



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2019–20

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| Verification group name:                | Administration and IT |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event (Postal)        |
| Date published:                         | July 2020             |

#### National Courses/Units verified:

| Unit code | Level      | Unit title                      |
|-----------|------------|---------------------------------|
| H1YW 73   | National 3 | IT Solutions for Administrators |
| H1YY 73   | National 3 | Communication in Administration |
| H27Y 73   | National 3 | Administration in Action        |
| H1YV 74   | National 4 | Administrative Practices        |
| H1YW 74   | National 4 | IT Solutions for Administrators |
| H1YY 74   | National 4 | Communication in Administration |

Due to the coronavirus COVID-19 outbreak, only round 1 verification of National 3 and National 4 units took place.

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

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

The following examples of good practice were observed:

- ◆ 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 meetings/discussions; use of different

coloured pens to annotate scripts when cross-marking; cross-marking initialled by the assessor and internal verifier.

- ◆ Candidate evidence from many centres was well presented, tasks clearly labelled, and assessment approaches included along with the judging evidence table.
- ◆ Some centres used the combined approach to reduce the level of assessment for candidates.

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

- ◆ All centres should ensure there are robust quality assurance measures in place for marking assessments. Centres should refer to *Internal Verification: A Guide for Centres offering SQA Qualifications* (February 2011).
- ◆ All centres must submit an internal verification/moderation/quality assurance policy when selected for external verification.

## **Assessment judgements**

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

However, there are a few 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 the task. Examples of errors included within the tolerance are: typing errors, minor layout errors (eg reference and date in wrong place) and spacing errors (eg one return between paragraphs, inconsistent or incorrect spacing in an email). 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 email 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. Some candidates were therefore passed for assessment standards when they had keyboarding errors that took them over the error tolerance for the task, and therefore should have been recorded as a fail. Both the assessor and internal verifier need to be diligent in checking candidate evidence for errors to ensure they are making correct assessment judgements.

### **Spreadsheet formulae**

The SUM function should only be used when adding a cell range eg =SUM(B3:B4). It should not be used with the + symbol, or when subtracting, multiplying or dividing.

If a candidate uses the SUM function incorrectly, this should not be accepted, and the candidate has therefore not achieved the corresponding assessment standard.

### **Combined approach (package 3)**

Some centres used the combined approach. Centres are reminded that 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.

## Section 3: General comments

It was clear that many centres had made a concerted effort to ensure the standards were applied consistently.

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 re-occurring issue every year. We would therefore strongly advise centres to take time to review candidate assessment work carefully.