



Professional Development Award

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019

Training in Adult Literacies

Verification group: 374

Introduction

The following units were sampled during the external verification activity:

H3P6 33	Delivering and Developing Adult Literacies Learning
H3P7 33	Preparing to Work with Adult Literacies Learners
H3P8 33	Raising Awareness of Adult Literacies
F8N8 35	Contexts of Adult Literacies in Scotland

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.

There was evidence of regular reviews of assessment environments, resources, and learning and assessment materials in all the centres visited. In most cases, session plans were in place incorporating equipment requirements and the teaching environment.

Centres were making good use of locally-devised assessment forms. There was also evidence that candidate feedback was being used to inform practice.

There was also evidence that the updating of centres' learning and assessment procedures had taken account of the results from SQA systems verification visits.

One centre had a clearly described map of initial and ongoing review across all aspects of this criterion. This included evidence that reviews took place prior to the course, midway through and post-delivery.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

Centres all recruited candidates from a range of sources, including external applicants and members of the centre staff.

There was consistent evidence that learning was matched to the experience of candidates. Centres were operating in line with the professional development framework for the adult literacies workforce in Scotland. One centre arranged interviews and enrolment sessions to ensure that candidates entered the programme at the correct level for their needs and prior achievements.

One centre arranged for candidates to submit a personal profile as part of the selection process. Successful candidates completed a comprehensive induction programme. Interests and development needs were recognised and tutor sessions incorporated additional session including dyslexia awareness.

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

All centres arranged for candidates to have scheduled contact with assessors to review progress and to revise assessment plans accordingly. There was also evidence of electronic communication being used to maintain contact between candidates and assessors.

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, a system of internal verification was evident. Internal verification feedback to assessors was accurate and consistent. There was appropriate recording of internal verification and internal verification activity was incorporated on assessment feedback sheets to candidates in many cases. Various methods were used to indicate where internal verification of individual scripts had been undertaken. Typically, the assessments were signed or initialled by both the assessor and the internal verifier.

In all cases, assessment materials and decisions were recorded and kept together with candidate evidence, thus allowing the internal verifier to track the evidence still required from the candidate and to see how assessment decisions had been reached.

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

In all centres the selection and use of assessment instruments and methods are valid, reliable, equitable and fair. Centres were generally using SQA-generated assessment instruments.

Marking guidelines and candidate feedback forms were appropriately generated by centres and in all cases meet SQA standards. Assessor feedback/marking sheets consistently included signatures and were dated. There was evidence that across centres, candidates received prompt feedback and appropriate centre-generated feedback forms. No barriers to individual candidates undertaking the assessments were identified in any of the centres.

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

Consistently, centres were informing candidates of the requirements to provide only authentic evidence. Assessment documentation included centres' plagiarism policies, and in the majority of cases candidates signed a plagiarism statement with each submitted assessment.

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

In all cases centre assessors and verifiers shared the same interpretation of standards. Candidates' work was being accurately and consistently judged against the requirements of the award. On the few occasions that an internal verifier queried an assessment decision, there was evidence that staff had a positive approach towards internal verification. There was also evidence that the decisions of internal verifiers were acted upon and seen as leading to improvements in practice.

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

In all cases centres were aware of the SQA retention of evidence requirements, and procedures were followed correctly.

There were no cases of the required evidence not being available for an external verification
All evidence that had been retained was being stored securely, whether electronic evidence or paper-based evidence.

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

There was evidence in all centres that external verification visit reports were disseminated to all appropriate staff and the information within them was being used to inform teaching, learning and assessment practice. In addition, there was evidence of specific discussions of the reports at staff meetings

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ In one centre, study support was provided through a tutorial process, in addition to learning events. Assessors say this support has led to higher confidence amongst candidates, and as a result the quality of submissions is improved.

Specific areas for development

No specific areas of development were highlighted during session 2018–19.