



# **National Qualifications 2014 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

## General comments

There was a reduction in the number of centres selected for central verification for Intermediate 2 and Higher. Of the 15 centres verified, there were 124 'Accepted' and 3 'Not Accepted'.

It would aid the verification process enormously if hard copies of candidates' reports were annotated to explain why marks had been awarded or deducted. 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 as a guide to the amount of help provided.

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

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

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

All centres had used the correct coursework task for 2013–14. 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. 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 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.

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. Centres must make sure also that the evidence submitted has been generated by the candidate and is the candidate's own work.

### **Intermediate 2**

Tasks 1 and 2 were generally well done. 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. Similarly, where a candidate links two tables using a foreign key, evidence of this must be clearly shown as part of the table's structure.

Tasks 3, 4, 5 and 6 were generally well done. Reports were generally well presented and the e-mail activity had suitable screenshots to support marks awarded. A minor issue was in the evidence presented to show the database results as a pdf file. In a number of cases it was not clear from the e-mail screenshot or the screenshot of the file that a pdf file had been created. A comment on the mark scheme that the correct file type had been observed by the class teacher would have helped clarify this issue.

Task 7, 8 and 9 were generally well done.

### **Higher**

Task 1, the data dictionary, was generally marked appropriately by centres. Centres should note where validation rule is to be used in the design, the rule should be written out in full eg  $\geq 40$  and  $\leq 99.99$ .

Task 2 on creating the database and relationships was completed to a good standard. Issues did arise where marks were awarded to candidates though no supporting evidence was provided. Centres must make sure that all evidence is provided for each candidate in the sample.

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

Task 5 was generally completed well. An issue that did arise was in the presentation of the candidates' report. A number of examples existed where the full report was not visible. It was not possible in these cases to verify whether the candidate had completed the minimum, maximum and average correctly.

Task 6 was completed well. Centres should simply make sure that evidence is available for all aspects of the task, including closing the form.

Task 8 was generally well done. One minor issue that existed is where centres used screenshots of the spreadsheet as evidence. Several screenshots were so small they were impossible to read. Centres must make sure all evidence is readable.

Task 9 was generally completed to a good standard. Again, centres must make sure all necessary evidence is available. The common missing printout was of the dialog box used during the set-up of the goal seek.