NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	**Administration and IT**
Verification activity:	**Postal**
Date published:	**June 2023**

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H1YV 74	National 4	Administrative Practices
H1YW 74	National 4	IT Solutions for Administrators
H1YY 74	National 4	Communication in Administration
J1Y4 75	SCQF level 5	IT Solutions for Administrators
J1YB 76	SCQF level 6	Administrative Theory and Practice
J21V 76	SCQF level 6	IT Solutions for Administrators
J21Y 76	SCQF level 6	Communication in Administration

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The approaches to assessment used by all centres that were verified were valid. Most centres used SQA's unit assessment support packs (UASPs) accurately. A small number of centres slightly amended SQA's unit assessment support packs to provide a context their candidates could relate to better. In all these cases, both the integrity and standard of assessment were maintained.

The following examples of good practice were observed:

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

♦ Many centres had marked up candidate work in a clear and logical manner, physically indicating on each candidate's printout every time the candidate had successfully followed an instruction in a task.

♦ Many centres demonstrated good practice in their internal verification processes, for example holding internal verification meetings and discussions; using different coloured pens to annotate scripts when cross-marking; or cross-marking initialled by the assessor and internal verifier.

Assessment judgements

The majority of candidate evidence submitted was of a very high standard, indicating centres had prepared candidates well for assessments.

Generally, assessment judgements across all centres in round 2 were correct, indicating centres had a good understanding of the requirements for each assessment standard.

A number of centres demonstrated excellent practice by creating checklists for each task. These checklists were very detailed, providing the assessor with a clear and concise checklist of what to mark on candidate printouts to ensure candidates were correctly recorded as a pass or fail for each assessment standard. It was very evident that using this approach ensured all candidates, regardless of the candidate's group, class or assessor, had their evidence judged thoroughly, consistently and accurately.

Although assessment judgements were generally correct, there are a few points to highlight to improve practice for some centres further:

Digital candidate evidence

If digital candidate evidence is submitted, centres must have a clear method of indicating judgements on candidates' work digitally, for example using digital ink, so that external verifiers can see exactly how candidate work has been judged and what keyboarding errors have been identified.

Keyboarding errors

Candidate evidence for assessment standards at all levels must be checked thoroughly for all keyboarding and layout errors. All keyboarding and layout errors must be identified on candidate printouts. These errors must be counted up to ensure the candidate is not over the error tolerance for that particular task. The only exceptions to this requirement are tasks for the assessment standards for Administrative Practices units — Outcome 1 in UASP 1 and UASP 2 as these are purely theory assessment standards. In UASP 3, the keyboarding errors do need to be indicated on the tasks, as these tasks have been designed to achieve other assessment standards as well as the theory assessment standards.

The error tolerance for each level is:

National 3:   1 error for every 10 words
National 4:   1 error for every 15 words
SCQF level 5: 1 error for every 20 words
SCQF level 6: 1 error for every 25 words

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

The error tolerance applies to each individual task. The following errors should be treated as one error within a task, no matter how often they occur within that task:

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

Both the assessor and internal verifier must be diligent in checking candidate evidence for keyboarding errors.

Employee versus organisational responsibilities

Assessment standard 1.4 of the Administrative Practices (National 4) Unit requires candidates to outline employee responsibilities for security of people, property and information. Centres must therefore only accept employee responsibilities and not organisational responsibilities. It is only assessment standard 1.4 of the Administrative Practice (SCQF level 5) unit that requires candidates to provide organisational responsibilities to achieve a pass.

Command words

Candidates must correctly address the command word in the assessment standard in order to achieve a pass for that standard. If the command word requires candidates to describe, but the candidate identifies, the candidate cannot be recorded as a pass for the relevant assessment standard.

Section 3: general comments

Overall, most centres had an excellent understanding of the assessment standards and demonstrated accurate judgements. Some centres had extremely robust and thorough checklists, helping ensure all candidates from different classes were assessed accurately and consistently.

Some centres not identifying keyboarding errors on candidate work is a recurring issue every year. We would therefore strongly advise centres to take time to check candidate assessment work carefully.