



Higher National and/or Graded Unit

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019

Sports Coaching

Verification group 629

Introduction

The units verified this academic session were:

FW5N 34	Conduct and Ethics for Sport and Fitness Practitioners
FW5W 34	Research in Sport and Fitness: An Introduction
FW5R 34	Coaching of Sports: An Introduction
FW5M 34	Sports Coaching Theory & Practice
FW61 34	Psychology of Sports Coaching
H810 35	Sports Development and Research
FW68 34	Coaching and Developing Sport: Graded Unit 1
FY00 35	Coaching and Developing Sport: Graded Unit 2
FY01 35	Coaching and Developing Sport: Graded Unit 3

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.

All centres were compliant with this criterion. It was clear from the reports that all centres had an effective review of the assessment environment (as documented in standardisation/team meetings) which take place on a regular basis.

Minutes of standardisation meetings clearly showed where discussions took place around marking guidelines, standardising assessment between candidates, and any actions arising with completed by dates. Where centres have multiple delivery sites there was evidence of this taking place using video conferencing.

Internal verification records were made available in all centres. Some centres provided this information electronically using shared folders or in some centres using a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). VLEs were also used for candidates to access learning materials.

A range of sports were offered in the centres selected for external verification, including basketball, hockey and football. There was evidence of relevant equipment being used to support the candidates undertaking these units. The external verifiers were shown typical learning environments and engaged in discussion with candidates regarding these.

Centres provided evidence, contained within a master folder, of pre-delivery that included a signed off check confirming that the environment, resources, equipment and materials were suitable prior to delivery. Quality departments, in some centres, provided a check sheet for staff showing which units have updated ASPs.

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. Where candidates were applying for the first year of an HN qualification, in most centres they are invited for formal interview following an online application. In most centres the assessment includes a fitness assessment to confirm the suitability of the course, a written answer to a question in the form of an essay and a one-to-one chat with the delivery team. It is seen as preferable that candidates have an interest in sport and sports coaching.

Information on the availability of additional support is provided to candidates at induction, and is arranged in consultation with the learning support team. It was also clear from evidence presented for this criterion that centres consider whether candidates have a sporting background and have the sufficient underpinning knowledge prior to studying SCQF Level 7 units.

In all centres the application process offers the opportunity for the applicant to disclose/discuss additional support needs. Induction was carried out by all centres and this offered a further opportunity for candidates to discuss any support needs. The investment of time by centres in interviewing candidates was seen as having a positive impact in KPIs.

A number of visits were carried for HN Graded Units. Candidate flow charts indicated the progress pathway of articulation. In one centre, applicants join the current students for the practical elements. This was deemed a useful way to gauge their level and readiness to study.

For candidates progressing to HND year 2 most centres required candidates to have achieved all 15 credits within the first year.

Two aspects of good practice were identified in relation to this criterion:

- ◆ One centre had introduced a summer school to aid transition onto the HN year 1 program. This offer targets the potential knowledge gap within Anatomy and Physiology.
- ◆ For HN graded unit candidates information sheets are issued and placed onto the VLE. These information sheets contain a vast amount of detail for the candidate in preparation for undertaking the graded units. Within this documentation there is clear signposting and mapping to the CfE and core skill development.

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. In all centres candidates had regular contact with assessors either by published timetabled activity (supported by a schedule of work), electronic methods (Moodle/Onenote), and/or drop-in sessions. In a small number of centres candidates are invited to watch classes in action for more practice and experience when not in official classes.

Many centres had a guidance system in place, where candidates have an allocated academic/guidance tutor, with scheduled meetings taking place. In a few centres there was evidence of support being provided in an informal manner. In one centre candidate support is embedded within specific units within the HNC, such as personal development planning.

Four aspects of good practice were identified in relation to this criterion:

- ◆ Excellent support was offered to all students via a lunch time drop-in service for catch-up and revision of work across the whole course. This was evidently well attended, with staff volunteering to give up their free time to support this initiative and encourage learners to stay on track and with a positive outcome.
- ◆ In unit H810 35 there was evidence of a very organised and effective OneNote system in place for candidates. This allows a flexible approach to learning and assessment through the use of the VLE.
- ◆ The level of feedback provided to learners is in-depth, and this includes a vast amount of support for development.
- ◆ The use of an at risk register not only provided visual information on each candidate's achievement, but it also provided an instant picture of which candidates need some form of intervention to keep them on track. This could be in the form of emotional support as well as academic. Candidates are discussed at a bi-monthly meeting where all staff are aware of potential issues.

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 compliant with this criterion. Almost all centres had a comprehensive and robust internal verification policy, and the units sampled during external verification activity had been subject to recent internal verification.

There was evidence of internal verification taking place pre-delivery in almost all centres. Internal verification paperwork indicated that mid-sampling and end-of-unit sampling was being carried out in many centres, and that internal verifier comment was fair and supportive. There was evidence of staff working together through the year to observe candidates and then comparing assessment decisions to ensure practical work is to the required level.

Course team and meeting minutes recorded standardisation activity in all centres. In most centres where units are offered across different campuses, it was evident that standardisation had taken place across assessors and included topics such as marking schemes, examples of student work and assessment checking — for example Turnitin marks.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. Most centres are using the most recently-published SQA-devised assessment materials and marking schemes. These had been verified internally at the pre-delivery stage. One centre used assessments that are line with the SQA ASP but not a direct copy, and one centre had used a centre-devised instrument of assessment.

There was evidence of standardising the use of assessment instruments across different campuses.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. All centres had in place a procedure for ensuring that assessment evidence is the candidate's own work. This was put into practice by candidates having to sign a plagiarism statement/authenticity statement (usually contained with the assessment cover sheet) confirming that the work submitted is their own efforts.

For practical sessions this is confirmed by the tutor within the completed observation checklist. For electronic submissions via VLEs all centres are using Turnitin.

Two aspects of good practice were identified in relation to this criterion:

- ◆ The electronic assessment cover sheet included a link which signposts candidates to the centre's malpractice policy.

- ◆ By using Turnitin for electronic evidence submission enhances candidate's transition onto higher degree level study.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. There was strong evidence in the work sampled across all centres that candidate evidence was accurately and consistently judged by assessors. Assessors were using the marking schemes within the ASPs. In Graded Units, assessors had marked clearly the rationale for the additional mark. In most centres there was evidence of detailed feedback being provided to candidates, for both practical and project-based assessments.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. All centres retained candidate evidence in line with SQA's retention of evidence policy, with a number of centres retaining evidence beyond the minimum requirements. In one centre this was done to ensure any appeals can be appropriately dealt with. In one centre exemplars are retained to aid standardisation.

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. There was evidence in all centres that staff have access to the feedback from qualification verifiers.

In most centres the report is disseminated by the quality staff to curriculum leaders, who then forward to the delivery team. Different methods are used to support this process, eg SharePoint, where staff can access for future reference and planning. The content is used to inform standardisation meetings. In most centres members of the delivery team were available to received feedback from QV visits.