NQ Verification 2016–17 Key Messages Round 2

01 Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Computing Science
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2017

National Courses/Units verified:

C716 75   National 5   IACCA*
C716 76   Higher   IACCA
C716 77   Advanced Higher Project

*Internally-assessed component of course assessment

02 Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres had used an SQA-produced assignment.

Centres should ensure that they are using the latest version of the assignment and have prepared any required files for the candidates in advance as specified in the 'guidance for assessors' section of the assignment.

Assessment judgements

National 5 and Higher

Assessors should try their best to ensure that they apply the marking scheme consistently across all candidates within the cohort.

Assessors should ensure that they only apply the marking scheme to the required criteria within each marking section.

Stage 1 Analysing the problem
The analysis stage should be marked for the whole assignment and not marked separately for the program and information system.

Stage 2 Building a solution (modular program design)
Assessors are reminded that SQA Reference Language (Haggis) is a program language with a strict syntax and it is not necessary for candidates to use this technique at this stage in the development of a solution. Alternative techniques such as structure diagrams, flowcharts or pseudocode would be acceptable and may involve less work for candidates.

Candidates should ensure that they show the design for the whole program and not just the main elements.

Stage 2 Building a solution (modular program development)
Candidates must ensure they provide evidence of all their testing.

Stage 2 Building a solution (information system design)
Candidates can show the design of their queries in any way that is appropriate, but they cannot screenshot the implementation of the query as evidence of design.

Stage 2 Building a solution (information system development)
Many candidates did not ensure that they had evidence of all the requirements for this stage.

Assessors should ensure that candidates have the candidate checklist and remind them to use it.

Stage 3 Reporting on the solution
Only one legal **or** security implication is required, it is not necessary to have one of each.

Advanced Higher

Assessors must ensure that there is evidence to support all of their marking decisions. Without evidence the verifiers cannot support the marks given by the assessors.

Early versions of stages should be kept as evidence of development and should form part of the reflective commentary. It is expected that candidates will re-visit phases of the development process and make alterations. The reflective commentary should be used to explain how these phases have been altered and why. It may be advantageous for candidates to separate their reflective commentary for each stage of the project.

It is important to stress to the candidates that the Record of Progress and reflective commentary must be continually updated as there are marks available at each stage of the project.

03 Section 3: General comments

The majority of assessors have now gained confidence in the marking system used for the IACCA and are marking appropriately.

Assessors should feel free to add comments on candidates' completed assignments to explain how they arrived at their decisions on the banding. This not only helps the assessor come to their decision but is helpful to both the internal and external verifier.

The comments made by the assessors regarding the reasoning for their marks was invaluable to the verification process.