



**Scottish Vocational Qualifications**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018**

**Business and Administration**

## Introduction

The Business and Administration SVQs verified this year were:

GK6W 21

GK6X 22

GK6Y 23

GM31 24

This year we have seen a continuation of the good practice that has been adopted by centres over the last five years. SQA network support events have been welcomed by centres and well attended.

We have also seen a big increase in the use of e-portfolios.

## 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.**

In all centres assessors and internal verifiers were occupationally competent and held, or were working towards, appropriate assessor and/or verifier awards. Staff were experienced in the delivery of work-based qualifications and had a comprehensive understanding of the requirements of the qualifications. Informative and up-to-date CPD records were maintained in all centres for members of the assessment/verification team. In almost all centres CPD records showed not only the course/training undertaken, but also the impact of the learning on the assessment process.

In all centres assessors and internal verifiers worked well together to provide excellent support for their candidates, each other and other SVQ staff within the centre.

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

In all centres policies and procedures are reviewed on a regular basis and updated as and when required. Policies and procedures within centres were robust and support the ongoing assessment and verification activity for the qualification being offered. These policies are easily accessible.

Almost all centres used a Workplace Checklist (or Site Selection Checklist) to ensure workplaces are appropriate in relation to accommodation, equipment, reference and learning material.

Health and safety issues are also addressed at this point.

## **Category 3: Candidate support**

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

In all centres prior achievement of candidates is reviewed during the recruitment/induction process. Also, a comprehensive initial assessment of each candidate is conducted at the same stage. The Core Skills profile, previous certificates and candidate job roles were all reviewed and aligned with the requirements of the SVQ and the appropriate units and level of qualification chosen. All centres check that any new candidate is placed in an appropriate workplace environment to gather evidence towards their qualification. The job role of the candidate is the key determining factor on deciding the units to be undertaken by the candidate.

Development needs and special assessment needs were identified at this time or within the first couple of weeks. Any additional needs are then taken into account when planning assessment in terms of timing, assessment methods etc.

The time taken at this stage ensured that the qualification level and units were chosen appropriately.

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

In all centres there was good evidence of assessment planning. There was also very good documentation to support the assessment planning process.

In almost all centres qualification verifiers found the assessment decisions made to be consistent and accurately judged against the standards and in a fair manner. Candidates were well prepared prior to assessment.

## **Category 4: Internal assessment and verification**

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

All centres had comprehensive policies covering assessment and internal verification. Assessment and internal verification records were very well documented. All centres had assessment and internal verification policies which were implemented consistently across the centre and updated regularly to ensure best practice. The processes within the centres were robust and supported the ongoing assessment/verification of the qualification being offered.

In all centres standardisation meetings took place and minutes were available. These formal meetings take place on a regular basis. There were also many opportunities for informal discussions.

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

In almost all centres candidate evidence was of a good quality and the evidence was appropriate to the qualification level being assessed.

In all centres there was a good range of assessment methods being used — this led to good triangulation of evidence.

In almost all centres there was good variety and range of evidence — there was a good balance of performance evidence and supporting evidence. In almost all centres observations and work product evidence was well tracked against performance indicators (PIs) and knowledge and understanding (K&U). In all centres work product evidence was well annotated, which placed the evidence in context.

In all centres there was good cross referencing from optional units to mandatory units and between optional units.

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

In all centres assessors know their candidates well and this excellent candidate support helps to ensure the authenticity of evidence.

In all centres plagiarism and malpractice were fully covered during the induction process. In almost all centres candidates were asked to sign a disclaimer indicating that they will comply with these policies. In all centres candidates were routinely observed by their assessor. This allows the assessor to get to know how candidates express themselves and how they record evidence. As such, any evidence not fitting into the pattern would be easily identified and investigated.

The use of witness testimonies also helped support authenticity.

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

In all centres there were regular formal meetings to support standardisation across assessors. Minutes of these meetings were available. There were also many informal opportunities for standardisation discussions. All of this helped ensure consistent judgement of assessment decisions.

All centres made very good use of their regular standardisation meetings to disseminate information to the team.

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

In all centres staff were well aware of the retention requirements set by SQA. Some centres retain candidate evidence in excess of SQA requirements, and no centre held evidence for less than the required period of time.

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

All centres have a procedure in place to disseminate feedback to staff. Examples of this include:

- ◆ The SQA co-ordinator meets with relevant staff after the qualification verifier visit to discuss feedback from the visit. If there are any action points these are discussed and remedial action put in place within the timeframe agreed.
- ◆ Upon receipt of the qualification verifier's report, the SQA co-ordinator e-mails it to all relevant staff and the content forms the basis of the next standardisation meeting. Minutes of standardisation and internal verification reports confirm that the content is discussed and action points monitored.

## **Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers**

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ the use of e-portfolios for candidate evidence
- ◆ the variety of evidence included in the candidate portfolios
- ◆ the tracking of evidence against PIs and K&U
- ◆ very good evidence of assessment planning

## **Specific areas for development**

No areas for development were reported during session 2017–18.