



NQ Verification 2021–22 Round 2

Qualification Verification Summary Report

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Verification group name: | Practical Metalworking |
| Verification event/visiting information: | Visiting |
| Date published: | June 2022 |

National Courses/Units verified:

C861 75 National 5 Practical Metalworking — IACCA

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The annually issued practical activity assessment task is the mandatory course assessment. All verified centres used the correct version.

No verified centre had any issues with the parts and materials document published to ensure centres could buy materials and fixings early enough to begin the practical activity assessment task.

A minority of centres had candidates who had referred to metalworking tools, machinery, or equipment outwith the National 5 Practical Metalworking course specification, while collating evidence for their logbook. Machinery such as grinders, which are not in the practical activity section of the course specification, should not be safety checked for use by candidates and therefore should not be used within the logbook. Centres should advise candidates only to use the tools, machinery or equipment within the practical activity section of the National 5 Practical Metalworking course specification when completing the logbook.

A minority of centres had issued candidates with different material thicknesses to those specified in the assessment task. While most of these centres had correctly updated the drawings to suit these changes, a minority of centres had not. Centres are reminded that they must try to obtain the material thicknesses as specified in the assessment task. Only in circumstances where specified material cannot be sourced, can centres adapt working drawings and issue a different

thickness of material. Centres do not need to inform SQA if a change in material thickness is necessary.

Centres must not alter or adapt the drawings in any way apart from the exceptional circumstances identified above. This includes moving the content of the practical activity into a different format.

The majority of centres were consistent in their approach to assessing functional sizes. These centres correctly used five of the suggested dimensions from the table in the practical activity, selecting at least one from each area. Assessors had indicated either on the assessment record, or a pro forma devised by the centre, which functional sizes had been selected for assessment and shown the awarded mark. These functional dimensions were consistent for all candidates within the group.

The use of the practical activity assessment record varied between the verified centres. Some centres had full commentary which easily allowed visiting verifiers to see where marks had been awarded, while some centres had extremely limited commentary, which resulted in some discrepancies between centre-allocated marks and those allocated by visiting verifiers.

A minority of centres had applied a finish that obscured candidates' practical evidence before visiting verification took place. Visiting verifiers were therefore not able to fully verify assessment judgements. Centres must ensure that candidates do not apply any finish that obscures their work, such as paint or dip coating. A clear lacquer can be applied. If a centre does apply a finish that obscures candidates' work, a 'Not accepted' verification outcome will be assigned to the centre.

Assessment judgements

Most centres had used practical activity videos as they applied the marking instructions to their candidate evidence. They found the videos extremely helpful to view alongside the marking instructions to ensure the correct judgements were being made for each candidate. The videos are available from the SQA Understanding Standards website.

Our visiting verifiers noted that most centres, although slightly lenient, are making fair and accurate assessment judgements. Most centres were confident in judging the evidence and correctly applying the marking instructions to the correct areas of the candidate evidence.

Some centres had incorrectly applied the Independence of work marks to their candidates. Centres are reminded that candidates must not be awarded full marks in any section where evidence from that section is incomplete. For example, if the tray is missing then the candidate cannot achieve full marks in the Bench work, Fabrication or Finishing sections of the marking instructions. Furthermore, candidates cannot achieve full marks in the Independence of work area within these sections.

A minority of centres were too lenient in their application of marks for the logbook. This was one of the main reasons for 'Not accepted' or 'Accepted*' judgement decisions. At these centres, candidate responses were often too vague and did not reference sufficient checks for using the machines and tools listed. Some candidates referred to actions that were carried out by the teacher; all checks should be conducted by the candidate. Some candidates also referenced personal protective equipment, where their responses should have been for the machine/tool care and maintenance. All centres are advised to use the exemplar logbook and Understanding Standards videos to assist in the correct application of marking instructions in relation to the logbook.

Our visiting verifiers reported that many candidates could not gain marks due to a poor standard of preparing the component parts for a finish. It is recommended that centres advise candidates, before assessment takes place, of the standard of finish required at National 5 level, for example, deburring and polishing component parts to remove scratches, process marks. If no attempt has been made by the candidate to prepare the components for assembly, then no marks should be awarded in this area.

03

Section 3: General comments

Centres should remember that if selected for visiting verification, they must ensure that any non-permanent mechanical joints such as internal and external threads should be easily disassembled to aid the verification process.

The majority of centres had evidence of internal verification at most stages. Some centres had comments from both the internal assessor and internal verifier for each section. Where the marks differ, it must be clear which mark has been awarded to the candidate. The agreed mark should be arrived at through discussion and with reference to the marking instructions.

Our visiting verifiers reported that differing metals such as aluminium and brass were being used for the handle and feet components of the garden lantern. Use of these materials, rather than mild steel, may help reduce some lead time during machine processes, although there is an awareness that cost implications would also need to be considered by centres.