

## **Report on Monitoring Standards 2004**

### **SVQ: Care Level 2 (G3HT 22)**

Two experienced members of SQA's verifying team and an external specialist in the field judged assessment material and candidate evidence against the standards of the Units:

- BS68 04 *Promote Effective Communication and Relationships*
- B6S9 04 *Promote, Monitor and Maintain Health, Safety and Security in the Workplace*
- B6V3 04 *Contribute to the Protection of Individuals from Abuse*
- B7AX 04 *Foster People's Equality, Diversity and Rights*

Centres were asked to provide evidence for two candidates for each of the above Units. There were a total number of 32 judgements for assessment instruments and assessment decisions in 2004. Detailed comments for each Unit are included in the appendix.

#### **Quality of collected material**

Material for all of the Units apart from 'Foster People's Equality, Diversity and Rights' B7AX 04 was of a generally acceptable standard. Presentation for Unit B7AX 04 was not of a high standard as it is mainly assessed as a stand alone which is not good practice. Candidates often use 'learned language' without any clear identification that they understand the meaning or that they are genuinely applying the values of social care in a knowing and meaningful way.

#### **Assessment instruments**

Evidence is collected through direct observation or real work practice and candidates' reflective accounts of their work with individuals receiving care. It is appropriate that evidence is collected from real work practice. The level of demand is generally high for the job role of the candidates, this however has been addressed in the revision of the National Occupational Standards and new awards are designed to be more achievable. Guidance was prepared following extensive consultation with the Care Sector, which will provide an opportunity to introduce greater clarity and lessen the chance for individual interpretation of what is required to prove competence.

#### **Evidence of candidate performance**

The application of the standard was variable. There were however some examples of good practice which was caring and sensitive.

## **Assessment decisions**

Assessment decisions appeared acceptable in the main for Unit B6V3 04 although there was some evidence that assessors had stretched the meaning of the performance criteria through cross referencing which only just met the requirements. Assessment decisions were of a variable standard for the other Units, lacking standardisation across centres. Specific Unit comments are available in the appendix and also under ‘General Comments on the Units’ on page

## **Comparing standards over time**

Generally standards over time have remained much the same, based on the limited 1999 sample of evidence available.

## **General comments on the Units**

### *BS68 04 Promote Effective Communication and Relationships*

- ◆ majority completed as stand alone Unit although some centres have cross referenced
- ◆ knowledge evidence difficult to track and often over claimed
- ◆ candidates rarely signed work — assessor signatures missing

### *B6S904 Promote, Monitor and Maintain Health, Safety and Security in the Workplace*

- ◆ good integration of theory and practice overall
- ◆ over use of questioning in some instances
- ◆ certificates used as only evidence
- ◆ lack of standardisation in some centres.

### *B6V3 04 Contribute to the Protection of Individuals from Abuse*

- ◆ lack of standardisation across centres
- ◆ wide range of evidence produced
- ◆ knowledge evidence variable.

### *B7AX 04 Foster People’s Equality, Diversity and Rights*

- ◆ completed as stand alone when Unit requires to be integrated
- ◆ lack of observed practice
- ◆ knowledge evidence variable and at times inappropriate
- ◆ too much knowledge inferred.

### **Conclusions and recommendations** (applying to all the Units)

- ◆ centres need to be more aware of the evidence requirements, which are stated on the Unit descriptors
- ◆ more attention should be paid to the principles of good practice stated on the Unit descriptor
- ◆ missing signatures should be identified during internal verification
- ◆ assessors and internal verifiers should always provide feedback to candidate on completion of a Unit
- ◆ knowledge evidence needs to be more explicit with less reliance on questioning or inferred knowledge
- ◆ internal verification should not be second assessment, nor should it simply be a check list which has been ticked with no commentary or feedback
- ◆ cross referencing overall was poor, leading to over assessment of candidates
- ◆ use of pre prepared workbooks can provide good supplementary evidence, however should not be used alone as the only evidence for Units
- ◆ there was a real concern about the lack of standardisation within centres suggesting some internal verifiers are not clear about sufficiency of evidence
- ◆ some candidates are still taking years to complete, this would be helped by more use of contracts and greater monitoring through robust internal verification systems