



Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Jewellery

Introduction

During academic year 2016–17 allocations were fairly general with extended lists of units which, on discussion with centres, was narrowed down to the selection below:

Jewellery: Graded Unit 1 (F4CE34)
Jewellery: Competition Entry (H09Y12)
Jewellery: Design for Jewellers (H2YL12)
Jewellery: Etching (HDA211)
Jewellery: Metal Forming (H1KC12)
Jewellery: Stonesetting (HD9X12)
Jewellery Manufacture Level 2 (GJ4H60)
Jewellery Manufacture Level 3 (GJ4V57)
Jewellery Manufacture level 4 (GJ6M53)
CAD Manufacture Level 3 (GJ4J57)
Jewellery Manufacture Level 2 (GJ4H60)
Jewellery Manufacture Level 3 (GJ4V57)
Jewellery Manufacture level 4 (GJ6M53)

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.

All centres are established delivering centres. All staff were found to be qualified and knowledgeable in their subject areas. Some centres employed staff on a part-time basis. Staff CVs were readily available at all centres along with CPD records and all staff were found to be either working towards an appropriate assessor/internal verifier qualification or were already in possession of one.

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

All centres had well developed systems of internal moderation and schedules of meetings. These were generally adhered to as evidenced by observation of agendas and minutes detailing discussions of teaching environments and learning resources overall. In these cases, meetings were generally chaired by senior members of staff with input from other staff as required and these were generally considered to be effective. Some centres were also able to take advantage of facilities in the local area to supplement the learner experience.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

A range of approaches were used by centres depending on the nature and number of applications each centre received. In all cases, candidates were invited to attend individual interviews with subject-specialist staff where matters relating to suitability of course and entry requirements could be discussed. These meetings were also used to ensure candidates were suited to the subject. The larger centres employed core skills screening and examples of these documents were available on request.

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

Centres had developed a number of different schedules. A common theme was regular contact with assessors and in all cases this was evidenced in recorded learning plans and other similar documents.

The use of virtual learning environments is becoming more evident with almost all centres now adopting an online system of recording contact between candidates and assessors and teaching staff in general, and this was welcomed in feedback.

A number of different VLEs were examined during the period of the external verification visits and all were found to be very similar in function.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres were found to be knowledgeable about their respective centres' procedures in relation to internal assessment and verification. These were generally well supported by quality systems developed over a long period of time with designated staff. Some centres had developed systems which were in some cases more streamlined and more appropriate for a smaller centre with limited numbers of staff.

All staff interviewed during the various visits were found to be aware of, and took part in, their own centre's quality procedures. Assessment and internal verification records demonstrated this.

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

Records of standardisation and assessment meetings were generally available or were evident in the minutes of other staff meetings where appropriate. In all centres, teaching and assessment packs were available and when inspected were found to contain instruments of assessment specifically prepared by the centre to ensure validity and equity. Staff were generally found to be highly aware of the issues around equality and fairness and were sensitive to the requirements for assessments to satisfy these requirements.

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

Much of the evidence pertaining to the jewellery area is created using specialist workshops and specialist tools which are generally located in the jewellery centres themselves. Much of the work is therefore done under the direct supervision of staff. In some cases, online resources such as 'Turnitin' were used to identify issues in relation to plagiarism. The fact that this resource would be applied was highlighted to learners in advance of submissions, which was considered worthwhile.

Candidates in most centres were required to sign documents relating to the authenticity of their work and these records were generally kept by centres should any issues arise.

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

All centres that were visited demonstrated an effective approach to assessment and to the recording of judgements made during the process. In most centres the staff involved were limited to small groups who worked very closely together and frequently discussed issues around assessment. It was pointed out that although these discussions were beneficial they should also be recorded at regular intervals through regular formal meetings and this was generally the case. In some centres where some ambiguity existed within the text of a unit the matter had been referred to SQA and the external verifier, and this was noted.

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

All centres were aware of SQA's minimum retention period for candidate evidence and in general it was found that individual centres operated procedures requiring them to keep evidence for a longer period than that required by the awarding body. Some centres were in the process of moving to an online system for retaining evidence due to space limitations and the external verifier was asked to advise on this at the last visit. It was accepted that for units which are 'live' at the time of the visit then physical evidence should be made available, but that some photographic evidence may be acceptable for evidence that is close to lapse date.

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

Generally, external verification reports were made available to centre staff on each centre's VLE and this availability promoted to staff through normal internal communications. Past reports were recovered from at least two centres' VLEs during visits to demonstrate that this was possible.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ A centre-devised risk assessment had been developed that particularly related to new candidates prior to commencing the award. This provided an opportunity to record any issues (academic and/or non-academic) which may influence the successful outcome of the course for the candidate. This risk assessment was then made available to staff and could be updated as required.
- ◆ One centre constantly refreshed the graded unit project on an annual basis to avoid any temptation for plagiarism (intended or otherwise) across HN1 and HN2 groups.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2016–17:

- ◆ Centres should continue to enhance their projects and assessments to be less intrusive to smooth delivery; this had been identified by staff and the EV as a problem.
- ◆ Centres would benefit from reviewing current equalities policy annually, specifically recording the date of changes due to upcoming and ongoing changes to equalities legislation.
- ◆ Good practice of agenda/minute taking would include the use of SMART targeting of agenda items, ensuring issues are addressed where possible, or reviewed moving forwards.