



National Progression Awards

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022

Digital Literacy

Verification group number: 358

Introduction

This report is compiled from verification visits which concerned a number of National Progression Awards within the Digital Literacy verification group. The centres were either schools offering an NPA as part of the subject choices in the senior phase or colleges offering it as part of their NQ programmes.

All verification was carried out virtually with access to evidence being given in advance of the visit. All visits took place during May and June 2022, which allowed verifiers to look at completed candidate work. All verification was deemed successful.

The NPAs and units reviewed were:

GJ7W 44 Digital Passport

H7E9 44 Information Literacy

H7EA 44 Network Literacy

H7EB 44 Social Media Literacy

GJ7X 45 Digital Passport

H7E9 45 Information Literacy

H7EA 45 Network Literacy

H7EB 45 Social Media Literacy

GL06 43 Digital Literacy

H9PV 43 Computer Applications

H3LJ 09 Computer Basics

H9PT 43 Digital Skills

GL32 45 PC Passport

HA6M 45 Web Apps: Word Processing

HA6J 45 Web Apps: Presentations

HA6L 45 Web Apps: Spreadsheets

GN58 45 Digital Media

HW4W 45 Digital Media: Audio

HW4Y 45 Digital Media: Moving Images

HW4X 45 Digital Media: Still Images

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.

Almost all staff involved with delivery are qualified in an appropriate vocational area and hold a postgraduate teaching qualification, such as PGDE or TQFE, with some being GTC registered.

CPD was discussed and found to be relevant in all cases.

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

All centres participate in a formal review of courses. Staff review NPA offerings well in advance and prepare to deliver them in a single academic session. The early initial review is particularly relevant in schools, as the availability of resources is a major consideration. In all instances, there is ongoing review to discuss delivery and assessment. In most cases, this was well documented; but in a few, this could be better documented to allow staff to recap on the discussion.

Evidence of ongoing informal review was discussed at all verification events where a delivery team is limited to an assessor and verifier. Good working relationships were seen and a resolution to any issues was rapid. Issues such as discrepancies with Solar assessments were highlighted in some instances and staff were proactive in seeking assistance from SQA.

It was noted that almost all delivery was conducted in a face-to-face environment, but there were some examples of needing to switch to remote delivery for short periods of time.

The majority of centres make use of electronic platforms for delivering course materials and, in some cases, for assessment. These can range from virtual learning environments to Microsoft Teams, Google Classroom or a centre-devised platform.

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 carry out some form of process to ensure that the right candidates are on the right course. This can take the form of an interview process or mapping to an academic profile in the case of colleges or training providers. In schools, NPAs form part of the senior phase choices and the selection process can take some time for classes to settle due to course changes in August.

It was noted that the availability of NPAs at SCQF level 3 is a good option for candidates wishing to return to the workplace but do not possess adequate digital skills. At this level, a willingness to learn is a key factor to consider in recruitment.

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

All candidates have regular face-to-face contact with assessors. In most instances, this is several times per week. This allows a clear view of progress, and action can be taken to revise assessment plans. The majority of centres adopt a formal delivery and assessment

schedule to follow as a guide. In some instances, this was very well planned and clear to follow, with evidence of detailed lesson planning.

Most centres provided evidence of candidate tracking systems. This can range from spreadsheets to specialised systems, which allow a clear insight to a candidate's progress and their readiness for assessment, and can allow development of an action plan as needed.

In all instances, centres adopt a positive candidate-centred approach to suit the needs of the cohort and the individual learner.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres had effective three-stage verification processes in place. In almost all instances, assessment and verification are well understood and well documented. There was evidence of both sampling of candidate assessment materials and double marking taking place; this was mostly clear to follow assessment decisions and internal verification confirmation.

Standardisation activity varied depending on the centre and number of cohorts. In many instances, this formed part of the ongoing review meetings that centres held regularly. Where available, minutes were effective in providing a clear record of activity.

In a few instances, there was evidence of standardisation taking place with other schools within the area.

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

In almost all instances, assessment was based on the SQA Assessment Support Pack (ASP). Solar assessments were used for knowledge assessments. Centres provided evidence of candidate scores on completion, as well as evidence that assessors and verifiers undertook assessments prior to use to ensure there were no errors. In a few cases, errors were highlighted and centres approached SQA for support to discuss this.

In a few cases, centre-derived assessments were used and these had also been checked pre-delivery.

Practical elements were mainly based on the ASP, but in most cases, assessment briefs were contextualised for use.

In a few instances, centres had a holistic approach. The assessment instruments and methods had generated evidence of candidates' underpinning knowledge from each outcome, and this was gathered towards the end of each unit. This took the form of

questions and practical editing skills, and candidates were assessed through undertaking a single project to meet a contextualised given brief.

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

All centres have malpractice and plagiarism policies in place, which have been developed in line with SQA requirements.

All centres have processes in place to authenticate candidate work. This can range from own work declaration with submissions to the use of electronic plagiarism checking software, such as Turnitin. All assessors are aware of the candidates' style and ability, and would take action if they receive any unusual work; this authenticates work in the marking process.

Centres adhere to assessment conditions, and candidates are aware of assessment conditions in advance, such as closed-book, timed assessment or open-book conditions.

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

In all centres, assessor judgement was found to be accurate and consistent with SQA requirements. Almost all assessment was supported by clear marking guidelines and judgements made in line with this. In many cases, centres provided marking commentary that clearly showed marking decisions. This provided good feedback for candidates and provided information for verifiers.

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

All evidence had been retained for all visits in line with SQA requirements. Verifiers discussed the retention of evidence and, in some instances, the archiving or data cleansing process.

In all cases, centres were effective in retaining evidence for verification and complied with retention policies.

A considerable amount of evidence is generated electronically, and this is accessed through secure usernames and passwords.

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

All centres confirmed that external verification reports were disseminated to staff on receipt. In some centres visited, there was evidence of previous reports being discussed at meetings. However, in most centres, it had been some time since they had a visit, and in a few instances, this was their first visit, so there was nothing to discuss in this area.

Verifiers discussed the usefulness of reports in informing assessment and verification practice.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ Well-planned delivery, assessment and internal verification schedule
- ◆ Sharing practice with other centres
- ◆ Use of trackers to monitor progress
- ◆ High level of positive candidate support
- ◆ The use of contextualised assessment briefs
- ◆ The use of a holistic assessment approach to cover all knowledge and skills

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ Some centres should consider using an electronic platform as an effective learning tool for sharing course materials where one is not already in place