![SQA logo]

Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022
Management

Verification group number: 247

Introduction

This year, many centres attended the network week courses for management and the course on assessment strategies held in February. Some centres no longer use reflective accounts as an assessment method for performance evidence, which shows improvement. However, not all centres did this, so further work is needed. With processes and procedures introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic in place, we see the innovative and effective use of technology to support the virtual and hybrid approaches in centres this year. We see increased support and guidance from the centres when virtual and hybrid approaches are becoming the norm. Although this has been a challenging and engaging period, this factual report demonstrates the quality of the delivery and that centres have continued meeting standards required by SQA. The qualification verification activity in session 2021–22 indicated 'high confidence' across almost all qualifications and units sampled.

GM26 23 SVQ Management at SCQF level 7
GM27 24 SVQ Management at SCQF level 9
GM25 25 SVQ Management at SCQF level 11

This list of units includes a variety of units that have been verified during 2021–22: H5XP 04; HK32 04; HK26 04; HC03 04; HK2L 04; HA9V 04; HK3E 04; H68E 04; H58V 04; H7CD 04; H422 04; H696 04; HK32 04; H8GY 04; H41X 04; H420 04; H8H2 04; H68H 04.

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.

All of the centres achieved 'high confidence' in this criterion, with all staff being qualified to assess and internally verify the SVQs in Management. All staff within the current centres have experience in the delivery of management qualifications. The qualification verifiers commented on good practices within all centres regarding the continuous professional development of staff. All centres provided CPD records which demonstrated specific links to assessment practice and specific awards in line with the assessment strategy.

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

All qualification verifiers reported that all centres provided documented evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of the assessment environments; equipment; reference, learning and assessment materials. All centres have processes and procedures in place, such as induction checklists, site checklists, internal verification policy and minutes of standardisation meetings; this shows that all centres are reviewing assessment and learning materials. All centres achieved 'high confidence' in this criterion.

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 have a process and procedure in place to ensure that candidate needs and achievements are matched against the requirements of the award. All centres have an interview and selection procedure, followed by an induction to the centre and the qualification. They hold these procedures with the candidates on a one-to-one basis, where they identify each candidate's skills and consider each candidate's achievements and needs. This reflects the level of the management qualification selected and the appropriate optional unit choice. All qualification verifiers reported that centres are identifying candidates' development needs and prior achievements, as well as providing support and guidance. All centres achieved 'high confidence' in this area.

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

Some candidates were interviewed during the qualification verification process. They confirmed having regular contact with their assessor and receiving excellent support. All centres demonstrate robust systems and procedures to make sure candidates are appropriately supported, such as clear assessment scheduling, planning arrangements, regular meetings, and blended learning opportunities combining face-to-face and virtual learning, email and telephone. All centres have ongoing scheduled contact with their candidates and offer a flexible approach to the candidate's working environment. Some centres have moved to virtual online learning, enabling communication with candidates on a day-to-day basis and when there is an identified need.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

The qualification verifiers' reports demonstrate that all centres have a robust internal verification system in place with a 3-stage model — pre-delivery, middle and end. All centres' documentation supports this process, with centres being well organised. The qualification verifiers sampled sampling plans, IV policies and attendance records for standardisation meetings. Some centres retained detailed standardisation minutes, providing a clear audit trail of discussions and decisions made. Whilst internal verification was robust and fit for the purpose in all centres, for some centres, standardisation content should be more detailed or unit specific. The internal verification policy varies among centres: some do ad hoc unit standardisation meetings, whereas others do both ad hoc and formal standardisation meetings; all are recorded. The qualification verifiers' reports also indicate good practice planning assessment and verification procedures. All centres' assessors and internal verifiers follow their centre's assessment and verification procedures.

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

This year, many centres attended the network week updates for management and the course on assessment strategy held in February. All assessment instruments were valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair in all centres. The qualification verifiers indicated that all centres were aware of the assessment strategy and that all centres' portfolios had a good variety of evidence. They also reported that all centres followed the assessment strategy and that the centres' quality assurance records backed this up. A few centres should note that the use of reflective accounts as performance evidence is not acceptable; however, reflective accounts can be used for knowledge and understanding. A small number of centres submitted policies, procedures or formal information document that should have been omitted as evidence, as they did not provide proof of either the candidates' activities or knowledge. Some centres also submitted blank documents and procedural information which did not demonstrate the candidates' activities.

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

The qualification verifiers' reports indicate that no evidence of malpractice or plagiarism was identified during virtual verification activities. Staff and candidates from all centres continue to maintain standards and meet qualification requirements. All centres have appropriate malpractice procedures in place which help to ensure that candidates submit their own work. The qualification verifiers indicated that all centres have authenticated documentation, such as signed and dated induction checklists, disclaimers and statements, and evidence of direct observation of the candidates. All centres authenticated candidate evidence in line with SQA's required conditions using candidate disclaimers. The one-to-one relationship between the candidate and the assessor also helps to ensure the authenticity of any evidence provided.

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

'High confidence' was recorded for all qualification verification activities in session 2021–2022. All centres accurately and consistently judged candidates' work against SQA requirements. All centres held standardisation meetings from a monthly to quarterly basis. The qualification verifiers reported good feedback from the internal verifiers to the assessors for providing advice and support where necessary. The qualification verifier sampling in the centres showed consistency in assessment and clear and relevant feedback from the internal verifiers. SQA external verification reports indicate that assessment decisions were consistent and accurately judged against the standard and in a fair and equal way.

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

All centres retained candidate evidence in line with SQA requirements and longer if necessary. Candidate evidence may be retained for longer periods by some centres due to requirements from other awarding bodies or funding requirements. This can vary from the

minimum requirement of one year to five years and beyond. Centres using an online system retained the candidate evidence for a year before archiving it.

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

All centres disseminated QV feedback to centre staff, sharing good practices and areas for improvement. Centres retained QV reports electronically, giving all assessors, verifiers and relevant staff access to the reports. All centres intend to hold team meetings or standardisation meetings directly after receiving the QV report from SQA. All centres recorded the outcome of QV activities and noted recommendations and actions, in order to address these directly.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

♦ According to candidate feedback, all centres ensured good contact, support and guidance with the assessor.
♦ Some centres provided very detailed minutes of standardisation meetings, providing a clear audit trail of decisions and actions.
♦ The candidates provided a good variety of evidence within their portfolios.
♦ Centres provided complete CPD records.

Specific areas for development

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

♦ A few centres should note that the use of reflective accounts as performance evidence is not acceptable; however, reflective accounts can be used for knowledge and understanding.
♦ Policies, procedures or any formal information document which do not provide proof of either the candidates' activities or knowledge should not be submitted.
♦ Blank documents and procedural information should not be submitted, as they do not demonstrate the candidates' activities.
♦ A small number of centres need to expand on CPDR to demonstrate the specific links to the subject assessed.