



Higher National Qualifications

And

Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Senior Verifier Report

2008

Subject: Administration

Sector Panel or SSC:

Date: 5 August 2008

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification which has taken place within Higher National and Scottish Vocational Qualifications in this subject.

HIGHER NATIONAL UNITS

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

Insert details relating to specific guidance which should be offered to centres based on the verification of centres.

Include:

- *General comments*
- *Areas of good practice*
- *Areas for further development*

General comments:

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

HIGHER NATIONAL GRADED UNITS

TITLES/LEVELS OF HN GRADED UNITS VERIFIED

Insert details below

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

Insert details relating to specific guidance which should be offered to centres based on the verification of centres.

Include:

- *General comment*
- *Areas of good practice*
- *Areas for further development*

General comments:

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

SVQ AWARDS

TITLES/LEVELS OF SVQ AWARDS VERIFIED

Insert details below

G7Y2 21

G7Y3 22

G8LH 23

G7Y5 23

G7Y4 24

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

Insert details relating to specific guidance which should be offered to centres based on the verification of centres.

Include:

- *General comments*
- *Areas of good practice*
- *Areas for further development*

General comments:

From the verification activity this year, it is encouraging that centre staff are becoming more familiar with the current standards and are using the holistic approach to assessment and triangulation of evidence.

In most cases, portfolios were well presented and well assessed. Evidence was easy to follow and well tracked against Performance Indicators and Knowledge and Understanding. Most centres presented a good balance between Performance Evidence and Supporting Evidence.

In the majority of centres, the following areas were effective:

There were effective assessor induction and selection processes in place

Assessors and internal verifiers were appropriately qualified and experienced. Arrangements were in place to support new assessors and internal verifiers and there was good evidence of CPD records. Best practice were those proformas which included a section on the impact the CPD has had on the assessment process.

Many centres had developed robust Assessment Planning proformas and centres were well aware of the importance of Assessment Planning in the assessment process.

Centres had both informal and formal opportunities for standardisation meetings. Minutes were available of the formal standardisation meetings.

Centres were well aware of the need to comply with the main Administration Assessment Strategy and the Assessment Strategies relating to any imported units.

Some centres were making innovative use of digital audio and video recording for evidence purposes.

The EV team had been very positive in the majority of the verification reports, however, there had been a number of holds for the following reasons:

- ◆ There had been insufficient appropriate evidence to confirm candidate competence
- ◆ Inappropriate assessment instruments had been used to confirm competence

- ◆ Some of the evidence provided was not of the appropriate level for the award

Where holds occurred, centres very quickly generated appropriate evidence and the holds were lifted in a timely manner.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

Centres had very good internal verification procedures in place backed up by good internal verification documentation. Some centres may benefit from internally verifying through the life of the Portfolio and not end-loading the internal verification process. This will provide timely feedback to assessors and candidates so that they can action any points raised as soon as possible.

It is an obvious expectation of verification that specific decisions by the assessor can be confirmed. This is more difficult where candidate evidence is not referenced against the standards. Assessor Observations, Professional Discussions and Personal Statements should be referenced to the specific PIs and K & U that the assessor feels are covered. It is not generally expected that this referencing would be grouped together at the start or end of the evidence.

It is advised that in observation, assessors should indicate coverage of PIs and K & U against the relevant point in the observation as this ensures the Internal and External Verifier can see exactly where the assessor judges where the coverage of each PI and K & U is to be found. An indication of the Unit covered is not sufficient for this purpose. If observations are not referenced to PIs and K & U, then it is difficult to verify assessment decisions. It is extremely helpful for both Internal and External Verification if the PIs and K & U could be included in the margin of the Assessor Observations rather than grouped together at the end.

Evidence needs to clearly show competence over time and breadth of scope. This can be done by increasing the use of evidence triangulation (Observation, Work Product and Supporting Evidence) to ensure the PIs are met over a period of time. Also candidate statements, assessor observations and work product could be annotated by the supervisor to confirm competence over time and a wider selection of work products can be used to confirm breadth of scope.

Where possible an attempt should be made to meet the K & U from Performance Evidence, rather than a bank of questions. Whilst it is good practice to infer knowledge from performance, this does not cover the “Why” aspects of the knowledge statements and these would still require to be covered by questions and/or discussion.

The core units should be evidenced mainly from evidence generated by the optional units and should not be gathered separately – although there may be some areas which will require separately assessed evidence. Best practice would be to holistically assess the evidence at the original time of the assessment, rather than re-assess the evidence at a later date. This holistic assessment is to be encouraged by ensuring all evidence submitted towards the optional units is cross referenced to cover the core units. Limited stand alone evidence should be used to meet the Core PIs.

Work Product evidence should be annotated by the candidate to place the evidence in context and to show why the candidate has offered this evidence and what PIs are covered. This annotation could be on the actual work product or in a related storyboard or as part of a professional discussion.

Work Product evidence should also be signed and dated by the candidate and when accepted should be signed and dated by the Assessor to confirm competence.

Assessors should consider asking line managers to review candidate observation/work product/personal statement and then provide a comment and signature – this endorses the evidence as a Witness Testimony, where it provides confirmation of candidate competence.

Advice and Areas for Development

Centres should make themselves familiar with the new Assessment Guidance produced by SQA, which is available on the SQA website. SQA’s website contains a variety of information and resources to support these awards.

It could be useful for candidates, assessors and IVs if contingencies were highlighted in matrices; to act as a reminder of the PIs which do not need Performance Evidence.

Unit 318 Design and Produce Documents: It is essential that candidates actually design documents rather than editing previously given products. Care should be taken to ensure that the documents meet the requirements of a Level 3 Award. In this unit it is essential that both the “design” and the “produce” requirements of this unit must be evidenced and both must be at the appropriate level.

Unit 314 Word Processing Software 3: Care must be taken to ensure that evidence produced meets the requirements of a Level 3 Award. This is reinforced in the Unit Summary where candidates are expected to produce complex documents. SQA’s Assessment Guidance is helpful in listing appropriate types of evidence.

It is essential that the various assessment strategy guidelines are adhered to.

Centres should ensure that any incremental change is incorporated into the unit matrices.

NATIONAL UNITS

(i.e. Freestanding units which contribute to NPAs or NCs etc.)

TITLES/LEVELS OF NATIONAL UNITS VERIFIED

Insert details below

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

Insert details relating to specific guidance which should be offered to centres based on the verification of centres.

Include:

- *General comments*
- *Areas of good practice*
- *Areas for further development*

General comments:

Advice on good practice and areas for further development: