

# Qualification Verification - Report

Qualification verification is the process we use to confirm that SQA centres comply with the quality assurance criteria and are assessing their candidates in line with national standards. Guidance for centres relating to the qualification verification visit can be found at [www.sqa.org.uk/qualityassurance](http://www.sqa.org.uk/qualityassurance).

Event ID	<b>93864</b>		
Centre Name	<b>SQA Operations</b>	Centre Number	<b>9994971</b>
External Verifier Name	<b>Iain Walker</b>	External Verifier Contact Details	<b>iain.walker@sky.com</b>
Double Banker Name (if applicable)		Date of Visit	<b>26 Oct 17</b>
Head of Centre Name	<b>Miss Lisa Robertson</b>	Head of Centre Email Address	<b>qav@sqa.org.uk</b>
SQA Co-ordinator Name	<b>Miss Lisa Robertson</b>	Centre Email Address	<b>qav@sqa.org.uk</b>
Verification Group	<b>Economics</b>	VG Code	<b>258</b>
Verification Block	<b>NA</b>		
Sites Visited	<b>Central verification event</b>		
Actual Units Verified (if different from allocation)	<b>F391 11 Example Graded Unit 1</b> <b>F5G3 10 Example Graded Unit 2</b>		

Summary of Visit		
	Outcome Statement	Non-Compliant Criteria
Resources	<b>High Confidence identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group</b>	
Candidate Support	<b>High Confidence identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group</b>	
Internal Assessment and Verification	<b>Reasonable Confidence identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group. Moderate risks exist within this category</b>	<b>Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.</b>

Sanctions	Entry in Action Plan
-----------	----------------------

Records of Discussions	
Discussions with Candidates	No
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	
Discussions with Staff	No
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	
Discussions with Assessors and/or IV	No
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	

# Outcome Summary

2.1	2.4				
3.2	3.3				
4.2	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.9

## Resources

	Criteria	Impact	Compliance Level	Comments	Agreed Action	Good Practice	Recommendations
2.1	Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.	High	<b>Green</b>	Records of work experience and CPD were provided along with copies of qualification certificates that are relevant to the awards being delivered. Both the Assessor and Internal Verifier hold post graduate business qualifications and have delivered SQA awards for over 5 years. Both attended the last two Professional Development Conferences and had attended workshops with their SIM. The records of the verification/standardisation meetings provided further evidence that staff are experienced, know their subjects and how the SQA awards work. There were records evidencing that the Centre holds SQA training events which were attended by the Assessor and Internal Verifier.			
2.4	There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.	High	<b>N/A</b>				

## Candidate Support

	Criteria	Impact	Compliance Level	Comments	Agreed Action	Good Practice	Recommendations
3.2	Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.	Medium	N/A				
3.3	Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.	Medium	N/A				

## Internal Assessment and Verification

	Criteria	Impact	Compliance Level	Comments	Agreed Action	Good Practice	Recommendations
4.2	Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.	Medium	<b>Green</b>	Completed verification reports were presented along with minutes and records of meetings including standardisation activity. There communication taking place between the staff involved is evident in the meeting records and showed comprehensive discussions relating to standardisation and marking. The internal verifier has made some alterations to marks, and the centre is implementing the internal qualification process well.		The centre is using the internal quality assurance system particularly well demonstrating that there is excellent communication between staff. It is this interaction and discussion that is so important in helping to determine the correct results. The staff have worked hard to get the grades right and are commended for their efforts.	
4.3	Assessment instruments and methods and their selection and use must be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.	High	<b>Green</b>	The assessments have been passed through the pre-delivery check and accepted as part of the quality assurance process. Minutes of meetings record discussions relating to the assessments and marking over a period of time, showing that there is an ongoing process in place. This is the sign of a centre that understands and is engaged with the way that the verification process should work.			
4.4	Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.	High	<b>Green</b>	The Centre has a policy relating to malpractice. All candidates sign an authenticity declaration at the examination. The centre has produced an Assessment Summary Report that confirms assessment conditions were followed and other assessment matters. The assessor and internal verifier are experienced and alert to the possibility of malpractice.			

4.6	Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.	High	<b>Green</b>	The marking has been thorough and it is noted that there were some minor alterations based upon internal verification checks. There were comments provided by the Assessor where there was a need to explain a marking decision, and these demonstrated a confident and competent approach was in place. The records relating to the marking are clear and there has been a reasoned and considered approach, with internal verification being supportive and helping to finalise marks. The two samples are accepted through qualification verification.		The approach to marking in recording discussions, and completing feedback on the marking are excellent. The Assessor has put a lot of effort into ensuring that marks are justified, and where a candidate goes astray the markers comments are very helpful. This is a good example of how things should be done.	In F391 11 there are two candidates with a mark of 48% and 49% respectively. Where candidates achieve 45% to 49% a review can in some cases (but not necessarily all cases) identify additional marks. There is no guarantee but some marginal fails may justifiably have their mark raised. Care has to be exercised in the review but it is important that this is undertaken as there are sometimes responses where an addition mark or so can be justified converting a fail to a pass.
4.7	Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.	High	<b>Amber</b>	Whilst the Centre has provided the samples of candidate evidence requested, no retention policy has been provided and there is no indication that the SQA retention requirements are being fully met. There is a note in the May course team minutes that records situations where candidate evidence is being disposed of immediately at the end of each semester, rather than being retained for the prescribed period beyond the end of a semester. This indicates that the SQA requirements are not always being met and that there is a lack of understanding over this important requirement.	The Centre must provide its retention of evidence policy that must meet SQA requirements. It must detail the period evidence is retained for, and the security measures in place to protect the evidence. The Centre must also provide course team minutes showing that the matter has been discussed and that there is an understanding that candidate evidence must be securely retained for at least the minimum period specified by SQA, and also record where staff can access the full policy document		
4.9	Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.	Medium	<b>N/A</b>		<b>N/A</b>		

<b>Summary of Feedback to Centre</b>	The Centre has many positive strengths with regard to the processes in place for marking and checking grades of the two graded units, and for providing CPD opportunities for their staff. One area of weakness was identified relating to the retention of candidate evidence, and an action has been set that will allow this to be rectified.
--------------------------------------	--

Name of Centre Representative present during feedback	
Name	Designation
Not applicable	

Assessors / IV					
Name of Assessor/IV	Assessor/IV	Awards/Units Sampled (eg. enter the codes and levels - G123 21)	Interviewed on the visit (Yes/No)	Assessor/Verifier Qualifications Achieved if applicable	Assessor/Verifier qualifications being worked towards with target dates
A. N. Assessor	A		No	SQA training events	
I. Verifier	IV		No	SQA training events	

<b>Evidence Seen</b>	A full sample was provided for the Central Verification event for both Units as per SQA requirements. The samples included scripts across all grades.
<b>Spontaneous Sample</b>	Sample as per SQA requirements for Central Verification.
<b>General Information</b>	All evidence required was submitted.
<b>Observation of Assessment Practice</b>	NA at Central Verification.

Previous Recommendations
The last report recommended that staff should attend the Professional Development Conference if possible. This has now taken place for the past two years.

Agreed Action Date/Type	
<b>Agreed Action Date</b>	15 Nov 2017
<b>Evidence Type</b>	Electronic