



# **NQ Verification 2013–14**

## **Key Message Reports**

<b>Verification group name:</b>	Practical Electronics
<b>Levels</b>	N4 and N5
<b>Date published:</b>	July 2014

**This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.**

# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 1

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Practical Electronics
Verification event/visiting information	Central event
Date published:	January 2014

#### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H25K 75 Practical Electronics: Circuit Design

H25M 75 Practical Electronics: Circuit Construction

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All of the assessments submitted for verification were Unit assessment support packs produced by SQA and therefore the approach was valid. Reference should always be made to the 'Judging evidence' tables of the Unit assessment support packs to ensure that the correct evidence is retained. For example there are instances where there is an assessor checkpoint/checklist and in some instances that should also be used as supporting evidence.

#### Assessment judgements

There was an example of over assessment where candidates only had to get two out of three answers correct but where being re-assessed for the one answer that was incorrect.

There was also an example of inconsistent marking where the assessor had ticked the checklist box for some candidates who had incorrect responses. This was initially difficult to spot as the assessor had not provided supporting commentary or made any indications on the candidates' responses.

## **Section 3: General comments**

There was no evidence that internal verification had been carried out at this point in time and it may be that centres have different timelines for internal verification. It is hoped that if internal verification had been carried out then the points listed above would have been picked up.

Additionally, although the verification sample used the SQA-produced Unit assessment support packs, centres are free to develop their own assessments. If they do use an assessment of their own devising, SQA would strongly recommend that they submit this for prior verification. This will ensure that the instrument of assessment used is a valid approach to assessment. The prior-verification service is free of charge and full details (along with appropriate forms for submission) can be found at <http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/63004.html>.



# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Practical Electronics
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2014

#### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H25K 74/75 Practical Electronics: Circuit Design

H25L 74/75 Practical Electronics: Circuit Simulation

H25M 74/75 Practical Electronics: Circuit Construction

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

In the main, assessment tasks were taken from the SQA Unit assessment support pack (UASP) tasks or prior-verified assessments and were, therefore, valid.

Most centres have adopted the combined approach to assessment, with one centre using the Unit-by-Unit approach. Assessments should be referenced against the Assessment Standards, which are exemplified across all USAPs.

One centre made very good use of supplementary comments regarding the additional support needs that were provided.

UASP tasks which only indicated an assessor checklist point would benefit from supplementary evidence to demonstrate how candidates achieved these tasks. This would enhance the assessor checkpoint, support internal verification procedures and remind assessors of the progress candidates have made towards achievement of the task. Assessors should therefore consider supplementary documentation where checklists apply.

Internal verification procedures should be evidenced in practice as well as policy.

## **Assessment judgements**

In the majority of cases, assessment judgements were found to be in line with the standards as defined within the 'Judging evidence' tables of the UASPs.

There was an example of over-assessment whereby candidates were noted as failing and then being re-assessed for complete tasks, when targeted re-assessment would be more appropriate.

One centre is using an electronic approach to capturing candidates' documentary evidence. However, candidates were using the same font that the assessor was using for assessor comments, making it difficult to distinguish which work was the candidates' and which was the assessor's. This can be rectified by candidates using a different font and ensuring that items are dated, showing timelines.

Where photographic evidence is submitted, the photograph should show sufficient detail for valid judgements to be made.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

There was variable evidence that internal verification had been carried out. It is anticipated that centres will have different timelines for internal verification. However, for future events, it is hoped that centres provide clear internal verification policies and evidence that the appropriate policy has been implemented.

In some instances, centres which were found to have made inappropriate assessment judgements had indicated that internal verification had been carried out. It appeared that the Internal Verifier was verifying the decisions made by the assessor but not necessarily trailing these decisions back to the required standards.



# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 3

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Practical Electronics
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2014

#### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H25N 74 Practical Electronics: Added Value Unit

H25N 75 Practical Electronics: Course Assessment

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All tasks were taken from the SQA Unit assessment support packs (UASPs) and were therefore valid. The use of SQA UASP tasks helps ensure common standards across all centres.

There were examples where centres made very good use of supplementary comments regarding how marks were arrived at for the National 5 Course assessment, and this is to be encouraged. Equally, there were examples where it was difficult to see how the marks were allocated — especially the 40 marks available for circuit construction for the National 5 Course assessment.

UASP tasks which indicate just an assessor checklist point would benefit from local supplementary evidence to demonstrate how candidates achieve these tasks to enhance the assessor checkpoint. This would also support internal verification procedures as well as remind assessors of the progress candidates have made towards achievement of the task. Assessors should consider supplementary documentation where checklists apply. This is especially relevant for the practical activities.

Many candidates entered for the National 4 Added Value Unit did not complete this Unit. The main reasons given were inappropriate candidate selection and/or candidates prioritising other work at the end of the academic session. The number of candidates not completing the National 4 Added Value Unit is a concern. It is hoped that methods can be developed to encourage candidates to complete the Added Value Unit.

## **Assessment judgements**

Assessment judgements were found to be in line with UASP requirements. However, centres should consider the use of supplementary information regarding how assessment decisions are reached for the construction part of the tasks. This was not always obvious when viewing completed circuits. In addition, the number of candidates not completing the National 4 Added Value Unit is a concern, as stated previously. If candidates are prioritising other work in May, it may be possible to find a solution to this.

Construction skills form a big part of the activities at both National 4 and National 5 and candidates need time and practice to gain experience with these predominately hand skills. Some centres have expressed concern with regard to the limited time and resources available to develop these skills. Other centres have noted a shortage of expertise in these skills in teaching staff. In this first session, centres have noted that some activities have taken longer to complete than anticipated and this experience will allow centres to improve time management of tasks in future sessions.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Internal verification is sometimes seen as an additional end-task to be carried out and is not always seen as the important tool it can be if issues such as resources, time management, standards, etc are discussed in detail at the beginning of the Course. There was variable evidence that internal verification had been carried out at this point in time. It is anticipated that centres will have different timelines for internal verification. However, it is hoped that, for future events, centres will provide clear internal verification policies and that there will also be evidence that the appropriate policy has been implemented.

This session has proved a good starting point for centres with the experience gained giving a good platform upon which to build. The main items to be considered for next session include:

- ◆ timing of activities across candidate's workload
- ◆ time management of tasks
- ◆ resource management
- ◆ internal verification activities
- ◆ local supplementary information to support assessor judgements