



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification event/visiting information	Event/visiting
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H222	National 3	Information Solutions
H21X	National 3	Building Digital Solutions
H226	National 4	Information Systems Design & Development
H223	National 4	Software Design and Development
H226	National 5	Information Systems Design & Development
H223	National 5	Software Design and Development
H226	Higher	Information Systems Design & Development
H223	Higher	Software Design and Development
H226	Advanced Higher	Information Systems Design & Development
H223	Advanced Higher	Software Design and Development

Section 2: Comments on assessment

02

Assessment approaches

All the centres used SQA Unit assessment support packs (UASPs) with Unit by Unit approaches, although some centres had made some small changes.

Centres should ensure that they are using the most recent UASPs and the appropriate Evidence Requirements.

Centres should ensure that if they make changes to the assessments in the UASPs the assessments still cover all the Assessment Standards.

The prior verification service is available free of charge and full details (along with appropriate forms for submission) can be found on the [new National Qualifications prior verification web page](#).

Assessment judgements

The majority of centres were judging the evidence according to the appropriate Assessment Standard.

It is important that assessors record on the candidate evidence where they decide that an Assessment Standard is achieved. This would aid support for the candidates, internal verification of the candidates' work and eventually the external verification process.

Higher Software Design and Development (SDD)

Assessment Standard 2.4 asks for an appropriate test plan and completed final testing. Depending on the task this could require a number of different tests, eg the task for UASP1 only requires one test to ensure the program finds the candidate with the top mark, whereas the task for UASP 3 could require more than a dozen different tests to ensure the program works correctly. It isn't acceptable to just test normal, extreme and exceptional data. All test plans should be accompanied by evidence (screenshots) that the test plans have been carried out.

Assessment Standard 2.2 requires evidence of high-level planning showing main modules and data flow. It should be possible to do this using one design notation.

Higher Information Systems Design & Development (ISDD)

The standard accepted by some centres for Higher ISDD Assessment Standard 1.1 ('Applying contemporary design and development methodologies'), when applied to Website design was much lower than required. The design should show where the implementation of the required structure and links will take place eg internal and external hyperlinks and search facility.

Advanced Higher SDD

UASP 1 did not give clear guidance as to where the opportunity to describe two data types was, and this will be rectified next session.

03

Section 3: General comments

Oral evidence is acceptable but it is expected that the assessor submits a note of the discussion that took place.

If a candidate doesn't meet the requirements of an Assessment Standard, then it is acceptable for an assessor to return the work to the candidate, without any further support, and ask the candidate if they could add some additional information to the answer that they have provided. This would not count as a re-assessment.

If a candidate cannot overtake an Assessment Standard then a period of consolidation and remediation should take place before the candidate is given another opportunity to be re-assessed on that Assessment Standard, using a different assessment instrument.

Centres should note that candidates should be given an opportunity to be re-assessed on any Assessment Standard that the assessor has deemed that they have failed.

Evidence of internal verification must be provided, as should a detailed description of how this has been carried out by the centre. Cross-marking should be clearly shown in a different colour to the original marking, as should the signature of the cross-marker. Clear guidance exists on SQA's website regarding internal verification:

[Internal Verification: a Guide for Centres offering SQA Qualifications](#)