



NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Childcare and Development
Verification activity:	Postal
Date published:	June 2023

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
J205 76	SCQF level 6	Child Development
J206 76	SCQF level 6	Child Development: Theory
J207 76	SCQF level 6	Services for Children and Young People

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Overall, the assessment approaches were satisfactory with centres making good use of the unit specification to ensure that outcomes and assessment standards were met. Most centres verified used the unit assessment support pack (UAS) — package 1, unit-by unit approach to assessment. One centre used Microsoft Teams to record and evidence candidate work. This was well organised and enabled tracking and monitoring of assessment to take place online whilst ensuring that assessment standards were being met.

Assessment judgements

Overall, the assessment judgements were satisfactory and feedback to candidates from assessors was clear and concise. The evidence provided by four out of four centres demonstrated that assessment standards were being met, with candidates evaluating and analysing where required. It was also evident that centres were encouraging learners to reference correctly.

In one out of four centres, the level of feedback to candidates varied depending on which campus they were based at. Centres should ensure that candidates are receiving equitable feedback in relation to assessment standards.

Section 3: general comments

In general, candidates have met the assessment standards and produced appropriate evidence relevant to SCQF level 6.

Centres should continue to advise candidates to keep case studies short and simple. In some cases, candidates are producing complex case studies that they do not have the knowledge and understanding to address, therefore disadvantaging themselves. Similarly, candidates should not be using centre-generated case studies as this does not allow for personalisation and choice.

If candidates are required to remediate work, this should be clearly and consistently applied across all candidates in the cohort. Similarly, candidates should not be directed to remediate spelling, grammar, punctuation and referencing. This can be highlighted to candidates to encourage progression in skills but is not a requirement of the assessment standards.

It must always be made clear whether work is a first or second attempt and where remediation is required, this must be clearly documented. If centres deliver on more than one campus, they should be encouraged to use the same assessment material and candidate feedback should be equitable and recorded in the same way. This assists with standardisation of evidence and internal verification procedures.

There is growing evidence of good practice, with many candidates producing assessment evidence to a high standard. There was opportunity for personalisation and choice in many cases, in line with design principles of Curriculum for Excellence and for one centre the use of Microsoft Teams is a welcome development.

In many cases, candidates were given clear and consistent feedback and feedforward. This is good practice and should be encouraged.

In most cases, there was evidence of internal verification. Centres are reminded that verification can occur at any point during the assessment process, not just at the end. If there is little or no evidence of internal verification, centres are encouraged to use the [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) on SQA's website prior to external verification. It was noted that many centres have robust and rigorous verification procedures in place, used effectively by internal verifiers.