



NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Accounting
Levels	N5 and Higher
Date published:	October 2015

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2014-15.



NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Accounting
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2015

National Units verified:

H1YP 75	National 5	Preparing Financial Accounting Information
H1YR 75	National 5	Preparing Management Accounting Information
H1YS 75	National 5	Analysing Accounting Information
H1YP 76	Higher	Preparing Financial Accounting Information
H1YR 76	Higher	Preparing Management Accounting Information

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Approaches used by all centres verified were deemed valid.

All centres used SQA instruments of assessment, with the Unit-by-Unit approach being the preferred option.

Assessment judgements

Verifiers found that the majority of evidence submitted was of a good standard; centres had a clear understanding of the requirements of the national standard and applied this to the marking of Unit assessments.

Marking continued to be lenient for theory questions, with candidates being credited with passes in Outcomes where their answers were vague or unclear.

While consequentiality was taken into account by the majority of centres, it continued to be an issue for a minority.

03

Section 3: General comments

Internal verification was completed by all centres that submitted evidence for verification. These centres are to be commended.

Centres must ensure that the instrument of assessment, judging evidence tables and solutions are submitted with candidate evidence.

The candidate evidence submitted for each Outcome should clearly indicate whether the candidate has passed/failed. Centres should submit complete evidence for an Outcome, ie where an Outcome is composed of more than one task, all tasks in the Outcome should be submitted.

When compiling stock record cards candidates should add the different stock values and show a total stock value at each date.

NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Accounting
Verification event/visiting information	Central Verification
Date published:	June 2015

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H1YS National 5 Analysing Accounting Information
H1YS Higher Analysing Accounting Information

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres that were verified used approaches that were deemed valid.

All centres used SQA instruments of assessment, with the Unit-by-Unit approach being the preferred option.

Assessment judgements

Verifiers found that the majority of evidence submitted was of an acceptable standard, which indicated that centres had a clear understanding of the requirements of the national standard and applied these to the marking of Unit assessments.

Computational Outcomes were in general, marked to a high standard for both National 5 and Higher. Few issues were encountered.

Theory continues to be weak at National 5 and Higher, in particular Higher Outcome 1.2 and Outcome 2.2 in the Unit Analysing Accounting Information.

Centres should approach candidate responses which refer to PESTEC as non-financial performance indicators for Outcome 1.2, with caution. Ideally, internal

non-financial factors should be **described** (ie ethical/environmental policies/employee relations). Centres should be aware that candidates who simply **identify** financial/non-financial factors, instead of describing, will be deemed to have not met the national standard for this Outcome.

Similarly, expectations must be raised regarding candidate responses for Outcome 2.2. Where using Analysing Accounting Information Package 1 Unit-by-Unit approach, for Task 2b candidates must evaluate each of the options and then recommend the most appropriate course of action. In some instances no recommendation was made. In Task 3a, where candidates correctly calculate payback to be 162.2 days, an answer rounded down to 162 days would be deemed incorrect. Payback is achieved on day 163, therefore acceptable responses would be either 162.2 days or 163 days.

03

Section 3: General comments

Most centres submitted scripts where there was some evidence of internal verification. It is to centres' benefit to ensure that scripts submitted show clear evidence of this, otherwise this will be highlighted in the external verification report.

There is an expectation that 30% of each centre's submission has been internally verified. Many centres commendably exceeded this expectation.

It is expected that candidate evidence submitted for each Outcome clearly indicates whether the candidate has passed/failed.

Assessments should be completed in ink.