



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Accounting
Levels	N5 and Higher
Date published:	October 2016

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

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

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H1YP 75 National 5 Preparing Financial Accounting Information

H1YR 75 National 5 Preparing Management 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 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.

Assessment of Higher Unit 'Preparing Management Accounting Information' Assessment Standard 2.1, highlighted some inconsistencies. Where candidates incorrectly calculate Production (in units), for Cash Sales or Credit Sales, this should be treated as one error each time; consequentiality should not be applied.

The standard of response to theory questions was variable at both levels. Whilst some centres have high expectations, the majority of centres are not meeting the national standard. Special attention should be paid to National 5 Unit 'Preparing

Financial Accounting Information' Assessment Standard 2.1. Where candidates make reference to the matching concept, this concept must be clearly explained in order to meet the Assessment Standard.

03

Section 3: General comments

All centres submitted scripts where there was some evidence of internal verification. It is clear, however, that centres need to adopt a more thorough approach as errors and omissions noted during SQA verification had been overlooked by the internal verifier.

It is expected that candidate evidence submitted clearly indicates, for each Outcome, the total number of errors made and whether the candidate has passed/failed the Outcome.

Where centres submit computational evidence there is an expectation that corresponding theory tasks/Outcomes will also be submitted. Some centres submitted computational evidence for Higher Unit 'Preparing Management Accounting Information', Assessment Standard 2.1. However, there was no candidate evidence submitted for theory Assessment Standard 2.2, despite both 2.1 and 2.2 being assessed in the same task.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Accounting
Verification event/visiting information	Central verification
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H1YS National 5 Accounting: Analysing Accounting Information
H1YS Higher Accounting: Analysing 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; the unit-by-unit approach was 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.

Assessment of Higher unit — whilst there has been a significant improvement in the standard of response to theory outcomes, one area continues to be weak: Outcome 1.2 requires that candidates 'describe' financial and non-financial performance indicators, simply 'stating' will not suffice.

Assessment of Higher unit — special attention should be paid to Outcome 2.1, Task 3 (a): Project A pays back in 2 years 162.22 days. Acceptable answers are 2 years 162.22 days or 2 years 163 days; an answer of 2 years 162 days would be incorrect.

In general, when calculating ratios/ARR, there is an expectation that candidates apply rounding conventions where answers derived have decimal places. Incorrect rounding counts as one error, each time.

03

Section 3: General comments

All centre submissions showed some evidence of internal verification. It is clear, however, that some centres need to adopt a more thorough approach as errors and omissions noted during SQA verification had been overlooked by the internal verifier.

Candidate evidence submitted should clearly indicate, for each outcome, the total number of errors made and whether the candidate has achieved or not achieved the outcome.

Where candidate answers are incorrect, this should be clearly highlighted. It was apparent in some instances that markers ignored incorrect aspects of candidate responses with no visible indication on the script that the answer was incorrect.