Higher National and/or Graded Unit

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Communities (108)

Introduction

This year the undernoted units within the following qualification were externally verified:

Qualification
Higher National Certificate (HNC) Working with Communities (G7KM15)

Units
Promoting Health in the Community - FM9E 34
Accountability for and Management of Resources - DK13 34
Group Work - F8L1 34
Working with Young People - FM9A 34
Learning Approaches - DK 17 34
Workplace Practice - DK1K 34

The above units were externally verified in two colleges this year. Visits to these centres showed effective teamwork from delivery staff and an increase in intercollege communication for the purpose of enhancing both standardisation and the overall experience of candidates undertaking the award.

Category 2: Resources

Criterion 2.1: Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.

Not applicable

Criterion 2.4: There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.

Both centres are effectively carrying out ongoing reviews of their assessment environments, assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials in line with SQA requirements. Both hold sessions where candidate representatives have an opportunity to meet the delivery teams and provide feedback on the application of this criterion.

Standardisation meeting minutes and internal verification reports within both centres also show that checks on adherence to all aspects of this criterion are carried out regularly.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

Both centres were able to demonstrate that they have reliable procedures in place for identifying prior achievements and development needs of candidates and matching them to the qualification being undertaken.

Both centres have robust pre-entry systems in place. This was verified by candidates interviewed, who reported being well supported. In one centre this involves a learning and development tutor working with candidates to develop individual learning plans and identify any additional support needs. In the other, candidates provide personal statements and are interviewed both individually and in groups. Within both centres prior achievements are recognised and wider learning support is also available. Candidates are actively encouraged to use the latter.

Criterion 3.3: Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.

Information from documents available within both centres and from candidates interviewed confirmed that regular scheduled contact with assessors is a key feature of delivery of this award. These meetings are a platform for candidates to review their progress; revise learning/ assessment plans and receive constructive feedback and guidance. Assessors also undertake outreach visits to ensure there is relevant support for candidates when out on placement.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

Criterion 4.2: Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.

In both centres assessors and internal verifiers are applying their assessment and verification procedures effectively. Both sampling and standardisation are taking place in line with SQA requirements and almost all IV records show detailed and constructive feedback to assessors. However, in one centre IV feedback from one unit was minimal.

Criterion 4.3: Assessment instruments and methods and their selection and use must be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

Both centres demonstrated compliance with the above by using SQA assessment support packs. All instruments of assessment seen and methods applied meet SQA standards. Clear assessment guidelines are also given to candidates to further ensure that this criterion is being met.

Criterion 4.4: Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.

Both centres comply with the above by including a plagiarism statement in all assessment guidelines for candidates. Similarly, assessment/re-assessment and malpractice policies are comprehensive and require candidates to sign a malpractice and plagiarism statement at induction.

Criterion 4.6: Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.

External verifier feedback from both centres confirmed that all candidate evidence seen had been accurately and consistently assessed against SQA's requirements. Constructive written feedback had been given to candidates, although one unit within one of the centres had not been signed and dated when assessed.

Criterion 4.7: Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.

For both centres SQA requirements for evidence retention are detailed in centre quality assurance policies, which were available as evidence. All candidate evidence is retained in line with this.

Criterion 4.9: Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.

Both centres are very effective in ensuring compliance with the above. In line with SQA requirements both disseminate external verification reports to teaching teams at standardisation meetings to inform assessment practice. This involves highlighting any examples of good practice and acting on areas where improvement is required.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2016–17:

♦ 'Flexible and responsive learner-centred approach from the teaching team.'
♦ 'Robust pre-entry requirements and support.'
♦ 'Motivated and committed teaching team that work closely together.'
♦ 'Candidates are provided with regular support and assessment feedback to develop skills.'

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2016–17:

♦ All concerns highlighted through internal verification need to be actioned.
♦ Consider increasing sample size for internal verification where there are concerns regarding the assessment process of units.
♦ Accurate and consistent recording of substantial assessor feedback across units.