



Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2021

Sport and Active Leisure: Facilities Management/Development

Verification group number: 202

Introduction

There were seven virtual visits carried out for this verification group during session 2020–21. Some centres uploaded materials to The Hub, whilst others forwarded paper portfolios to SQA for onward transmission to the appointed external verifier.

GG8M 23 SVQ 3 Leisure Management
GA00 22 SVQ Sport and Active Leisure: Operational Services

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 centres were compliant with this criterion. For all of the qualification verification activity for SVQ provision carried out over the session 2020–21, it was found that assessors and internal verifiers were qualified and occupationally competent to assess and verify the awards being delivered, in line with the assessment strategy. In all centres CPD records were up to date, logged and available for external verification.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. All centres used regular standardisation meetings to discuss assessment approaches and methods and ensure assessment tools are suitable to generate evidence that meets the requirements of the mandatory and optional units within each of the qualifications. In most centres, assessors have developed new and innovative approaches to learning and teaching this session. These approaches have supported candidates to continue with their qualification during furlough and COVID-19 restrictions. There was also evidence in sampling internal verification records that learning materials were current. The assessments and checklists being used in all centres follow the unit specification and assessment strategy. There was evidence of agreements being put into place for candidates to use relevant risk assessments for any facilities they may use throughout their SVQ award in order to take into account the possible impact of COVID-19 on facilities and working environments.

Recommendations

- ◆ Consideration of online platforms and e-portfolios. Given the circumstances and the evolution of the working environment and the increased prevalence of technology, consideration of e-portfolios may be beneficial for future candidates. This could link in to communication, instantaneous uploading of evidence, feedback and accessibility for assessors, internal verifiers and candidates.
- ◆ Continued development to create an organised structure within portfolios, for example templates for performance criteria and knowledge and understanding elements across a range of units where applicable. This could include question sets and templates for reflective narrative and witness testimonies.

- ◆ Consideration of recording verbal conversations relating to standardisation and quality assurance practice. This could be a working document that allows constructive conversations to be recorded and captured.

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 were compliant with this criterion. From the review of reports it was clear that appropriate processes were in place to record evidence for this criterion. Candidates have access to various digital tools to support their learning and development, for example Google Drive, Trello and One Drive. Candidate support needs can either be self-referred or identified during induction/when working with their assessor.

Good practice

- ◆ Including a mental health unit for a candidate to complete when it was not feasible for a practical to be completed.
- ◆ Candidates appreciated the level of pastoral support received after assessment observations.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. The review of reports showed that different models were in place that were flexible in their approach. Despite the impact of COVID-19, scheduled contact took place regardless of work being generated, or not, to ensure contact was maintained with the candidates. Where centres were using e-portfolios, candidates were able to see their feedback at any time, and to see their progress through the SVQ award. Assessors found e-portfolios beneficial for tracking progress. All centres maintained regular contact with candidates using digital platforms such as Google Drive, Trello, One Drive, WhatsApp, Zoom, and MS Teams, in addition to email, phone calls and text.

Good practice

- ◆ Candidates having access to their assessor on a daily basis is no doubt beneficial in terms of support and to identify any potential areas of concern that may arise.
- ◆ It was highlighted from the candidate interviews that the communication from the assessor was extremely beneficial, not only from the perspective of the qualification and employment, but also the welfare and wellbeing of the candidates through challenging periods of furlough for both the assessor and candidates. The check-ins to ensure all was OK shows a candidate-centred approach.
- ◆ Investment in candidates, and a candidate-centred approach, was evident. Level of detail and support to all candidates was demonstrated through conversations with assessors and

internal verifiers as well as assessment evidence sampled. This included the rapport built with candidates and employers linked with the qualification.

- ◆ There was clear evidence of assessment planning in the candidate digital portfolios, for example candidates have access to a gap analysis tool that allows them to view areas where further knowledge and understanding need to be completed.

Recommendation

- ◆ Consider developing a matrix grid for each candidate to provide an overview at course level rather than just unit level. This would provide a useful tool for an assessor to look at development areas as well as progression. For the candidates, this would allow them to see their overall course progression and detailed feedback. This could inform assessment planning.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. Assessment and verification procedures were effective and met SQA requirements and National Occupational Standards. Standardisation meeting minutes showed discussion of units within the awards being delivered in centres to ensure a standardised approach to assessment. Evidence of completed internal verification documentation were consistent with the centres' policies and procedures for ensuring standardised assessment practice.

Good practice

- ◆ Internal verification tracking sheet recorded robust verification of all candidates. Internal verification takes place with every candidate at least four times over the course of the qualification.

Recommendations

- ◆ Assessors should ensure that evidence being generated by each candidate is cross-referenced against other mandatory and optional units where possible. This will reduce the candidate workload and over-assessment.
- ◆ Assessors should ensure that entries within the unit matrix grids for each unit are matched against the evidence requirements. There were some instances where entries had been made, but they were not referenced against any of the performance criteria.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. Centres use a range of assessment methods that are appropriate in meeting the unit evidence requirements, the assessment strategy and the

National Occupational Standards. Assessment instruments range from observation/s, work product/s, professional discussion and witness statement/s to some reflective accounts. They were all used to gather appropriate evidence for candidates' portfolios. Candidate evidence had been mapped across and ticked off within the portfolio via an element achievement record or unit matrix.

