

# Qualification Verification - Visit 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>83542</b>		
Centre Name	<b>Sports Academy (Scotland) Ltd</b>	Centre Number	<b>3005860</b>
External Verifier Name	<b>Alan Beattie</b>	External Verifier Contact Details	<b>candalan@aol.com</b>
Double Banker Name (if applicable)		Date of Visit	<b>21 Dec 15</b>
Head of Centre Name	<b>Mr Eric Dawes</b>	Head of Centre Email Address	<b>eric@sportsacademyofscotland.org</b>
SQA Co-ordinator Name	<b>Mr Eric Dawes</b>	Centre Email Address	<b>eric@sportsacademyofscotland.org</b>
Verification Group	<b>SVQ Sport and Active Leisure</b>	VG Code	<b>199</b>
Verification Block	<b>SV</b>		
Units Allocated	<b>G927 23,GK77 23</b>	Sites Visited	<b>Cumbernauld - Westerwood.</b>
Actual Units Verified (if different from allocation)	<b>All live Units in use within G927 23. Candidates are at the moment only registered with this award.</b>		
	<b>There are no candidates at this time for GK77 23.</b>		

Summary of Visit		
	Outcome Statement	Non-Compliant Criteria
Resources	<b>Significant Strengths identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group</b>	
Candidate Support	<b>Significant Strengths identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group</b>	
Internal Assessment and Verification	<b>Significant Strengths identified in the maintenance of SQA standards within this Verification Group</b>	

Sanctions	
-----------	--

Records of Discussions	
Discussions with Candidates	No
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	
Discussions with Staff	Yes
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	As indicated, 4 staff were available on the day of the visit and this allowed a good discussion on the assessments, plans and other SQA requirements. All staff were very experienced in SQA awards and were actively involved in the sector.  It was clear from the discussion that all worked in close harmony to support the candidates in their tasks and that approach is commendable
Discussions with Assessors and/or IV	Yes
if YES, please provide a brief summary of the discussion:	As above as both assessors and IVs were actively involved in the discussions.

## 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	Required Action	Evidence Type / Required By Date	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>	All well qualified and have been delivering the award for some years. All have long and history within the sector and remain working within that sector. This was put to good effect in the support given to the learners.				
2.4	There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.	High	<b>Green</b>	The centre had minutes of frequent meetings to ensure that all proforma and procedures were kept up to date and the proforma in use were dated for use each year. This demonstrated the currency of the materials in use.  All were very much up to date.				

## Candidate Support

	Criteria	Impact	Compliance Level	Comments	Required Action	Evidence Type / Required By Date	Good Practice	Recommendations
3.2	Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.	Medium	<b>Green</b>	Candidates were all employed within the industry and had (as players) some years of experience in the game(s). Prior to embarking on the award, all were interviewed and during the award there were very frequent review meetings. This supported APL and individual planning and allowed prior skills and experience to be utilised to best advantage.				
3.3	Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.	Medium	<b>Green</b>	<p>Candidates have both formal and informal contact for monitoring purposes and have both phone and email contact at any time this is needed.</p> <p>Candidates were clearly well supported with the contacts and all had review meetings in support of their own performance and assessment plans were well documented.</p>			The breadth and depth of support within the records was of a high order.	

## Internal Assessment and Verification

	Criteria	Impact	Compliance Level	Comments	Required Action	Evidence Type / Required By Date	Good Practice	Recommendations
4.2	Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.	Medium	<b>Green</b>	The records of assessment and the details of the Internal verification undertaken along with the feedback to the assessor was of a high order. There was evidence of standardisation being recorded clearly.				
4.3	Assessment instruments and methods and their selection and use must be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.	High	<b>Green</b>	All instruments in use were fair and valid. Much of the award is of a practical nature and this had been assessed by clearly documented observation and comment.  Knowledge had been assessed by selected questions and recorded responses.				
4.4	Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.	High	<b>Green</b>	All candidates were aware of the policies relating to this requirement. Most work was assessed under observation conditions and candidates were well known to their assessor. Discussions with candidates would show up any discrepancies should that be an issue.  All met SQA requirements.				
4.6	Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.	High	<b>Green</b>	Staff held regular standardisation meetings and samples of candidate work had been discussed (and recorded) by the assessors to ensure that SQA requirements were being met in full. This was as stated, well documented.				
4.7	Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.	High	<b>Green</b>	The centre had policies in place to ensure that material were kept for longer than required by SQA due to other regulatory requirements.				

4.9	Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.	Medium	<b>Green</b>	There was recorded evidence of the sharing of reports and other documentation and in fact previous reports had been signed by all staff involved. Any actions were also clearly recorded.				
-----	---	--------	--------------	---	--	--	--	--

<b>Summary of Feedback to Centre</b>	<p>The centre had made effective use of staff experience and their operational competence to support the award and to support the learners well.</p> <p>The centre while delivering in several sites, had adopted a standardised approach where possible to ensure that all received fair treatment and staff felt well supported and valued. That was clear from discussions.</p> <p>Documentation was well recorded and that helped both the Internal and External verification process.</p> <p>The centre will in due course move to the revised NOS and will take that opportunity to ensure the update of material where required.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

Name of Centre Representative present during feedback	
Name	Designation
Eric Dawes	Eric Dawes

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
Eric Dawes	A	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34,35	
Eric Dawes	IV	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34,35	
Tom Docherty	A	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34	
Tom Docherty	IV	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34	
Marco McIntyre	A	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34	
Marco McIntyre	IV	G927 23	Yes	D32,33,34	
Patricia Keppie	A	G927 23	No	D32,33,34	
Patricia Keppie	IV	G927 23	No	D32,33,34	
John Ritchie	A	G927 23	Yes	A1	
John Ritchie	IV	G927 23	Yes		L&D911 March 2016
Colin Ireland	A	G927 23	No	A1,A2	
Colin Ireland	IV	G927 23	No	A1,A2	

<b>Evidence Seen</b>	The centre had a large number of candidates and a selection was made from portfolios from every site, Assessor and Internal Verifier. This allowed the work of all staff to be sampled for all Units in use, many being finished with some still being completed.
<b>Spontaneous Sample</b>	The centre had gathered (as agreed) a large number of portfolios from different sites and assessors and so the sampling was a case of selecting samples from the portfolios brought as requested.
<b>General Information</b>	The centre had been delivering the award for a number of years and had now a substantial number of candidates spread across the country. Assessors and IVs worked as a team to ensure that assessments were standardised and that all received equitable treatment. The team involved with assessment and verification had years of experience in the award and this had been put to effective use in the support and guidance being given to the learners.
<b>Observation of Assessment Practice</b>	Not undertaken on this visit.

Details of feedback for SQA	
<b>Feedback to ASV</b>	N/A

<b>Feedback to QV</b>	N/A
-----------------------	-----

<b>Previous Recommendations</b>
No points had been raised on the previous visit.