



# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Care
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2015

#### National Units verified:

H21E 74 National 4 Care: Investigating Services Assignment

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

This report has been produced following the second round of verification activity and involved six centres. There was a wide variation in evidence submitted reflecting the different approaches that centres take to assess their candidates. It is hoped that this report will help to inform and improve centres' approaches to assessing their candidates and the quality assurance process.

#### Assessment approaches

Some centres adapted the Unit assessment support package appropriately and provided candidates with clear and concise requirements and excellent assessment choices with a variety of case studies.

Most centres correctly provided at least two scenarios to choose from, and most were appropriate in that they clearly identified individuals who were using care services. A few centres provided scenarios where the links with care services were poor and this was not helpful for candidates.

A few centres commendably provided scenarios that enabled candidates to choose from individuals across a range of ages, abilities and cultural diversity. One centre did well to promote the candidates' personalisation of their learning by providing basic scenarios that candidates developed to include additional details about the individual that reflected the candidates' own interests.

All Assessment Standards have to relate to the chosen case study individual, and at least one centre's candidates failed to do this as they described care services that would not meet the needs of the case study individual.

For Assessment Standard 1.1, the description of the case study individual was generally done well. Most candidates went beyond minimum evidence requirements to describe items from all three areas identified in the Unit assessment — ie stages of lifespan, aspects of development, and influences on development. A few candidates only identified rather than described the items, and therefore should not have been awarded a pass.

Assessment Standard 1.2 is an investigation of needs and candidates were required to identify and describe at least two needs of the individual, and use at least two sources of information to find out about these needs. While most centres' candidates identified and described the needs of the chosen individual, a frequently occurring problem was the limited evidence of any investigation and/or identification of the sources of information used.

Assessment Standard 1.3, the application of psychological and/or sociological concepts to the case study individual, clearly differentiated the more able candidates from those who perhaps struggled, more than any other Assessment Standard. Lenient marking by a few centres was evident here. A few candidates misunderstood the sociological concept of socialisation. Candidates from a few centres explained psychological concepts that were very similar, such as attachment and bonding, which resulted in some candidates replicating some or all their explanations while claiming evidence for both concepts. Centres should support candidates to make appropriate selections of concepts.

Assessment Standard 1.4 is an investigation of care services and again there was limited evidence of any investigation. It required a brief summary and the main provision it offered. Candidates from a few centres provided only the summary or the main provision and not both. Candidates from most centres did explain the way the service met the needs of the chosen individual. A few centres permitted candidates to describe services that are not care services — care services would normally be those registered with or regulated by the SSSC, the Nursing and Midwifery Council, Healthcare Improvement Scotland, or other care professional regulating bodies.

Candidates from several centres presented their findings for Assessment Standard 1.4 in a PowerPoint presentation and this seemed to work well for those who supplemented the PowerPoint with additional written evidence, and/or where each PowerPoint slide provided sufficient descriptions and explanations.

With regard to Assessment Standard 1.5, candidates from a few centres presented their findings within booklets produced by their centre, and this was a reliable way of ensuring that all Assessment Standards were addressed by all candidates. The booklets contained text boxes for each Assessment Standard with short headings outlining individual Assessment Standards. These booklets also helped assessors to quickly identify and mark the evidence produced for each Assessment Standard.

Assessment Standard 1.6 was generally done well by candidates from most centres. A few centres supported candidates to plan, carry out and review their investigation as a series of tasks which the candidates recorded on centre-produced forms at relevant points in the process. This approach would help candidates develop the skills required for subsequent Care Projects at National 5 and Higher levels.

Centres did not indicate that their candidates were meeting the requirements of the assessment conditions for Assessment Standard 1.6 'The review of the skills, knowledge and understanding demonstrated during the assignment should normally be completed in no more than one hour'. It would be useful to have a statement to clarify this when submitting the instrument of assessment.

Some centres provided checklists for the candidates to help guide them through completion of the project. The Assessment Standards were not always clearly identifiable within the instruments of assessment. If these were clarified, it would help the candidates to monitor their own progress and enable assessors to judge when candidates have met the Assessment Standards.

In summary, centres should adapt the Unit assessment support packages and provide clear and accurate information for their candidates. The assessment should cover all the Assessment Standards and provide the candidate with personalisation and choice. Information on judging evidence or exemplar answers are a useful tool for ensuring reliability and validity in approach.

## **Assessment judgements**

Some centres provided documentation to show candidates have been given clear, constructive and positive comments. Extensive assessor feedback was available on an 'Assessment Comment Sheet'.

One centre also stated that a candidate had provided a verbal response in addition to written evidence. If an assessor is assessing a candidate in this way then a record of dialogue or checklist/summary should be provided.

Centres have not always ensured assessment judgements are in line with national standards with some candidates' work not meeting the standard.

Where centres have used a pass mark or score on the assessment, they need to ensure that the candidate still has the opportunity to meet all the Assessment Standards.

In summary, centres should ensure their assessment decisions are accurate and cover all the Assessment Standards. Feedback sheets which include assessor and internal verifier comments enable the candidate to gain feedback and to monitor their progress.

## Section 3: General comments

### Internal verification

It is good practice to demonstrate that the internal verification process was thorough. It is useful to see comments made by the internal verifier. However, the internal verification process in some centres was not as effective as it could have been and did not identify issues with the assessment decisions that were subsequently identified during external verification.

Not all centres provided evidence of internal verification. Centre staff are reminded that all centres offering SQA qualifications must have an effective internal quality assurance system in place which ensures that all candidates are assessed accurately, fairly and consistently to national standards. A possible approach to verification is the SQA Verification Toolkit: [www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit).

### Good practice

Assessment cover/summary/feedback sheets provide good relevant information that assists the tracking of assessment decisions and internal verification processes. These can also contain a statement signed by the candidate that confirms that it is all their own work.

In one centre the assessor used a structured format to ensure the candidates could achieve the Assessment Standards and also evaluate their own learning and progress.

Another point of good practice is to annotate candidates' work where they meet the Assessment Standards. This facilitates the internal and external verification process and would have effectively highlighted any omissions in the candidates' evidence.