



**Scottish Vocational Qualifications
Qualification Verification Summary Report 2021**

Youth Work and Community Development

Verification group number: 108

Introduction

This year's external verification sessions covered the following awards:

- GL4J 22 SVQ Youth Work at SCQF level 2
- GL4K 23 SVQ Youth Work at SCQF level 3
- GD69 24 SVQ Community Development at SCQF level 4

Almost all of the centres were delivering the Youth Work awards at both SCQF levels 2 and 3, with level 3 proving to be more popular. Most were offering these awards as part of the Modern Apprenticeship (MA) scheme. Very few centres were offering the Community Development award. Some centres stated that they would be keen to offer this award if it appeared within the MA framework.

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.

Centres were not required to provide evidence to show compliance with this criterion because of the COVID-19 situation, but many centres still complied. Those that did had managed, for example, to receive appropriate CPD online.

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

Almost all of the centres produced evidence which showed full compliance with this criterion. However, a small number were advised to demonstrate compliance through staging and recording online standardisation meetings to show that the above elements had been discussed.

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 of the centres met this standard by demonstrating that they had reliable and responsive guidance and support mechanisms for candidates in place. All provided evidence which showed good pre-entry guidance and mechanisms in place to guarantee ongoing support. Liaison with a range of external support agencies was highlighted in this regard.

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

All centres produced candidate assessment plans of a consistent high quality that were well beyond the required standards. Each showed regular contact, with an acute awareness that, due to COVID-19 restrictions, candidates were working alone and remotely. Plans provided clear guidance and direction regarding the requirements of the award and all dates agreed with candidates were followed up.

There was also a marked increase in the number of centres now using assessment planning sessions to steer candidates towards exact requirements of each unit and supporting them

through how to gather relevant evidence to achieve performance criteria. Many were now adopting this approach with one centre producing a video to exemplify this.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Most centres complied fully with this criterion. However, to facilitate external verification, some centres should check that information on completed candidate evidence-gathering documents bears the correct details of dates, unit titles and SQA codes.

Similarly, during internal verification, a cross-referencing approach to candidate evidence would enhance consistency of judgement. The use of sample answers would also facilitate this.

Also, where candidates present different understanding of questions, such assessments should be reviewed during internal verification.

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

Almost all of the centres presented evidence which showed that this criterion was being met fully. There were examples where assessors had clearly adopted a candidate-centred approach in relation to their choice of instruments and methods. This, according to candidates interviewed, had enhanced not only their confidence but also their ability to identify and generate relevant evidence.

However, a small number of centres highlighted lack of motivation as a problem with some candidates. In such cases the centre was advised to review its approach to methods applied and the selection of instruments. For example, where a candidate is lacking in motivation the centre was advised to consider a more structured approach such as the use of set questions and answers for obtaining evidence of knowledge and understanding.

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

All centres demonstrated that they were using SQA approved processes and procedures to meet this criterion. Some presented paper-based evidence containing candidate disclaimers. However, many centres have now migrated to electronic portals for uploading candidate evidence. These platforms only allow candidate work to be uploaded following a statement of authenticity.

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

Candidate evidence presented for external verification showed that almost all of the centres had demonstrated compliance with this criterion through the implementation of a thorough approach to standardisation. However, lack of consistency of judgement was an issue in a small number of centres. Similarly, very few recordings of discussions relating to assessor judgements were available and, in some cases, candidate achievement records were not presented.

These centres were advised to raise these matters during standardisation meetings and to identify methods for enhancing consistency of judgement such as the availability of sample answers.

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

All centres had met this criterion and had taken into account new SQA retention requirements in the light of COVID-19 restrictions.

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

All centres demonstrated compliance with this criterion through the presentation of the relevant section within their respective internal verification policies

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2020–21:

- ◆ Reliable and responsive guidance and support mechanism for candidates
- ◆ A broad range of assessment methods
- ◆ Candidates being steered towards exact requirements of each unit and being supported on how to gather relevant evidence to achieve performance criteria
- ◆ Candidate-centred approach to choice of instruments and methods of assessment
- ◆ Knowledge and understanding instruments of assessment sampled had been designed to ensure consistency of approach

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2020–21:

- ◆ Information on completed candidate evidence-gathering documents should bear the correct details of dates, unit titles and SQA codes
- ◆ Discussions on assessor judgements should be recorded during standardisation meetings
- ◆ Consistency of judgement should be addressed
- ◆ A more consistent and accurate approach to recording of assessment of candidate evidence
- ◆ Review of assessment approaches for candidates lacking motivation