



SQA Advanced Qualification (China)

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024

Computer Science

Verification group number: 357

Introduction

There were only four verification events for this group in session 2023–24. This involved two centres only, with each having a generic verification (not covering criteria 2.1, 4.3 or 4.6) and a unit verification covering criteria 2.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.6. All verification was carried out virtually.

Group award: GM5A 48 — Computing Software Development

Units:

HP1T 47 — Computer Systems Fundamentals

HP2K 48 — Software Development — Data Structures

HP2M 48 — Systems Development Object Oriented Analysis and Design

HP2P 47 — Software Development — Programming Foundations

HP1R 47 — Developing Software Introduction

HP2D 48 — Scripting for Interactivity

HP2E 47 — SQL — Introduction

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.

CVs and CPD records for all staff involved in delivery, assessment and internal verification were made available as requested and reviewed by the verifier. All CPD logs were found to be clear and included valid and current CPD activities that had taken place.

All assessors and internal verifiers have relevant qualifications and experience in relation to the subject area and the roles in which they are involved.

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

Centres provided policy documentation in relation to the review process. This was supported by completed checklists in relation to equipment, learning and reference materials and currency of award materials such as unit specification and ASPs.

All evidence reviewed confirmed that structured and effective review processes are in place and that these are being followed.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

Centres provided a range of documents in support of this criterion, including details of English language requirements, academic entry requirements and evidence of candidate support systems. Course outlines/timetables and teaching plans were also provided which included tutorial support.

In all instances, centres provided evidence of student support taking place. The verifier noted that in all instances, centres were proactive in student support and pastoral care.

All centres provided information relating to the range of support services and information that candidates can access.

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

In all instances, evidence was provided which detailed staff availability including contact details and individual office hours. In all cases it was found that candidates have a wide range of options to contact assessors outwith class.

Course timetables were made available, as were teaching and assessment plans. These are also made available to candidates.

Course timetables show when formal class contact takes place for all of the subjects each semester. They also show availability of staff to ask questions and seek help. In all instances, centres have the necessary operational contact systems and procedures to allow candidates to review their progress and provide support when necessary.

In all instances, details of the range of support services available to help support candidates throughout the duration of their course were found to be extensive and well publicised to candidates.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Centres made their internal verification handbooks available, which were found to be in line with SQA requirements.

All units in the requested samples had been subject to pre-delivery verification and this was supported by minutes of standardisation meetings.

All scripts provided by centres had been subject to internal verification processes and were supported by signed documentation to support the process having taken place.

Checklists were supplied for all candidate scripts and signed and dated by assessors and verifiers.

Verification processes were found to be carried out effectively.

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

All instruments of assessment were found to be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

In all instances, the primary assessment for all units was the SQA CASP. Backup or secondary assessments were provided and these had been devised by centres and were of the same standard as the SQA CASPs.

All instruments of assessment used had been prior verified by SQA and had also undergone internal verification and pre-delivery checks. This was supported by internal verification documentation.

The assessment approach to all units reviewed was found to be fully valid.

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

Centres supplied copies of current plagiarism policy documentation. These were found to be extensive and fully met SQA's requirements.

Centres also supplied candidate assessor handbooks. In all instances, these documents had sections on the centre's policies and procedures for plagiarism and malpractice (centre and candidate).

In support of assessment authenticity, candidate declaration forms were provided.

It was found that all centres have valid procedures in place and that this is being well communicated to staff and candidates.

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

The verifier reviewed all scripts sent for review and noted that the standard of candidate work was high.

All evidence was well presented and easy to follow in terms of marking decisions and compliance with evidence requirements.

There were a few instances of remediation having taken place and this was clearly identified and updates were appropriate.

Clear feedback and internal verification evidence was noted on all the scripts reviewed and in all instances the verifier fully accepted all the centre's assessment judgements.

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

All centres were found to have clear policies in relation to assessment materials and records.

Details of methods for secure storage, including retention periods, were provided and in all cases this exceeded SQA's requirements, but is necessary to meet centre requirements.

It is evident that all procedures were being followed by documentation or photographic evidence being provided.

In terms of assessment records, in all instances they are retained beyond the period of evidence retention in line with the centre's own requirements for audit purposes.

All retention of assessment evidence and records were compliant with SQA requirements.

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

In all instances, centres provided policy which detailed dissemination of feedback. This was also supported by copies of minutes which showed this as being discussed and recorded. In addition, all centres provided a copy of a circulation list.

Documentary evidence was seen that confirms that if any actions are required these will be dealt with by the course team and supervised by the SQA Co-ordinator. This was seen to be considered in completed internal verification records.,

In all instances, centre staff are regularly in attendance at feedback sessions that take place as part of the virtual verification process.

In all instances, centres evidenced fully operational systems for circulation of QV reports from SQA.