Recommendations

- ◆ Some discussion took place around generating additional evidence during observations. Both assessors were given some methods for knowledge questions in terms of either having an additional questions template within each of the units or alternatively the assessor could add the oral question to the comments section of the observation checklist. There should be clear referencing of the responses within the appropriate unit checklist.
- ◆ Consideration of evidence submissions and looking at a variety of evidence to include technology such as video, audio and pictures/photos that may be challenging in hard copy portfolios.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. Assessment evidence is generated by different methods. Candidates completing online portfolios have their own password-protected area within the digital environment that only they, and the assessor/internal verifier, have permission and access to view. Where candidates are in a live environment they are directly observed by the assessor. If the assessor is not present, witness statements, video recordings or photographs are presented. In most centres candidates also signed an 'own work' declaration.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. It was clear from the review of qualification verification reports that the evidence sampled by external verifiers found assessor judgements to be consistent and accurate, meeting the requirements of the SVQ awards sampled. Standardisation meetings were used in all centres to support this process. Candidate evidence was mapped against the evidence requirements in the units within each SVQ. In all centres the internal verification process was clear and consistent and there was evidence of internal verification sampling taking place.

Recommendation

- ◆ Assessors should ensure that feedback is given on all candidate evidence submitted, and clear evidence of remediation should be recorded on the assessment documents including assessor signature, date of remediation and the method for remediation (eg verbal, using a digital platform).

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. All centres met SQA's requirements for retaining candidate evidence, many of them retaining evidence for longer than required to. There was evidence of archiving portfolios using digital platforms.

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

All centres were compliant with this criterion. It is clear that feedback from qualification verification reports is disseminated to relevant parties within centres. The content of these reports is then discussed at standardisation meetings. Minutes from these meetings record action points and how assessment practice is informed.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ Including a mental health unit for a candidate to complete when practical could not to be completed.
- ◆ Candidates appreciated the level of pastoral support they received after assessment observations.
- ◆ Candidates having access to their assessor on a daily basis is no doubt beneficial in terms of support and to identify any potential areas of concern that may arise.
- ◆ It was highlighted from the candidate interviews that the communication from the assessor was extremely beneficial, not only from the perspective of the qualification and employment, but also the welfare and wellbeing of the candidates through challenging periods of furlough for both the assessor and candidates. The check-ins to ensure all was OK shows a candidate-centred approach.
- ◆ Investment in candidates, and a candidate-centred approach, was evident. Level of detail and support to all candidates was demonstrated through conversations with assessors and internal verifiers as well as assessment evidence sampled. This included the rapport built with candidates and employers linked with the qualification.
- ◆ There was clear evidence of assessment planning in the candidate digital portfolios, for example candidates have access to a gap analysis tool that allows them to view areas where further knowledge and understanding will need to be completed.
- ◆ Internal verification tracking sheet recording robust verification of all candidates. Internal verification takes place with every candidate at least four times over the course of the qualification.

Specific areas for development

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

- ◆ Consideration of online platforms and e-portfolios. Given the circumstances and the evolution of the working environment and the increased prevalence of technology,

consideration of e-portfolios may benefit future candidates. This could link in to communication, instantaneous uploading of evidence, feedback and accessibility for assessors, internal verifiers and candidates.

- ◆ Continued development of an organised structure within portfolios, for example templates for performance criteria and knowledge and understanding elements across a range of units where applicable. This could include question sets and templates for reflective narrative and witness testimonies.
- ◆ Consideration of recording verbal conversations relating to standardisation and quality assurance practice. This could be a working document that allows constructive conversations to be recorded and captured.
- ◆ Consideration of a matrix grid for each candidate to provide an overview at course level rather than just unit level. This would provide a useful tool for an assessor to identify development areas as well as progression. For the candidates, this would allow them to see their course progression and detailed feedback. This could be looked at for assessment planning.
- ◆ Assessors should ensure that evidence being generated by each candidate should be cross-referenced against other mandatory and optional units where possible. This will reduce the candidate workload and over-assessment.
- ◆ Assessors should ensure that entries within the unit matrix grids for each unit are matched against the evidence requirements. There were some instances where entries had been made, but not referenced against any of the performance criteria.
- ◆ Some discussion took place around generating additional evidence during observations. Both assessors were given some methods for knowledge questions in terms of either having an additional questions template within each of the units or alternatively the assessor could add the oral question to the comments section of the observation checklist. There should be clear referencing of the responses within the appropriate unit checklist.
- ◆ Consideration of evidence submissions and looking at a variety of evidence to include technology such as video, audio and pictures/photos that may be challenging in hard copy portfolios.
- ◆ Assessors should ensure that feedback is given for all candidate evidence submitted, and clear evidence of remediation should be recorded on the assessment documents including assessor signature, date of remediation and the method for remediation (eg verbal, using a digital platform).