher level only. No verification was carried out at Intermediate 2 or Advanced Higher level.

The application of the detailed mark scheme was generally appropriate. A few centres were generous in their application of the mark scheme.

One general improvement that centres may be able to make is in annotating all candidates' reports to explain why marks had been awarded or deducted. This is improving though a number of centres need to provide more consistent comments.

Detailed comments provided in the marking grid are extremely useful to the verifier as a guide to how marks were awarded or as a guide to the level of help provided.

In the same way, centres should provide documented evidence to support the awarding of marks. This may be a screenshot or a printout of the candidate's work. Screenshots and printouts must be readable in all cases.

The documented evidence should provide full and clear detail of the work undertaken by the candidate.

## Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres had used the correct coursework task for 2014–15. From evidence submitted, centres understood the requirements of the task.

## Evidence Requirements

Centres must make sure all necessary printouts are included for each candidate. These printouts must be readable and all requested information must be visible. Likewise, any screenshots must be scaled to allow the data to be read.

## Administration of assessments

The majority of centres had applied the mark scheme appropriately and consistently across the sample. The majority of centres had shown evidence of internal verification.

## Areas of good practice

The use of internal verification procedures was seen in the evidence of many centres.

Best practice demonstrated in this area involved the centre marking the work a second time but without access to the original marks. The two sets of marks were compared and where discrepancies existed an agreed mark was applied.

Where a centre has only a one-teacher department, a variation of this process can include using a partner school to perform the internal verification process.

## Specific areas for improvement

When selected for verification, centres must make sure that necessary documentation is completed correctly.

- ◆ Task 1, the data dictionary, was generally marked appropriately by centres. Indication of lookup to the original entity was demonstrated to a good standard, as was the use of restricted entry. One issue that did arise was where restricted entry was indicated, but not all correct list entries were stated, full marks were still given.
- ◆ Task 2, creating the database and relationships, was completed to a good standard. Issues did arise where marks were awarded to candidates without supporting commentary or evidence was not readable, eg screenshots were too small. Centres must make sure that the evidence provided for each candidate in the sample is easy to read.
- ◆ Tasks 3 and 4 were generally completed well. In most cases, centres provided clear evidence of the query as well as clear screenshots of the query result.
- ◆ Centres should note that labels must be complete and fully visible, as well as being appropriate to the data displayed. Centres could also encourage pupils to change automatically generated headings to something more appropriate.
- ◆ In the completion of task 4, in rare instances, it was not clear how the correct subject had been found (classes with the number of students greater than maximum allowed) — candidates appeared to know the subject that had this issue and queried on the subject name. Centres must be careful to check the process by which a candidate produces their solution.
- ◆ Task 5 was completed well. Centres should simply make sure that evidence is available for all aspects of the task, including closing the form and any filter.
- ◆ Tasks 6 to 8 were generally well done and marked appropriately. In most cases, candidates provided appropriate evidence to support all aspects of this task.
- ◆ A few minor issues were evident throughout the sample: evidence of styles not always clear or accurate in definition; evidence of style pane area not provided by all candidates; marks awarded for pagination where no evidence existed