



Course report 2022

Subject	Administration and IT
Level	National 5

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any appeals.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	5410
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	31.0	Cumulative percentage	31.0	Number of candidates	1680	Minimum mark required	74
B	Percentage	26.4	Cumulative percentage	57.4	Number of candidates	1425	Minimum mark required	61
C	Percentage	23.6	Cumulative percentage	81.0	Number of candidates	1275	Minimum mark required	48
D	Percentage	13.4	Cumulative percentage	94.4	Number of candidates	730	Minimum mark required	35
No award	Percentage	5.6	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	305	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Question paper

All questions functioned as intended. Some candidates achieved high marks in the question paper. Centres commented that candidates had sufficient time to complete the paper. The majority of candidates submitted printouts for all questions. Most candidates attempted all parts of the theory question. Most candidates truncated formulae in the spreadsheet printouts.

Assignment

The course component performed as expected. Many candidates attained high marks, however a few candidates attained very low marks. Candidates did not attain the top few marks because of keying-in errors and inconsistencies.

Many candidates used the snipping tool to evidence internet research tasks. Most of these candidates did not attain the criteria marks for the research as they truncated their snip, or the snip was so small the evidence was illegible.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Question paper

Question 1(a)

Most candidates attained 2 marks in the value printout. Almost all candidates were able to insert a new row correctly.

In the formula printout, many candidates attained the multiplication and SUM formula marks.

Question 1(b)

In the formula printout, most candidates attained the mark for the linked formula in C4 and C5, and most attained the replication mark in column D.

Question 2(a)

Most candidates attained full marks for this question.

Question 2(b)

Most candidates created a report. They also searched and sorted on one criteria correctly.

Question 2(c)

Most candidates attained at least 3 marks for this question. Candidates were able to update the database by deleting and amending records.

Question 3

Most candidates attained most marks for the explain question.

Assignment

Task 1 — Advert

Most candidates included the information in the correct place, amended the heading to be block capitals and centred, and included a shape with text. Most candidates also included number bullets correctly and moved the text.

Task 2 — Internet printout

Most candidates correctly selected a 3- or 4-star hotel. Most candidates provided the correct driving directions, however, a few candidates showed walking directions only.

Task 3 — E-diary printout

Most candidates chose the correct week to insert the meetings and events.

Task 4 — Theory

Most candidates attained most marks for the sources of information and tasks/duties of an administrator.

Task 5 — Itinerary

Almost all candidates inserted the logo and keyed in the date on the front cover. Most candidates inserted the correct dates and were able to merge and remove the shading in each individual table.

Task 6 — Mail merge

Almost all candidates had a wristband of the correct size, and used two or more text formats, and most candidates produced evidence of a merge.

Task 7 — E-mail

Most candidates attained very high marks in this task. Almost all candidates gained the essential information and the sent marks.

Task 8 — Presentation

Most candidates attained highly in this task. Most were able to insert a new slide and copy the information from the e-files into two columns. Almost all candidates attained the move, design and remove slide number marks. Almost all candidates printed the presentation six slides per page, along with a full-page slide.

Task 9 — E-diary

In the calendar, almost all candidates changed the event time and location, and printed a daily view.

Task 10 — Certificate

Most candidates attained high marks in this task. They included fonts, formats and a page border, along with a suitable graphic. Keyboarding of the sentence was excellent.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Question paper

Question 1(a)

Some candidates did not increase the font size of the headings in rows 1 and 2. Many candidates did not attain the keyboarding mark because the sponsorship label was keyed in incorrectly.

Some candidates did not attain the marks for the subtraction formula because they did not appear to understand the concept of cash raised and surplus, and therefore added instead of subtracting the cells. Some candidates also continue to include =SUM in the multiplication and subtraction formula, where it is not required. In the formula printout, many candidates calculated the percentage instead of the value when completing the IF statement. Many

candidates also truncated the IF statement, and therefore could not attain marks. Many candidates included the cost per person table when they had been instructed to omit it. Some candidates also inserted formulae in shaded cells, even though the comment was attached to an unshaded cell.

Question 1(b)

In the value printout many candidates were unable to sort the table correctly; many candidates sorted column A only. Many candidates were also unable to format both value printouts correctly; many used a combination of accounting and currency in one worksheet, and some did not format the percentage increase to whole numbers or percentage format. In the formula printout, although candidates were able to link worksheets, they truncated the entry fees formula. Many candidates did not name the cell in the cash statement, which was evidenced in this printout.

Question 2(b)

Many candidates did not insert an appropriate heading, and capitalisation was often incorrect. Some candidates truncated the logo, and some did not insert the logo. Many candidates did not attain the print mark because they either did not include the full name (title, first name, surname) or they included the club's mobile number instead of the player's mobile number.

Question 2(c)

Many candidates did not sort on two fields, so did not attain these marks.

Question 3

Many candidates did not attain any marks for the outline question. Candidates did not display knowledge of the wording of the principles; although candidates were not required to use exact GDPR wording, they did need to word it so that the principle could be recognised.

