



Higher National and/or Graded Unit

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019

**Mechanical and Manufacturing
Engineering**

Verification group: 212

Introduction

The following units and graded units were verified in 2018–19:

DV12 35 Graded Unit 2 Project
DV11 34 Graded Unit 1
DW7M 34 Plant Systems: Services
DW7N 34 Plant Systems: Utilities
DV9G 34 Mechanical Engineering Principles
HOPP 34 Lean Manufacturing

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.

For each of the visits undertaken, verifiers reported that centres were carrying out appropriate reviews. In almost all cases these were evidenced by the completion of pre-delivery checklists, but some centres additionally minuted staff meetings at which resources, assessments and learning materials were reviewed. Almost all centres actively downloaded unit specifications and, where available, exemplar assessments/ASPs at the start of each session; some added the session date to existing paper copies. Some centres made effective use of real-time computer-based course management tools.

Overall, this criterion has remained effectively applied by centres, although a recommendation was made to a centre to annually download unit specifications and 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.

Almost all centres encourage online applications, with applicants invited to identify their aims and any additional support needs they may have. Typically, during induction, such applicants are introduced to the candidate support processes available at the centre. These processes are always available to candidates identifying additional needs post-enrolment.

From the small number of visits undertaken, it seems clear that centres are more often providing earlier notification of available support.

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

Candidates on HN programmes at some centres have regular scheduled progress meetings, although these may be outwith the normal teaching day. VLEs, email and text-messaging are also sometimes used and found to be effective methods of maintaining appropriate communication channels. The latter methods are most in use with part-time candidates.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Actions were raised at two centres where record-keeping was incomplete, although appropriate internal assessment and verification policies were in place and being implemented. Each centre met the requirements of the actions raised and their overall rating was therefore amended to 'high confidence'.

For the Graded Unit 1 papers sampled for central verification, all reports were positive for this criterion.

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

Overall, this criterion was being applied effectively at centres although actions were raised at two centres. Each was required to more clearly indicate the mark distribution on instruments of assessment.

For the Graded Unit 1 papers sampled for central verification, all reports were positive for this criterion.

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

As required, all centres visited have appropriate policies in place which describe typical candidate transgressions and possible sanctions.

Where assessments are required to take place in controlled, supervised conditions then centres ensure that appropriate accommodation and staffing are provided.

Many centres require that coursework undertaken by candidates in their own time is submitted electronically using the centre's VLE and is automatically subject to review by anti-plagiarism software.

Commonly, coursework assignments are individualised to help avoid collusion.

For the Graded Unit 1 papers sampled for central verification, all reports were positive for this criterion.

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

Assessment judgments were overall accurate and consistent, though in one instance an action was raised requiring the centre to re-mark an assessment using a corrected marking scheme.

For the Graded Unit 1 papers sampled for central verification, all reports were positive for this criterion.

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

All centres visited presented the evidence requested by the verifier and all retained candidate evidence in accordance with SQA requirements. Most centres retain the evidence for a longer period, though at some centres, storage space limitations mean that physical evidence (for example, constructed assemblies or artefacts) is kept only for the minimum period stipulated.

For the Graded Unit 1 papers sampled for central verification, all reports were positive for this criterion.

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

Reports from all visits undertaken indicated that QV reports are added to master folders (typically these are in electronic format) and discussed at team meetings.

At some centres, the quality department will extract QV recommendations and any good practice identified, then circulate these across the centre.