



NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|---|------------|
| Verification group name: | Childcare |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event |
| Date published: | March 2015 |

National Courses/Units verified:

H4KL 76 Higher Child Development

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Using the SQA-produced Unit assessment support (UAS) packs ensures that centres provide a valid approach to assessment. It is recommended that amended assessments are submitted for prior verification to ensure all Assessment Standards are included and achievable.

Most centres used the SQA-produced UAS package 1, Unit-by-Unit approach.

From 2015–16, centres should ensure that they are using the latest version of the UAS packs. These are available to download from SQA's secure website via SQA Co-ordinators.

Candidates **must** select an individual child/young person to allow them to achieve all of the Assessment Standards for Outcome 1. The candidate evidence submitted for verification did not always include this.

In order to authenticate their work, candidates must use the Harvard Referencing System and assessors must exercise their professional responsibility in ensuring that evidence submitted is the candidate's own work.

Assessors must ensure that the work produced is at the correct SCQF level — the evidence submitted did not always meet the national standards for Higher. For Assessment Standards 1.3 and 1.4 candidates' work tended to be descriptive and lacking in evaluation and analysis. Evidence of research in to the chosen influences was minimal.

Internal verification processes must be in place: not all centres had quality assured their candidate evidence.

Personalisation and choice were not always evident. In some cases it appeared that assessors were overly prescriptive, leading to similar submissions by many candidates.

This is not a practice-based Course and it does not involve primary research. There was evidence of primary research being carried out without any permission request or consent. Candidates should be directed to page 15 of the UAS pack for specific advice. Children's names must not be used and there must be anonymity.

Recording results correctly is important. Candidates should not be recorded as not achieving an Outcome or Assessment Standard after only one attempt: re-assessment should take place.

It is not necessary to relate the remaining Assessment Standards to the two aspects chosen in Assessment Standard 1.1. This will limit the scope of the work as, while it would demonstrate depth, it would restrict breadth in terms of the chosen child or young person. If approaching the UAS with a particular focus, eg health, it is important to remember that the Assessment Standards relate to the chosen child, not their condition. In Assessment Standard 1.2, some centres were accepting assessment methods such as diagnostic tools which were not appropriate to the chosen child or young person.

03

Section 3: General comments

Some centres used a case study. This is an example of good practice.

A mind map with the child at the centre would be a possible way to keep candidates focused on their chosen child or young person.

A bibliography should be included to evidence research by the candidate. This will ensure authenticity of the candidate's work.

Candidates must be supported to produce material at SCQF level 6. Evaluation and analysis are critical when assessing work at this level.

Candidates must be allowed one or, in exceptional circumstances, two re-assessment opportunities.

Centres must use the current UAS packs.

To assist centres with quality assurance, SQA has produced an Internal Verification Toolkit: www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/71679.5825.html.