Many candidates did not attain any marks for the describe question. Candidates often gave vague advantages of e-mail rather than features. Sometimes when features were identified, they were not described.

Assignment

Task 1 — Advert

Many candidates removed the footer text when adding their name in the footer. Keyboarding tended to be inaccurate. Graphics were often not consistent in size or relevant to the scenario of Scottish wildlife. Candidates who chose lions, giraffes and koalas could not gain the mark.

Task 2 — Internet printout

Many candidates provided screenshots/snips for evidence of internet research, but they did not include all the criteria requested. Where candidates submitted screenshots/snips, most were far too small; this made it difficult to award marks because detail could not be read.

Very few candidates showed the distance to the city centre from the hotel, and some candidates confused customer ratings with star ratings for the hotel.

Task 3 — E-diary

Candidates who provided screenshots/snips usually attained fewer marks than candidates who printed straight from the e-diary because the screenshots/snips often missed the key information required to award marks.

Many candidates who printed the e-diary in weekly view did not provide supplementary printouts, and therefore marks could not be awarded for the meetings as they were all truncated.

Many candidates did not include the hotel name for the location of the accommodation meeting — this was a problem-solving skill. Many candidates included the word 'hotel' as the location, rather than the name of their chosen hotel.

Task 4 — Theory

Some candidates outlined tasks/duties instead of describing them, and confused features of a reliable source with examples of reliable sources.

Many candidates did not perform well in the explain question because they explained methods of security rather than health and safety.

Task 5 — Itinerary

Very few candidates attained 2 or 3 keyboarding marks. Many candidates did not correctly convert am and pm into 24-hour clock or work out the correct time of the boat trip.

Some candidates were not able to print in booklet format; instead, they printed four pages on one A4 sheet.

Task 6 — Mail merge

Many candidates thought that the name of the boat trip was Watch the Wild, and the majority did not include the time of the trip. The tourist name was to be included when merging — this should be the title, first name and surname. Many candidates omitted the title field.

Task 7 — E-mail

Few candidates attained the keyboarding mark, and many did not forward the e-mail. Again, where a snip was the only evidence provided, this often did not include all the relevant details, and it was sometimes very small to read. Where the background theme had been changed to a dark colour, the light text was very difficult to read.

Task 8 — Presentation

Many candidates did not attain the title slide mark because of keyboarding errors or omission of the required information. The heading of the new slide was often inconsistent with the other slide headings. Some chosen designs were very busy; this sometimes made it

difficult to see all the required information, especially in the footer. Although a footer was evident on most candidates' printouts, it was often incorrect.

Task 9 — E-diary

Few candidates gained the mark for inserting a task in a to-do list because they incorrectly inserted the task as an event.

Task 10 — Certificate

Many candidates did not include a box for the recipient's name and omitted the word 'certificate'.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper

Centres should refer to the marking instructions and general marking principles on SQA's website when preparing candidates for future assessment.

If there is an instruction to increase the font size, it is recommended that it is increased substantially, not just by 1pt or 2pts, so that the increase is very clear to see.

Candidates should check all printouts for truncation, especially formula printouts, which often require cells to be elongated. They must also proofread printouts before submission.

All actions in a comment must be completed; for example, calculate the surplus and name the cell. Many candidates forgot to name the cell.

When sorting a worksheet, the whole spreadsheet must be sorted, not just a column.

Centres must ensure that candidates have practised all required features for the database; for example, sorting on two fields.

Where candidates are asked to include a name, they must have title, first name and surname in the correct order.

Good practice would be to use block capitals for main headings in databases and spreadsheets; this ensures consistent capitalisation.

The logo should be inserted where instructed and not truncated.

Centres should remind candidates to answer the question by thinking about the command word used. An outline response needs more than one word; a describe response needs more detail than an outline response; and an explain response must include a cause and effect.

Assignment

Centres should refer to the marking instructions and general marking principles on SQA's website when preparing candidates for future assessment.

There was evidence of poor keyboarding across all tasks in the assignment, especially when candidates had to create a document. Candidates must proofread their work carefully before submission.

If there is a footer already in a word document, it is advised that candidates insert their name/SCN in the page header. Where graphics are to be inserted, they should be consistent in size and orientation.

Internet searches tended to be poorly completed. If screenshots/snips are used, candidates must ensure that all the information required is visible and legible. Marks cannot be awarded

if information cannot be read. Candidates must ensure that they show all the criteria that has been requested. If options of different accommodation or travel are given, candidates must clearly identify which one they are selecting.

A describe response needs more detail than an outline response (outline plus more) and an explain response must include a cause and effect.

Where candidates are asked to include a name in a mail merge task, they must have title, first name and surname in the correct order.

The layout of e-mails was better than in previous years. All e-mails must have a subject, start, sensible message and close, along with open punctuation. It is good practice for candidates to use the Cc function when copying in additional recipients to an e-mail.

Centres should practise the creating tasks function using to-do lists, not inserting a task as an event.

Appendix 1: General commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level. Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).