



**National Qualifications Units**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018**

**Core Skills: Numeracy**

## Introduction

The following units were reviewed by the qualification verifiers:

F3GF 08	Numeracy SCQF Level 2 (40 hours)
F3GF 09	Numeracy SCQF Level 3 (40 hours)
F3GF 10	Numeracy SCQF Level 4 (40 hours)
F3GF 11	Numeracy SCQF Level 5 (40 hours)
F3GF 12	Numeracy SCQF Level 6 (40 hours)
F3GL 08	Numeracy: Using Number — Measuring SCQF Level 2 (10 hours)
F3GH 08	Numeracy: Using Number — Money SCQF Level 2 (10 hours)
F3GJ 08	Numeracy: Using Number — Time SCQF Level 2 (10 hours)
F3GG 08	Numeracy: Using Number — Using Graphical Information SCQF Level 2 (10 hours)
F3GL 09	Numeracy: Using Number — Measuring SCQF Level 3 (10 hours)
F3GK 09	Numeracy: Using Number — Calculation SCQF Level 3 (20 hours)
F3GG 09	Numeracy: Using Number — Using Graphical Information SCQF Level 3 (10 hours)

NQ Core Skills Numeracy accounted for 20% of the Core Skills verification activity for session 2017–18. The majority of the activity was in Numeracy SCQF Levels 4 and 5. All reports, apart from one, indicated High Confidence. The other report indicated Reasonable Confidence.

All the external verifiers were experienced, professional and competent in their role. One external verifier continues to be seconded from the Mathematics Verification Group. One external verifier is due to return at the beginning of session 2018–19.

All centres had robust and effective quality procedures in place. Most centres had a master file, either in paper or electronic format, containing information relating to the systems and procedures for the delivery and quality assurance of the award.

All assessors and internal verifiers were familiar with the systems in place to support the verification process, and had a good understanding of the requirements of the qualification. In all centres, assessors and internal verifiers provided excellent support to the candidates. Reports confirmed that assessments met the requirements of the units, and were being implemented in a consistent and fair manner.

In most centres, contextualised assessment material was available reflecting the vocational area of the candidates. All centres had regular staff meetings to monitor and review candidate progress, and to discuss standardisation. Appropriate methods of assessment included assignments, projects, group work, observation, verbal response, written calculation and graphical exercises. In many centres, staff used standardisation meetings to discuss contextualisation and the use of naturally occurring evidence.

## **Category 2: Resources**

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

Almost all centres utilised some form of staff evaluation plan that reviewed all aspects of course planning and delivery. In almost all centres, course teams reviewed plans annually to ensure that assessment environment, equipment and references, and learning and assessment materials were all maintained to effectively deliver the courses. In all centres, assessments are reviewed at standardisation meetings that take place at least twice a year.

## **Category 3: Candidate support**

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

All centres had documented induction processes to ensure that candidates' development needs and prior achievements were matched against the requirements of the unit. All centres used the Core Skills profile to assist in aligning candidates' achievements with the unit to be taken. In most centres, special assessment requirements were usually identified during the recruitment and planning stage, and action was taken to accommodate these needs. Many centres used personal action and training plans to ensure that fair access was provided to assessments.

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

Most of the activity reviewed was in a college context. In almost all cases, a class tutor had weekly contact with the candidates to review progress and update learning plans. In all centres, candidates were well supported during the formative learning process. In a few centres, learner development tutors were employed to give focused support to candidates. Learner development tutors liaised with vocational tutors to ensure candidates requiring additional support were identified at an early stage.

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

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

In all centres, the documented procedures were implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment. In all centres, regular standardisation meetings considered the appropriateness of assessments in terms of level and quantity. In almost all cases, documented minutes were available.

In all centres, internal verification events were held to ensure consistency of marking. In almost all centres, internal verification procedures were thorough and provided good feedback to assessors and candidates. In most centres, policies and procedures were reviewed annually.

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

Almost all centres were using the SQA assessment support pack (ASP) or modifications of the ASP. In almost all centres, the assessors and internal verifiers had regular standardisation meetings to consider and discuss any new assessment materials. In all centres, standardisation meetings were used to review contextualised assessments and identify naturally occurring evidence.

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

In almost all centres, plagiarism and malpractice were fully covered during the induction to the programme and candidates undertook to comply with these policies. In almost all centres, assessments were carried out under formal supervised examination conditions.

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

In almost all cases, model answers were available and checklists were created to help ensure that each task had evidence to show completion. In almost all centres, regular standardisation meetings were held for all staff. In all centres, assessment decisions were accurately and consistently judged against the standards.

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

In all centres, evidence was retained for at least, if not beyond, the period specified by SQA. All centres were aware of the retention requirements of SQA.

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

In all centres, feedback from the qualification verifiers was either available on the centre intranet and/or was disseminated to staff during the next standardisation meeting.

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

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

- ◆ use of naturally occurring evidence for assessments
- ◆ vocational contextualisation of assessments
- ◆ use of e-portfolios
- ◆ use of individual learning plans