



National Qualifications 2013 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 Qualifications (NQ) Awards

Titles/levels of NQ Awards verified:

Information Systems C216 11

Information Systems C216 12

Information Systems C216 13

General comments

Of the 32 centres verified, there were 28 Accepted and four Not Accepted.

The level and range of discrepancies has narrowed and centres are applying the detailed marking scheme more consistently and accurately than in previous years.

It would aid the verification process enormously if candidates' hard copies of reports were annotated to explain why marks had been awarded or not awarded. Though this is improving across centres a number of centres need to provide more consistent comment.

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

In the same way, centres should provide documented evidence to support the awarding of marks.

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

Visiting verification for Advanced Higher continues to be successful with most centres carrying out the marking of the project accurately and consistently.

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

Evidence Requirements

All centres used the appropriate Coursework task based on the level of Course the candidate was taking.

Administration of assessments

The use of internal verification procedures was in evidence for 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.

A variation of this process was demonstrated by one centre where a partner school was used to perform the internal verification process.

Areas of good practice

Intermediate 2

Task 1 — 8 was generally well done

Higher

Task 1, the data dictionary, was generally marked appropriately by centres.

Task 2 on creating the database and relationships, was completed to a good standard.

Tasks 3 and 4 were generally completed well.

Task 5 was completed well.

Tasks 6 to 9, the web authoring task, was generally marked appropriately.

Specific areas for improvement

When selected for verification, centres must make sure that necessary documentation is completed correctly. In some cases only one of the expected documents was included with the documentation.

Intermediate 2

Task 1 — Centres should take care to ensure that there is clear evidence of the use of line spacing, drop capitals and consistent headings.

Task 2 — Certain centres failed to produce all necessary evidence stated on the Coursework task.

Task 3 — One weakness was some centres awarding candidates who did not use the hyperlink function when linking the summary page to the presentation.

Tasks 4 and 5 — Centres should be careful where the creation of a field requires it to be 'restricted choice' that clear evidence exists that the candidate has set the field to 'limit to list' or another appropriate option.

Tasks 6, 7 and 8 — Minor issues arose where candidates failed to change the labels for the forms/report/layout or failed to make sure the complete label was visible.

Higher

Task 1 — Centres should note if a validation rule is to be used in a design then the rule should be written out in full eg ≥ 40 and ≤ 99.99 .

Task 2 — A few issues arose where marks were awarded for relationships (even though the relationship was missing). Centres must read the accompanying notes carefully before beginning the task as all necessary information is provided to avoid this type of error.

Task 3 and 4 — Centres should note that labels must be complete and fully visible, as well as being appropriate to the data displayed.

Task 5 — Centres should simply make sure that evidence is available for all aspects of the task, including closing the form.

Task 6 to 9 — Centres have improved in this area by highlighting the key commands that the candidates had used. With the variety of software used to solve this task there were instances where the key commands were not clear to the verifier.

Advanced Higher

Centres visited this year all applied the detailed mark scheme appropriately.

The following advice should continue to be adhered to by centres presenting Advanced Higher:

- ◆ Ensure there is evidence for every requirement of the marking scheme.
- ◆ Ensure complexity of the task, particularly relating to the processes involved in the task and the design of the user interface, is at Advanced Higher level.
- ◆ Ensure that the candidate's system design documentation, ie data modelling, data flow and entity modelling matches the functional requirements in the specification.
- ◆ Ensure that the process of normalisation from UNF to 3NF is included and has been carried out correctly.
- ◆ Check E/R diagram reflects the normalised data model.
- ◆ The design in relation to normalisation and E/R diagrams should reflect the whole database system and not individual sub-systems which have been normalised and E/R diagrams created independently of the other entities.
- ◆ Ensure the design of the user interface is carried out prior to implementation and not screen shots of the interface which has already been implemented.
- ◆ Time allocation should be a plan of how long is to be spent on each activity, not a progress diary of how long was spent on each activity.
- ◆ Candidates must supply evidence of a complete working solution which has been systematically tested to match the original functional requirements.