# SQA Advanced Qualification (China)

# Qualification Verification Summary Report 2024

# Information Technology

**Verification group number: 288**

# Introduction

All verification in this group was unit verification and therefore only criteria 2.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.6 were verified. There were only six verification events within this group. Four of these reviewed were in relation to unit HP6L 47 which sits in a number of group awards, while the remaining events focused on computing awards.

**Group awards**

GPON 48 – Financial Services

GR3K 48 – Hospitality Management

**Unit**

HP6L 47 - Information Technology Applications Software 1


**Group award**

GM5A 48 Computing Software Development

**Units**

HP1X 47 – Team Working in Computing
HP21 47 – Computing Introduction to Project Management

HP1V 47 – Troubleshooting Computing Problems
HP29 47 – Professionalism and Ethics in Computing
HP2H 48 – Self Describing Data (XML)

# 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.

# 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.

Overall, internal assessment and verification was found to be carried out effectively and centres provided completed records to demonstrate this.

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

All scripts provided by the 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.

## 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. In a few instances of unit HP6L 47, the CASP had been used as a basis to centre divided contextualised assessment which was found to be appropriate and met the required standard.

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

In most cases, a sample of 12 was provided. This is a good sized sample to provide an overview of consistency in marking. The verifier reviewed all scripts sent for review and noted that, in all cases, the standard of candidate work was high. It was noted that some errors had been made and these were identified correctly by the assessor. In most cases, there was evidence of re-do of some elements for unit HP6L 47. This was found to be identified correctly by assessors and feedback given to candidates to indicate what needed to be amended.

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

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.