



NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Care
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	September 2024

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H21E 74	National 4	Care: Investigating Services Assignment
J22S 75	SCQF level 5	Care: Social Influences
H21C 74	National 4	Care: Values and Principles
J22Y 75	SCQF level 5	Care: Values and Principles
J230 76	SCQF level 6	Care: Values and Principles

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres that submitted evidence for the Care Added Value Unit provided either a centre-produced assessment or had adapted SQA's added value unit assessment support (UAS) pack. SQA's UAS pack provides commentary on assessment judgements that centres may have found useful.

As required, all centres provided candidates with a range of suitable case study scenarios to choose from and most provided sufficient detail for the candidate to apply psychological and/or sociological concepts. Best practice was demonstrated by the provision of case study scenarios that represented individuals from a range of different cultural backgrounds and in sufficient numbers to enable candidates to choose one that met their personal preferences or interests.

For Assessment Standard 1.6, all centres provided helpful prompts to candidates to ensure they knew what evidence was required. A few centres gave their candidates an hour to complete the task with the assistance of an A4 sheet of their own notes. There are benefits

to this approach, however centres should ensure that candidates are provided with extra time where required, otherwise this would be an unnecessary barrier to achievement for some candidates.

For units at SCQF levels 4, 5 and 6, all centres adapted the appropriate SQA unit assessment support pack, and most did this effectively. The UAS pack provides useful commentary on assessment standards, but centres should ensure their assessments comply with the assessment standard thresholds outlined in the most up-to-date unit specifications. While candidates are expected to be given the opportunity to meet all assessment standards, they will be judged to have passed the unit overall and no further re-assessment is required if they meet the assessment standard thresholds. For example, for Assessment Standard 1.1 in the *Care: Values and Principles* Unit Specifications at National 4 and at SCQF level 5 — candidates have to be given the opportunity to describe or explain the needs of two individuals who use care services but do not need to be re-assessed for 1.1 if they meet the threshold of describing or explaining the needs of only one individual who uses care services.

For National 4 units, a few centres used an assessment that required candidates to populate tables with evidence, with each row of each table clearly identifying the information required to meet the relevant assessment standard. This is good practice at National 4 level as it organises the work for the candidate and provides an exemplar for how the candidate might organise their assessment submissions on other occasions; it reduces the likelihood of candidates omitting required evidence; and potentially reduces marking time for the assessor.

For units at SCQF levels 4, 5 and 6, most centres provided assessments that clearly identified the unit title and code, assessment instructions and assessment standards. Good practice was also demonstrated by centres who obtained signed statements from candidates to confirm that the submission was all their own work and that any content by other authors had been clearly acknowledged and referenced.

A few centres appeared to have collated candidate evidence from a number of sources, and in these circumstances, it is important that records clearly indicate the source of evidence for each assessment standard. Evidence should also be clearly labelled with the candidate's name and the assessment standard which it relates to.

Assessment judgements

The assessment judgements for all centres were in line with national standards, reliable and accepted. The assessment judgements for some units were accepted*, which means accepted with recommendations.

In the assessment feedback for units at SCQF levels 4, 5 and 6, a few centres highlighted where candidates had achieved and/or needed to be re-assessed but had omitted to include words of recognition or encouragement and this could be de-motivating for candidates. Assessors demonstrated best practice when their feedback to candidates was balanced, positive and encouraging.

A few centres had examples of being inconsistent with the amount and quality of feedback given to individual candidates within the same cohort. Candidates who require re-

assessment may require more detailed feedback than others but where two candidates achieve the assessment standard, they should receive similar levels of recognition and reward.

A few centres were severe in their assessment judgements and only accepted evidence if it was presented in a particular section of the candidate's submission, even if it was clearly visible in another part of their submission. In the interests of fairness, a holistic approach to assessment judgements should be adopted in these circumstances where practicable.

A few centres provided examples of assessment judgements that were lenient.

Standardisation meetings, cross marking, robust internal verification processes and the use of assessment exemplars should support assessors to consistently judge the evidence to assessment standards.

Section 3: general comments

Most centres presented documentation that indicated effective internal quality assurance systems were in place. This ensures that candidates were assessed accurately, fairly and to national standards. The internal verification toolkit provides useful guidance and is available here: www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit

Good practice was demonstrated by pre-delivery meetings and documentation that was more than a checklist of tasks completed, and provided guidance on approaches to teaching, assessment and assessment judgements based on prior knowledge and experience. This support facilitates the principles of assessment — validity, reliability, equitability, fairness and practicability.

Good practice was demonstrated by centres who provided marking guidelines that clearly specified assessment standard thresholds.

A few centres provided documented professional feedback and guidance from the internal verifier to the assessor, and this promoted consistency of standards across assessors. On occasion it also provided useful recognition and support to the assessor.

A few centres asked candidates to leave first submission attempts intact and to highlight new evidence in bold, and/or in a different font or font colour — this practice enables new evidence to be quickly identified and assessed. Good practice was demonstrated by centres using methods of recording assessment feedback and outcomes that clearly distinguish between first submissions and re-assessments.

Many centres used standardised candidate feedback forms and candidate assessment records to track and record progress and outcomes. These are invaluable to quality processes and examples of SQA's Candidate Assessment Records can be adapted from the unit assessment support packs.

A course team approach to supporting the teaching and assessment process was evident in a few centres and this promotes the validity and reliability of assessments and assessment judgements.