



# Qualification Verification Summary Report

## NQ Verification 2018–19

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Childcare and Development
Verification event/visiting information:	Event
Date published:	June 2019

#### National Units verified:

H4KL 76	Higher	Child Development
H4KM 76	Higher	Child Development: Theory
H4KN 76	Higher	Services for Children and Young People

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Overall, the assessment approaches were satisfactory. Where a centre had used their own generated assessment, this had mainly been submitted to SQA for prior verification, which is strongly recommended for centre-generated assessments. The main issue identified with centre-generated assessments was that the assessment did not meet the assessment standards of the unit or, in some cases, were too prescriptive, directing candidates to use specific case studies. This is not in line with the design principles of the units. Centres should advise candidates of a maximum word count as this would guard against excessive word counts and some candidates having an advantage over others. Most centres verified used the unit assessment support pack (UASP) — Package 1, unit-by-unit approach to assessment. There were two examples of centres using an integrated portfolio approach to assessment. Where centres use this approach, they should ensure that assessment tasks meet the assessment standards if they are not using SQA generated UASPs.

#### Assessment judgements

Overall, the assessment judgements were satisfactory and feedback to candidates from assessors was supportive, detailed and constructive. However,

in three centres, the evidence provided was not deemed to be of a sufficiently high standard for SCQF level 6. Where assessment standards require candidates to evaluate and analyse, centres should ensure that the candidate's work does this, otherwise, the candidate assessment material is largely descriptive, making links tenuous or weak and not meeting assessment standards (1.2 and 1.4 for Child Development, 1.2 and 1.3 for Theory, and 1.2 and 1.4 for Services for Children and Young People). In many cases, there was no referencing evidenced, making work descriptive and anecdotal.

In some instances, candidates had been passed where they had not met the assessment standards set. For example, some candidates did not discuss the inter-relation of aspects of development in 1.1 of Child Development and did not identify appropriate assessment methods in 1.2 of Child Development. Centres should ensure that methods of assessment are appropriate for the age of the child in the case study. Centres are reminded that there is no requirement to remediate section 1.4 as per the SQA's review report.

Where candidates are discussing Services for Children and Young People, centres should ensure that these services are appropriate for the age of the child in the case study. Similarly, centres should ensure that candidates discuss relevant legislation, strategy and initiatives and that the difference in these are made clear by candidates. An example of this is candidates stating that 'getting it right for every child' is a piece of legislation. In more than one centre, candidates discussed and described the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child as a piece of legislation when it is not. Candidates should be directed to amend this in assessment material.

03

## Section 3: General comments

In general, candidates have met the assessment standards and produced evidence relevant to SCQF level 6. Centres should continue to advise candidates to keep case studies short and simple. In some cases, candidates are producing complex case studies that they do not have the knowledge and understanding to address, therefore disadvantaging themselves. Similarly, candidates should not be using centre-generated case studies as this does not allow for personalisation and choice.

Where candidates are required to remediate work, this should be clearly and consistently applied across all candidates in the cohort. Similarly, candidates should not be directed to remediate spelling, grammar and punctuation. This can be highlighted to candidates but is not a requirement of the assessment standards. It must always be made clear whether work is a first or second attempt and where remediation is required, this must be clearly documented.

Where centres deliver on more than one campus, they should be encouraged to use the same assessment material and candidate feedback should be standardised and recorded in the same way. This assists with standardisation of evidence and internal verification procedures.

There is growing evidence of good practice, with many candidates producing assessment evidence to a high standard. There was opportunity for personalisation and choice in many cases, in line with design principles of Curriculum for Excellence. In many cases, candidates were given clear and consistent feedback and feedforward. This is good practice and should be encouraged.

In most cases, there was evidence of internal verification. Centres are reminded that verification can occur at any point during the assessment process, not just at the end. Where there was little or no evidence of verification, centres are encouraged to use the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit prior to external verification ([www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit)). It was noted that many centres have robust and rigorous verification procedures in place, used effectively by internal verifiers.