



Course Report 2015

Subject	Administration and IT
Level	National 5

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It 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 and marking instructions for the examination.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Assignment

Stakeholders commented that the assessment covered a wide range of the Course content and could be completed within the 4-hour time allocation. It was an accessible assessment for all levels and did not have any tasks which performed unexpectedly.

Evidence showed that candidates were familiar with the type of assessment provided. They were able to access e-files and to action and delete comments appropriately.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Assignment

Markers commented that candidates attained a wide range of marks. Pleasingly, there were fewer candidates who attained very low marks than last year, meaning that more candidates were entered at the correct level. Good candidates were able to excel, whereas less able candidates were able to attempt all tasks.

The spreadsheet tasks were generally well attempted by candidates.

The theory tasks were again poorly attempted. Candidates were able to attain marks for specific theory, eg Principles of Data Protection Act, but had great difficulty in describing other points in relation to the organisation.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1

Task 1: Most candidates attained at least half marks in this task. Almost all were able to insert the reference and date, price of the trip, and complimentary close, and to embolden the required headings. The layout of the letter tended to be correct.

Task 2: Almost all candidates printed out a form for this task. Where candidates had all the fields in the form, accuracy was usually very good.

Task 3: Good candidates attained highly in this task. Most were able to design the poster using fonts, formatting and graphics.

Task 4: The vast majority of candidates attained full marks for this task.

Task 5a: Candidates were able to send an e-mail.

Task 5b: Most candidates were able to outline three Principles of the Data Protection Act.

Task 6a: Almost all candidates were able to sort the table correctly and most populated it accurately.

Task 6b: The majority of candidates searched the database correctly and printed the fields requested.

Task 7: Most candidates attained some of the keyboarding marks even though there were many foreign words.

Task 8a: Almost all candidates attained both the sum formula and print marks.

Task 8b: Most candidates were able to show % and print the chart on a separate sheet.

Task 9: Most candidates attained most of the marks available for this task.

Task 10: Candidates tended to insert meetings on the correct day.

Task 11: Most candidates completed the search correctly and inserted a logo in the correct place in their report.

Task 12: The majority of candidates were able to gain marks for inserting the name, logo and a suitable heading.

Task 13: Most candidates attained the graphic mark and left space for information to be inserted.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1

Task 1: Many candidates did not attain the mark for inserting the headed paper correctly — the font or formatting was often different to the e-file given. A number of candidates had a different font or size for the reference and date. The subject heading was also often in an incorrect place in the letter.

Most candidates did not attain all the keyboarding marks for the task, and many did not attain any of the four keyboarding marks available. Some candidates did not carry out manuscript corrections accurately. Many candidates continued formatting after a heading, eg emboldening the colon after the paragraph headings. Some candidates did not follow instructions to put the paragraphs in the correct order.

Task 2: Candidates rarely attained more than half marks for this task. Many candidates did not populate both tables, therefore only some information was visible. Truncation was also an issue with this task — both field names and the information which was keyed in. Many candidates did not insert a form footer. Where it was inserted, it was often not on a separate line or above the candidate name.

Task 3: Candidates often did not attain either of the keyboarding marks for this task. Dates often did not have years and were sometimes inconsistent in style. The sentence which was inserted also often had keyboarding errors.

Task 4: A number of candidates truncated information on either the value or formula sheet, so were not awarded the print mark. Many candidates also used `>=` in the IF statement instead of `>`.

Task 5a: Many candidates did not use the Cc function of e-mail as instructed, and had difficulty with the layout or keying in of a business e-mail, so were not awarded the keyboarding mark. Many candidates asked a question in the body of the e-mail, but failed to include a question mark. A number of candidates did not insert the NHS website requested; instead they inserted another commercial EHIC website.

Task 5b: Few candidates attained highly in the first two sections of this task. Many candidates were writing one-word answers, and they often did not write about consequences from the organisation's viewpoint in the second section.

Task 6a: A number of candidates omitted ? in EHIC? so they were not awarded the new field mark. A few candidates did not seem to understand that a tick is positive and blank is negative when using a yes/no field.

Task 7: A significant number of candidates did not amend the dates of the trip as instructed by the comment in the e-file. Most candidates were not awarded the presentation mark as they did not follow the given layout. Candidates often did not follow the instruction to swap the required information between day four and day six.

Task 8a: Some candidates had not named the cell in the previous task. Candidates also had difficulty in using absolute cell references in cell C7 and this was often not replicated to C8.

Task 8b: Many candidates printed a colour pie chart on a black and white printer; therefore the segments could not be differentiated, so the chart mark was not awarded. Candidates had difficulty in thinking of an appropriate heading for the chart. In addition, the capitalisation of the heading was poor.

Task 9: Some candidates omitted the date from the year. A number of candidates formatted the logo differently on different slides or it was clipped. Some candidates did not follow the given layout when inserting graphics.

Task 10: Many candidates' weekly view printout was truncated, and they did not include supplementary sheets. A number of candidates inserted meetings at incorrect times. Inconsistent capitalisation of entries was common.

Task 11: Most candidates were unable to key-in an appropriate heading accurately and few candidates printed out the fields required to phone parents, eg full name.

Task 12: Many candidates did not include any shading on their feedback form and few candidates attained all three keyboarding marks due to poor keyboarding. The majority of

candidates still do not treat the asterisk correctly. Though most candidates keyed in the final sentence, many did not insert it into a footer.

Task 13: Keyboarding accuracy was again poor in this task.

Task 14: Candidates tended to score poorly in this task as they were unable to describe a **method** the organisation could use.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Assignment

Centres should ensure candidates read instructions carefully — many candidates are not being awarded marks due to not following print, sort, and search instructions. Candidates must ensure that they proofread work carefully. Keyboarding, consistency of capitalisation and spacing were poor across many centres.

When using a black and white printer, centres should ensure that black and white charts are created or segments are labelled so that segments can be differentiated.

Dates must have a year and should follow a consistent style within a task.

E-diary entries should be checked for truncation. If this is evident, supplementary sheets must be printed so that marks can be awarded.

In theory tasks — when outlining or describing from the organisation's viewpoint — it must be clear that it is what the organisation does, not the employee.

Centres should ensure that candidates can apply punctuation marks correctly, especially for asterisks, hyphens and dashes.

All e-mails must have a suitable subject heading, opening and close, and the body of the e-mail must make sense and use appropriate punctuation.

Where e-files are provided for tasks, any additional information must be consistent with the existing style. For example, if the e-file shows graphics in portrait style, additional graphics must also be in portrait style.

Candidates should be encouraged to use templates from their software for DTP tasks, eg Task 13 — certificate.

When a task asks for a Name to be included, this means title, first name and surname.

Where a footer is requested, candidates should insert this using the footer function. This must be shown on a separate line above any candidate information.

Centres should be aware that the Principles of Marking are part of the marking instructions and are shown on the last few pages.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	4267
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2015	5619
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 100				
A	26.3%	26.3%	1480	70
B	29.0%	55.3%	1629	60
C	23.0%	78.4%	1295	50
D	7.6%	85.9%	425	45
No award	14.1%	-	790	-

For this Course, the intention was to set similar grade boundaries to last year. The Course Assessment functioned as intended therefore no adjustment to grade boundaries was required.