

Report on Monitoring Standards 2004

SVQ: Food & Drink Manufacturing Operations G5SP level 2

An *experienced member of SQA's verifying team judged assessment material and candidate evidence against the standards of the Units:

- D6V8 04 *Contribute to Health and Safety in Food and Drink Manufacturing*
- D6V9 04 *Maintain Hygiene Standards in Food and Drink Manufacturing Operations*
- D6VA 04 *Work with Others in a Food and Drink Manufacturing Environment*
- D6VB 04 *Diagnose and Rectify Operating Problems*
- D6VC 04 *Maintain Product Quality*

The volume of evidence was manageable for a reduced scrutiny team and the exercise went ahead on the basis of one verifier only.

Centres were asked to provide evidence for two candidates for each of the above Units. There were a total number of 28 judgements for assessment instruments and assessment decisions in 2004. Detailed comments for the each Unit are summarised in the appendix.

Quality of collected material

The quality of presentation and record keeping ranged from good to excellent. Overall, the quality was very satisfactory.

Assessment instruments

The instruments of assessment were fit for the purpose intended. A diverse range of question types were used in assessing candidates' learning. There was variability within centres in the use of integrated assessments. Where integration has been used it worked very well. Centres should be encouraged to make more effective use of integration. The level of demand of the assessment instruments was appropriate for the level intended.

The assessment was carried out under real working conditions as detailed in the assessment plan enabling the observation of performance and gathering of natural evidence to support achievement of competence. Appropriate guidance was given on the criteria for pass, standard of performance required for a competent performance and validity to PCs and range. In addition, centres gave guidance on non achievement of the required standard.

Evidence of candidate performance

There was improved quality of record keeping since the last monitoring exercise. However, the overall presentation for some of the centres' Candidates Achievement Record (CAR) and tracking documents need to be further improved on. Evidence of integration of assessment inter- and intra Outcomes and Units making learning more authentic and holistic as well as engendering in the candidates the ability to apply gained knowledge and skills in different contexts and situations was available. In addition, integrated assessments were used appropriately, reduced the assessment workload for both candidates and assessors. There was overall consistency in the application of standards to both the questions used in assessing the candidates' learning and in judging candidates' performance. The assessment and candidates' performance were in line with national standards.

Assessment decisions

Generally, assessment decisions were accurate and consistent within centres and across assessors. There was overall consistency in the application of standards to both the questions used in assessing the candidates' learning and in judging candidates' performance.

Comparing standards over time

Evidence available from the materials scrutinised for all five modules in terms of instruments of assessment and candidates' responses suggest that the qualification standard in 2004 is very much comparable with that in 1999. This is based on the fact that most centres are using questions drawn from a Question Bank (with answers prepared) by the professional body and/or the National Training Organisation (NTO), although the questions have been contextualised to suit the centre's processing food operations.

Where centres have made up their own questions, they mostly modelled those along the questions available in the Question Bank. Where appropriate, centres should clearly indicate which form of assessment they are using for example oral test or multiple choice questions (MCQs). If oral test is used, it should be indicated that the responses on the candidates' answer sheet were scribed by the assessor.

Whilst standards are comparably the same, there is a marked improvement in the assessment process.

General comments on Units

Overall, the Units were fit for the purpose intended.

Recommendations

Centres should:

- ◆ clearly identify the CAR and the tracking documents, Centre, the candidate's name, the Unit title and Number, etc
- ◆ clearly indicate which form of assessment they are using. The assessment plan should state whether the test is an oral test, multiple choice questions (MCQs) or a combination of questions, etc. Where an oral test is used, it should be indicated that the responses on the candidates' answer sheet were scribed by the assessor
- ◆ be encouraged and supported by both SQA and the team of moderators to make more effective use of integrated assessments inter- and intra-Outcomes and Units where appropriate