



Higher National and/or Graded Unit

National Units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019
Sport and Fitness

Verification group 459

Introduction

There were 21 visits for this verification group during Session 2018–19. This activity spanned across Higher National (four visits), National Awards (11 visits) and Graded Units (six visits). The following units were looked at by the qualification verification team.

Higher National Units:

H4TL 35	Plan, Teach and Evaluate a Physical Activity Programme to Meet the Needs of Older Adults
H4T5 35	Applied Exercise Prescription for Special Population Groups
FW60 34	Strength and Conditioning: An Introduction
FW5Y 34	First Aid in Sport
FX9K 35	Fitness Conditioning in Sport
H4TF 34	Nutrition for Fitness, Health and Exercise
DP2M 35	Managing Stress through Exercise and Therapy
DW64 35	Mechanics for the Health and Fitness Professionals
H01A 34	Inclusive Sports Provision; An Introduction
H4T6 35	Applied Fitness Assessment for Specialist Population Groups
H4T7 35	Applied Nutrition Assessment and Prescription
H4T8 35	Current Exercise Trends

Higher National Graded Units:

H4VL 34	Fitness, Health and Exercise: Graded Unit 1
H4VM 35	Fitness, Health and Exercise: Graded Unit 2

National Awards Units:

D821 11	Sports Officiating: Indoor Football
F40L 11	Sport and Recreation: An Introduction
F40A 11	Teamwork through Sport and Recreation
F40B 11	Contemporary Fitness and Exercise Training Methods: An Introduction
F40D 11	Developing Leadership
F825 11	Exercise and Fitness: Circuits
F41A 11	Sporting Activity Participation & Performance: Rugby Football
F7JC 12	Exercise and Fitness: Fixed Weight Training
F826 11	Exercise and Fitness: Resistance Training
F7JD 12	Exercise and Fitness: Free Weight Training
F7JE 12	Exercise and Fitness: Circuit Training
F7JB 12	Exercise and Fitness: Cardiovascular Training
F40S 11	Sports Participation and Performance: Badminton
F79E 12	Individual Performance in Sport Analysis and Evaluation
F40G 11	Health and Wellbeing
F7JG 12	Sport and Recreation Developing Volunteering

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 were compliant with this criterion. It was clear from the reports that centres were presenting evidence to demonstrate initial and ongoing reviews taking place. There was a range of evidence presented for this criterion that documented the checks being carried out — for example minutes of standardisation meetings, pre-delivery checks on both unit specifications and assessment materials, and minutes from assessment team meetings. There was evidence of equipment and consumable needs being identified at team meetings then fed into yearly inventory lists.

Where centres make use of other fitness facilities there was evidence of good working relationships to ensure that this criterion is being met in terms of equipment being used. In some centres the course evaluation process was used to identify areas of improvement and development for future cohorts.

In some centres the use of electronic methods was noted to record standardisation meetings, internal verification activity and the storage of candidate evidence (for example, SharePoint). There was also evidence of online assessment materials being used to support the practical observation of candidates. Where units are delivered in collaboration with other departments (for instance, First Aid) there was evidence of the sharing of resources.

Good practice

- ◆ In one centre, to support the curriculum delivery and candidate experience, a number of Surface Go devices have been purchased to create a portable e-class. These devices fully support the assessment environment and assessment materials, through their detachable element, to capture evidence outwith the traditional classroom, which fosters creativity and innovation. This data/recording can then be uploaded to the centre OneDrive.
- ◆ Making use of a commercial gym facility provides a wider selection of gym equipment and in greater numbers. This also provides a real working experience for the candidates to become familiar with.
- ◆ Requesting a centre development visit ensured that clarity and support were given on the changes to the graded units for Fitness, Health and Exercise.

Recommendations

- ◆ In the Level 6 NGA in Exercise and Fitness, the further development of learning and teaching materials will enhance the learner experience and allow staff to make steps forward in their delivery and gain a better understanding of the delivery requirements.
- ◆ Paperwork relating to the pre-delivery checklists, initial and ongoing review of assessment materials, and internal verification systems should be able to be accessed during the external verification process.

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 were compliant with this criterion. In most centres candidates are invited into the centre for interview, following their online application. Part of this initial assessment is to confirm suitability for the chosen course and carrying out practical assessments. It was also evident from the QV reports that additional support arrangements are available within centres, and these are assessed by the student learning support team.

Information is gathered at pre-entry or while on course. Where additional support needs are identified, this information is available to the course team. In some centres personal learning support plans are in place.

Where visits were carried out for HND units, it was evident that second-year candidates progressing from first year are assessed by the delivery team to confirm suitability for this course before a place is offered; and for graded units that candidates are expected to have completed the core units, or are in line to complete, prior to undertaking the graded unit.

For candidates undertaking units in the secondary sector, these reflected their personal career aspirations or they are looking towards furthering their education in this area. NPA units delivered in the secondary sector are undertaken by candidates in sixth year.

Good practice

- ◆ The pre-start programme for potential new-start candidates helps to identify additional learning support needs, and as a result support mechanisms are put in place prior to the candidate starting their course programme. Additionally, it also gives them an opportunity to meet delivering staff, view their timetable, and ask any question associated with their potential learning journey.
- ◆ Excellent CPD opportunities were available for the candidates by organising excursions and external visits that allows them to put some of the learning into context.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. Across all centres there were a variety of different models in place to ensure that candidates have regular contact with assessors to review progress. Some examples of how this is carried out:

- ◆ Candidates are informed of the delivery schedule at their induction and are provided with timetable information.
- ◆ Master folders also contained this information.
- ◆ Delivery schedules also indicated assessment dates and a reassessment schedule.
- ◆ The candidates had knowledge of when units were being delivered and when assessments take place throughout the year.

