



Higher National and Vocational Qualifications Internal Assessment Report 2012

Physical Education Sport & Leisure (HN)

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

Higher National Units

General comments

The HN awards involved have been available now for some time and centres have generally become experienced and comfortable with the National Standard. However many centres had new staff involved and it was encouraging to note that where they had been involved in assessment, they had been supported in so far as the Units were involved.

There is still a need for some centres to ensure that the quality of feedback is consistent across Units and assessors as there can be variation and it is the feedback which shows why an assessment decision has been made. It also allows the candidate to make progress and learn.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Centres had almost without exception, made use of SQA material where this was available. Where it was not, centres had made good use of their own assessment material which generally met the SQA requirements. Assessors seemed well aware of the Exemplar material and are better aware that they can also use their own material although submission to SQA for Prior Verification is strongly recommended.

Evidence Requirements

There remains at times some concern that a small number of centres, while applying the SQA marking schedules, do so generously.

The attention of centres is drawn to the need to ensure that assessments and marking is appropriate for the SCQF level of the Unit involved and not assessed below that level. All evidence requirements need to be addressed.

Administration of assessments

Many centres provided detailed policies and evidence of Internal Verification which in these cases added to the robust nature of the process and gave confidence in the validity of assessments.

In a small number of centres there was some evidence to suggest that the process was not as detailed, given that issues that might have been identified had not been noted or addressed.

General feedback

As indicated above, many centres had given excellent feedback to candidates which gave first class support to the candidate and showed how and why an assessment decision had been reached. This is to be commended and all centres are encouraged to ensure that this practice is adopted with consistency across Units and assessors.

Candidates in all centres had access to assessment at times and stages which gave the best opportunity to achieve success.

Areas of good practice

Centres had, in the main, used their growing experience and confidence in delivery and assessment to add value to the learning process as they continued to refine their work. The quality of recorded feedback in some centres was of a high calibre and gave excellent support to candidates.

Specific areas for improvement

In a very few centres, the quality of feedback was not the same across assessors. Centre Internal Verifiers should try to share and support the best practice with all staff involved.

Higher National Graded Units

Titles/levels of HN Graded Units verified:

HN Graded Units at SCQF levels 7 and 8 for HNC/D Sports Coaching with Development of Sport.

Similarly for HNC/D Fitness Health and Exercise at both levels as well as Sports Therapy.

Also HNC (SCQF level 7) for Coaching and Developing Sport.

General comments

As is the case with the Units from the awards listed, the Graded Units have been available now for some time and centres have generally become experienced and comfortable with the National Standard.

It is worthy of note that, in a few centres, new staff had been allocated the Graded Units to deliver and assess, but had not been as well supported as when delivering other HN Units. This seemed to be a problem in a small number of centres. This had been noted by the External Verifiers involved.

As with the HN Units, there is still a need for some centres to ensure that the quality of feedback is consistent across Units and assessors, as there was some evidence of variation. Feedback shows why an assessment decision has been made and allows the candidate to make progress and learn.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Centres had all used SQA Exemplar material or variations of this, so there were no real issues with the material used. However, there were some issues with regard to marking and assessment in some centres where the minimum required evidence was not always presented, or a high mark had been awarded for the minimum work. Revisions to the Coaching award will, it is hoped, address this issue and other revisions are being conducted to ensure the standards are maintained.

Evidence Requirements

Most centres had made effective use of the marking schemes provided and most had expanded on these schemes to show clearly what was required. However some centres still awarded what seemed to be a high mark when in fact not all evidence had been addressed, so evidence of competence was incomplete. Centres are reminded that minimum evidence could be regarded as a simple pass and not a high level pass. To achieve a high level pass requires work of a higher quality in keeping with the criteria for SCQF level 7 or SCQF level 8.

Administration of assessments

Many centres provided good evidence of Internal Verification which helped ensure the continued quality of assessment. A small number of centres had some variation across assessors. Where this was noted, it should be addressed.

General feedback

Feedback to candidates was very good in some centres while a few offered less feedback. It is important that candidates receive recorded feedback to support learning and show the Internal and External Verifier how a decision had been made.

All centres offered assessments at relevant times and stages.

Areas of good practice

In some centres, the quality of feedback was first class and detailed for every candidate. Most centres adopted a measure of integration where possible but some offered additional opportunities which had also been well recorded.

Specific areas for improvement

Where centres had not adequately addressed minimum evidence, or where minimum evidence had been assessed at too high a level, the centre needs to consider the Unit requirements carefully. The changes in the revised Coaching award, particularly in the Graded Units, will require centres to revise their marking and further ensure that all evidence is indeed addressed.

SVQ awards

General comments

The comments are for Verifications groups listed:

SVQ Sport and Recreation

Verification Group Number:
198, 199, 202, 203, 204

The majority of centres delivering SVQ awards had been doing so for a number of years and had used their growing experience and confidence to add to the candidate experience. The exception to this was for the SVQ in Spectator Safety where the award was new to the centres delivering. This had presented no problems as the centres were experienced in the industry and with SQA awards and procedures.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Here again, centres with some years of experience had continued to refine their procedures and were confident in making changes if appropriate and also moving with the standards and industry needs.

In all cases, the awards were delivered by a small number of centres (only one or two for some awards) but these awards were required and are important for employers.

Evidence Requirements

Centres showed sound understanding in most cases of the requirements of the awards and most were experienced in assessment and the gathering of evidence.

Administration of assessments

Generally centres had supported assessment well and had supported candidates well in the gathering of evidence at a level appropriate for the SVQs in question. Almost all centres had robust Internal Verification procedures in place and kept sound records of candidate performance.

General feedback

The vast majority of centres had given candidates fair and valid feedback and this approach is commended as it allows candidates to learn and shows how and why an assessment decision has been reached.

Areas of good practice

The generally high quality of feedback is encouraging to note. Centre had in some cases made greater use of IT in assessing and recording candidate evidence and this work – on-going in some cases – has much to commend it as it enhances the candidate experience.

It is also worth noting that centres have adopted more links with NQ and other SQA awards and that SQA has responded favourably to these links and supported their development.

Specific areas for improvement

A small number of centres had not adequately taken on board points previously raised and had not acted upon them. Where advice is given, centres should reflect and act or at least note any action taken or reasons for not doing so.