



# **Internal Assessment Report 2010: Business and Administration (397)**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Vocational Qualifications in this subject

# **SVQ Awards**

## **Titles/levels of SVQ Awards verified**

G7Y2 21 (level 1)

G7Y3 22 (level 2)

G8LH 23 (level 3)

G7Y4 24 (level 4)

## **General comments**

From the centres visited, there was evidence that centres were well aware of the national standards and of the appropriate assessment strategies relating to these Awards.

The assessment guidance developed by SQA has helped centres gain an accurate understanding of the national standards.

Assessors were familiar with the Performance Indicators and Knowledge and Understanding in each Unit relating to the Awards.

Assessors were suitably qualified and experienced and were well aware of the variety of evidence needed to support these Awards.

Assessors and internal verifiers were aware of the need to balance Performance Evidence and Supporting Evidence.

Performance Evidence observations were comprehensive and linked to Performance Indicators and Knowledge and Understanding. Work product observations were very well annotated to place the evidence in context.

There was good triangulation of evidence, using both Performance Evidence and Supporting Evidence.

There was also good cross-referencing of evidence across Units and between optional Units and core Units within the Awards.

Portfolios were well presented and well assessed. Candidate feedback indicated that they were very well supported by assessors.

There was very good evidence of assessment planning, including review and feedback.

Centres had good systems of internal verification in place. These systems were well documented. Internal verification provided good feedback to both assessors and candidates.

Candidates are well supported by assessors. There was good evidence of assessment planning. From the centres visited there was evidence that regular meetings take place to standardise assessment decisions.

## **Areas of good practice**

Assessors and internal verifiers were appropriately qualified and experienced.

Portfolios were well presented and well assessed. Assessment decisions were valid and reliable.

Assessment processes were well structured, with clear stages of planning, review and feedback.

There was good evidence of assessment planning.

There was a good range of evidence, showing good triangulation of evidence.

There was a good balance of Performance Evidence and Supporting Evidence. Many centres were using an evidence gathering form or a storyboard/personal statement to place the evidence in context.

Well documented CPD records were available; many showing the impact of the CPD on the assessment process.

All candidates sampled had fair access to the assessment process.

Internal verification procedures were well documented, providing good feedback to assessors and candidates. Best practice in internal verification is to have the activity spread evenly over the life of the portfolios.

There had been a further increase in the use of e-portfolios across centres.

Knowledge and Understanding was well covered. Some Knowledge and Understanding was covered by Performance Evidence, while other areas required the use of questions.

## **Areas for improvement**

These SVQs have been in place for some time now. As such, there are no specific areas that need to be addressed across the board. However, we recommend that centres embrace the good practice identified above.