NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 1

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01 ▶ Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	**Administration and IT**
Verification event/visiting information:	**Event (Postal)**
Date published	**June 2022**

National Courses/Units verified:

H27Y	National 3	Administration in Action
H1YY	National 3	Communication in Administration
H1YW	National 3	IT Solutions for Administrators
H1YV	National 4	Administrative Practices
H1YY	National 4	Communication in Administration
H1YW	National 4	IT Solutions for Administrators

02 ▶ Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The approaches to assessment used by all centres verified were valid. All centres used SQA unit assessment support packs (UASPs) accurately and consistently.

The following examples of good practice were observed:

♦ Candidate evidence from many centres was well presented, with tasks clearly labelled and assessment approaches included along with the judging evidence tables.

♦ Many centres used the combined approach to reduce the level of assessment for candidates.

♦ Some centres created codes and used these to annotate all candidate printouts.

♦ Centres generally had a strong internal verification policy, documenting their approach to quality assurance. Many centres demonstrated good practice in their internal verification processes: holding internal verification meeting/discussions; the assessor and the internal verifier using different coloured pens to annotate scripts; internal verification initialled by the assessor and internal verifier.

The following comments are intended as a guide to centres on future practice:

♦ All centres should ensure they have robust quality assurance measures in place for marking assessments. Centres should refer to 'Internal Verification: A Guide for Centres offering SQA Qualifications'.

♦ Evidence of a centre's internal quality assurance processes and their application must be provided when selected for external verification.

Assessment judgements

The majority of evidence submitted was of a very good standard which indicated that centres had prepared candidates well for assessment. Generally, centres judged evidence accurately, showing they had a clear understanding of the requirements of each assessment standard which was applied accurately to the judging of unit assessments.

However, there are a number of points to highlight. The following comments are intended as a guide to improve centre practice.

Keyboarding errors

Centres must check candidate work thoroughly for keyboarding and layout errors. All keyboarding and layout errors must be marked on candidate printouts. These errors need to be counted to ensure the candidate is not over the error tolerance for the task. The error tolerance for each level is:

National 3: 1 error for every 10 words
National 4: 1 error for every 15 words

Errors can appear anywhere in a task. Examples of errors that are included within the tolerance are: typing errors, minor layout errors (eg reference and date in the wrong place) and spacing errors (eg one return between paragraphs, inconsistent or incorrect spacing in an e-mail). There is flexibility over layouts but a sensible business layout must be used.

Each of the following would be treated as one error no matter how often they occur in the task:

♦ incorrect/inconsistent capitalisation
♦ incorrect/inconsistent spacing after punctuation at end of sentence
♦ incorrect/inconsistent spacing for commas, colons, semi-colons, brackets
♦ incorrect/inconsistent spacing between paragraphs
♦ confusion of hyphen/dash
♦ omission of apostrophe
♦ highlighted punctuation at the end of a heading
♦ missing full stops

Keyboarding errors were commonly missed on word-processing, desktop publishing and e-mail tasks. Common errors not identified by assessors were:

♦   inconsistent capitalisation
♦   incorrect punctuation
♦   layout/spacing errors

A small number of centres had not identified any keyboarding errors on candidate work.

Digital candidate evidence

Some centres are providing candidate evidence/printouts digitally. When candidate evidence/printouts are being submitted in a digital format, centres must provide evidence of how judgements were made on these digital printouts, including evidence that shows that keyboarding errors have been identified eg digitally inked printouts. A copy of a candidate's digital evidence with no indication of any marking is not appropriate for external verification.

Combined approach (package 3)

A number of centres used the combined approach. With the combined approach, the theory assessment standards are often assessed in the same task as IT-related assessment standards. This means keyboarding must be marked in theory answers. Assessors must identify all keyboarding errors on the candidate's printout. If a candidate is over the error tolerance for that task, they can still pass the theory assessment standards if their answers are correct, however they would fail the IT-related assessment standards.

03 ▸ Section 3: General comments

It was clear that many centres had made a concerted effort to ensure the standards had been consistently applied, even during these challenging times.

We would continue to encourage all centres to read the assessment standards carefully along with the information for judging evidence and check candidate evidence thoroughly against these standards. Centres not identifying keyboarding errors is a reoccurring issue every year. Therefore, we continue to advise centres to take time to annotate candidate assessment work carefully.