

Our ref: Sport/UL/PG/MS

25 November 2002

To: SQA Co-ordinator
FE Colleges

Action by Recipient	
	Response required
	Note and pass on
✓	None – update/information only

Contact Name – Paul Gallacher at Glasgow
Direct Line – 0141 242 2328
E-Mail – paul.gallacher@sqa.org.uk

Dear Colleague

Sport, Leisure and Recreation Update

The contents of this circular should be passed to the member of staff responsible for Sport, Leisure and Recreation.

Assessment Panel

The Sport and Leisure Assessment Panel meets twice a year to provide SQA with operational advice on the qualifications being delivered in centres. The Convener of the Panel is Ms Fiona Grossart with members being FE Lecturers in Sport. Many staff have emailed or written with concerns which are discussed in this forum. Should you have any matter you wish to raise with the Panel send these to the postal address or email address above.

The Panel discussed the Principal Assessor Reports for Sports Coaching, Sports Organisation and Fitness and Exercise. These Reports can be viewed from the SQA website: www.sqa.org.uk. Also discussed was the National Qualifications Review of Project Based National Courses. The SQA full time External Verifier/Moderator gave an update on Quality Assurance based on the annual Senior Moderators report. This Report can also be viewed on the SQA website.

Higher National

The pilot design rules are being utilised by the Sports Coaching Consortium and the Leisure Management Consortium with a view to validate in Spring 2003/Summer 2003. The Fitness and Exercise Consortium wish to extend under the current design rules and, if possible, to make minor amendments to units.

HN Quality Assurance of Units

The following are extracts from the Senior Moderator report mentioned above.

Two forms of visiting moderation are covered in this report. Retrospective moderation, which took place in the Autumn of 2001, including any follow up visits, and Moderation visits which took place towards course completion in May/June 2002.

Moderators were, in general, satisfied with the standard and quality of work presented and assessed for the moderation process. The broad range of units which were used for the process makes it difficult to identify any specific areas of strength or weakness in terms of candidate performance.

However the following general points emerged in a number of reports and/or were commented upon by moderators:

The level of demand of some units is far greater than others as can be evidenced by the number of outcomes and the number of range items within unit specifications.

The use of Merit is confused with a lack of clear criteria being set or used. Very few of the centres visited had a clearly defined policy with guidelines or criteria for the award of merit. Retrospective moderation was not taken seriously by some of the centres and was regarded as time consuming by most.

Specific issues identified

In many cases if a unit was moderated it was in only one centre. This makes it difficult to determine if issues were with the specific units. I have therefore scrutinised the submitted moderators' reports to try to identify common issues raised as being of concern. Most of the issues listed were evident in a number of, if not all, centres.

- ◆ Centres have become more confident and adept at integrating assessment but few had well established or documented procedures for mapping it. In a number of cases moderators could not view or identify where materials were.
- ◆ In a large number of reports moderators highlighted the fact that they had no marking instructions to work with or had work presented which had not been marked by lecturers to show achievement.
- ◆ All centres had procedures laid down for internal moderation. Despite this a number of moderators suggest in their reports that centre staff need to meet to discuss and set standards. This would seem to suggest that internal moderation has either not taken place or has not been effective.
- ◆ A number of centres had no re-assessment policy or procedures. In some cases re-assessment was by repeating the original.
- ◆ Particularly for retrospective visits materials had not been retained or were unavailable to moderators.
- ◆ In a number of centres inappropriate assessment instruments were being used. This was most often caused by staff not ensuring that all items from an outcome, performance criteria or range statement had been addressed by the question or task.

- ◆ A number of reports mention lack of clear recording methods. These include centres where there is no record of individual candidates and their achievement of units/ outcomes etc. There were also a number of cases where assessment instruments existed but were not labelled to show which outcome or PC they were designed for.
- ◆ The change in SQA policy to accept incomplete evidence has not been appreciated by all centres or moderators. A number of reports mention that the process could not be completed or was insecure as the evidence, if available, was incomplete.

Discussion was obviously an important part of the visits and a number the reports mention issues which were discussed and resolved. A number of reports mention discussion taking place regarding errors within unit specifications including spelling mistakes, factual errors, issues of clarity and practicality. It would be hoped that the current HN review process and the rewriting of units will eliminate these issues.

SVQ in Sport

SPRITO have issued the Assessment Strategies for discussion and implementation. All details on SVQs in Sport can be found in the SQA SVQ Update booklet which is available in centres.

The Physical Education/Sport and Leisure Advisory Group has been stood down. Members are thanked for their valued strategic advice given to SQA over the past three years.

If staff wish to contact me about this Update or any other matter relating to Sport, Leisure and Recreation they can do so by postal or email address above.

Yours faithfully,



Paul Gallacher
Qualifications Manager