



**Professional Development Award**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019**  
**Education Support Assistance**

**Verification group: 489**

## Introduction

The following units were sampled during the external verification activity:

F7HR 12	Supporting the Development of Children and Young People from Birth to Eighteen Years
F7HV 12	Professional Practice in an Educational Setting
F7HY 12	Supporting Children and Young People in an Educational Setting
F7HS 12	Supporting the Behaviour of Children and Young People

## Category 2: Resources

**Criterion 2.1: Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.**

Not verified for these qualification types.

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

Evidence was available in all centres visited that ongoing reviews of the assessment environment, equipment, reference, learning and assessment materials were taking place. Minutes of meetings recorded the decisions taken and there was also evidence of the action points and which member of staff was responsible for taking the action forward.

## **Category 3: Candidate support**

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

In all centres, candidates were interviewed as part of the recruitment process. The course requirements were discussed and candidate needs were assessed at this point. This included consideration of placement requirements. Staff members visited candidates on work placement and provided additional support if necessary. Extended learning support was available in some centres if the candidate requested it.

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

All centres had robust systems in place to support candidates and provide ongoing support. The quality of feedback was generally good both in terms of written submissions and workplace feedback.

## **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, internal verification documentation was clear and thorough and included evidence of discussions on standardisation at staff meetings.

Signatures on candidates' paperwork were generally the method used to demonstrate that internal verification had taken place. One centre included helpful comments to guide new assessors on their approach to assessment decisions.

Centres also provided evidence of regular internal verification discussions at team meetings typically at the beginning, middle and end of each session.

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

All centres were using the SQA-developed NABs.

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

All centres had appropriate policies on academic malpractice for candidates and staff. Candidates were generally introduced to the policies at the beginning of the year at enrolment and induction, and they were reinforced throughout course delivery.

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

All centres had marking guidelines covering all units. Summary checklists of results were frequently used and remediation was clearly highlighted on candidate paperwork. Written feedback was given to candidates in most cases. All judgements that were externally verified were accurate and consistent.

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

All centres had the required candidate evidence available. In all cases the centre's own retention policy met or exceeded SQA requirements.

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

All centres had a clear policy on dissemination of qualification verification reports, and staff were involved in actions on development. In addition, some centres had as part of their policy, all previous reports available to new assessors.

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

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

- ◆ One centre offered an assessor course to all new assessors delivering units for the first time.
- ◆ One centre had weekly study ‘coaches’ who were allocated to provide academic support such as Harvard referencing.
- ◆ One centre had a unit induction process that supported lecturers delivering a unit for the first time. The centre also allocated a ‘buddy’ to provide additional support.
- ◆ One centre used in service days to offer further support to evening class candidates who were not normally in college during the day, when all staff were available.
- ◆ All candidates sign a statement confirming the authenticity of their work before submitting an assignment.
- ◆ The use of Turnitin was highlighted as good practice in one centre. Although this is considered as normal practice for the majority of qualifications, it was argued that this is a new development for this subject area.

## **Specific areas for development**

The following areas for development were reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ In one centre, staff were keen to integrate assessments as much as possible. Assessors were recommended to work with existing NABs to build confidence, and to look at a plan of integration in the future. The centre was advised to submit the new assessments for prior verification.
- ◆ In a number of cases, the quality and quantity of feedback being provided to candidates needs to be improved.