- ◆ They are also able to access this information on the secure part of the website. Centres also have regular delivery days for units.
- ◆ Delivery teams will also provide timetable information using Facebook.
- ◆ In some centres there is an open-door facility for students to access the tutor outside scheduled delivery times.

In many centres there was a guidance system in place where candidates receive a mandatory one hour weekly guidance session and access to a guidance tutor to monitor attendance, attainment and progression. Where staff identify a potential issue with a candidate regarding attendance, attainment or progression, an individual action plan is designed by both parties to get the candidate back on track.

From the graded unit QV reports, it was evident that candidates were having the appropriate contact with their assessors, having a face-to-face interview with the assessor to discuss their proposal; their completed planning stage; their development stage and finally on completion of the evaluation stage and presentation. Outwith this time, the staff team were available to meet and discuss progress at the candidate's request and in relation to any required remediation.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Almost all centres were compliant with this criterion. In most centres there was evidence of meetings that included standardisation on the agenda. Centres had internal verification policies in place that required assessment materials to be checked before delivery, during delivery and after delivery. Most centres provided evidence of these activities being recorded using standard templates and retained in either hard copy or stored on the shared-access drive on the centre's network. In some centres there was evidence of internal verification of assessment evidence during the delivery (following outcomes being completed).

Recommendations

- ◆ Feedback from the internal verifier to the assessor is currently provided verbally, within the department. There was limited evidence of this being recorded in any detail. It was suggested that the centre evaluates the use of the recording materials in the SQA internal verification toolkit.
- ◆ Internal verification could be more robust and look at a larger sample of candidate evidence to ensure assessor consistency. Comments and feedback from the assessor to the internal verifier could be more detailed.
- ◆ Internal verification process was not picking up that candidates were submitting insufficient evidence and not meeting the minimum evidence requirements outlined in the unit specification.

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

Almost all centres were compliant with this criterion. Most centres used SQA AEPs/ASPs/NABs that had internally verified pre-delivery. Some centres used centre-devised materials that had been verified internally or prior verified and matched against the SQA unit specification documents.

Good practice

- ◆ To allow for clearer information and recording of assessors' judgements to benefit the staff and the student, one centre developed a marking grid for the development stage of the graded unit. This had been prior verified by SQA.

Recommendations

- ◆ Where re-assessment takes place, centres should use alternative assessment instruments.
- ◆ There was evidence of centres devising their own assessment instruments, based on SQA materials. However, these had not been internally verified and did not meet the evidence criteria as set out in the unit specification. The centre is advised to have assessments internally verified/prior verified before delivery.

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

Almost all centres were compliant with this criterion. In most centres candidates are required to sign a declaration or e-declaration confirming that all work submitted is their own. In some centres this is completed at induction; in most centres as part of individual unit submission.

In some centres, there was evidence of candidates submitting assessment using Turnitin software. In all centres, for graded units there was evidence of assessor interviews taking place.

For practical work, performance observations are an integral part of the course work. In almost all centres, where assessment requirements are closed book, these are completed under supervised conditions.

Recommendation

- ◆ The completion of authenticity declarations should be applied in full in all instances, for all candidate evidence submitted. In a small number of centres these declarations had not all been signed.

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

Most centres were compliant with this criterion. In many centres, sample marking schedules were in place for the units reviewed and the assessments had been marked against these schedules. The internal verification provided feedback of agreement with the marking.

In some centres there was cross-marking of assessments. In some centres candidate evidence was not marked in accordance with the requirements of the unit specification, and the justification for marks being awarded was not clear.

In a small number of centres the assessor feedback could have been more detailed and could have reflected the competence of the candidate responses, and the evidence requirements of the assessment.

Good practice

- ◆ In one centre, following the submission of the planning stage for the graded unit, the internal verifier organised a cross-marking exercise between both assessors. Candidate work was chosen and then both assessors marked the work. The results were recorded in a specially adapted 'Learner Assessment Record' that allowed both assessors' judgements to be viewed side-by-side. This was a successful process for both of the assessors and the internal verifier.
- ◆ In one centre, for the graded unit, assessors cross-mark each other's work to ensure a consistent assessment decision is being made across all cohorts.
- ◆ The level of detail contained in Form IV5 from one site is impressive as it not only recognises the judgements of the assessor but also gives feedback that would be helpful to the candidate.

Recommendations

- ◆ It was recommended to centres that constructive and progressive feedback should be used in judgement of candidates' evidence. This would allow the candidate who passes to get feedback on what could be even better — some candidates who have passed do no benefit from this feedback.
- ◆ It was recommended in some centres that a clear audit trail be implemented across all assessors, in relation to assessment decisions, of what was first attempt, remediation or pass to ensure a standardised process is being applied in full.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. All met minimum requirements for the retention of evidence. Almost all centres retained evidence for one year following the completion of the course.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. A variety of methods were used to ensure that staff have access to the qualification verification report. In most centres dissemination of feedback is carried out at departmental meetings. Initially reports are distributed by the quality team to the relevant curriculum managers. Reports were uploaded onto shared drives for the delivery team to access.

In most centres the delivery staff were invited to join the feedback session after the qualification verification visit. In some centres the quality team analyse qualification verification reports across verification groups, identifying and highlighting any issues, areas for concern, action points (where given), recommendations or identified good practice, then disseminating this analysis to course teams.