

Report on Monitoring Standards 2004

SVQ: Using Information Technology G5F0 — level 2

A Scrutiny Panel consisting of two experienced members of SQA's verifying team and one external specialist in the field of IT judged assessment material and candidate evidence against the standards of the Units:

B7WE 04 (206)	<i>Ensure your Own Actions Reduce the Risk to Health and Safety</i>
D2N3 04 (208)	<i>Improve Your Own Effectiveness in the Information Working Environment</i>
D2N2 04 (204)	<i>Contribute to the Effectiveness of the Information Technology Working Environment</i>
D2N1 04 (201)	<i>Enable the Use of Information Technology</i>

Centres were asked to provide evidence for two candidates for each of the above Units. There were a total number of 58 judgements for assessment instruments and assessment decisions in 2004.

Quality of collected material

The scrutiny panel judged that for Unit B7WE 04 *Ensure your Own Actions Reduce the Risk to Health and Safety*, the quality of presentation ranged from 'satisfactory' to 'excellent'.

For the other three Units, the quality of assembly of materials for monitoring was, in some cases, lacking. Certain requested materials were missing from submitted evidence. Some examples of totally inappropriate/unacceptable submissions were provided in relation to the material requested by SQA for monitoring purposes

Assessment instruments

The instrument of assessment for Unit B7WE had an appropriate level of candidate demand and most centres demonstrated integration within and across Outcomes. For this Unit, in the vast majority of cases, conditions of assessment were not provided with the monitoring evidence (where provided they were acceptable) nor was guidance on criteria for pass and validity to performance criteria and range.

For the other three Units, using observations to summarise individual assessment techniques, obscures appropriate candidate evidence. It should be made clear which performance criteria were observed on each occasion. There is confusion between assessors observing candidate evidence production, and the actual product evidence generated by candidates. If an assessment is observed, product evidence from the activity should also be submitted.

Evidence of candidate performance

For the other three Units, the candidate descriptions of evidence items were often unclear. Some evidence items were missing in portfolios, although performance criteria were awarded to the candidate. No evidence of assessor endorsement of evidence items was present in some cases. Cross-referencing of evidence items to performance criteria and across Units is not acceptable in certain cases where the Units in question were not submitted for monitoring. Inconsistencies were noted in the recording and claiming of evidence items against performance criteria, range etc. It was not possible to determine whether evidence items were candidate generated or are handouts (in some cases). A lack of cross-referencing between evidence items and performance criteria made the exercise difficult especially within the time available

Assessment decisions

The scrutiny panel's view was that Unit B7WE was adequately assessed, recorded and awarded. There was variability of assessment practices for the other three Units (please refer to comments under 'Evidence of candidate performance' which apply).

Comparing standards over time

Standards for this VQ changed in 1999 and this made the task of comparing 2004 evidence with that submitted for 1999 more challenging. No decision about the rigour with which standards are being applied in 2004 as compared to 1999 was recorded by the Scrutiny Panel.

Recommendations

The following comments apply to the other three Units outlined above.

Recommendations

- ◆ the evidence from claims involving other qualifications or awards should be explicitly provided within the candidate portfolio
- ◆ results should not be recorded on copied documentation. Any outdated IV signatures and dates imply that the IV process is in doubt
- ◆ using observations to summarise individual assessment techniques, obscures appropriate candidate evidence. It should be made clear which performance criteria were observed on each occasion
- ◆ evidence and result grids should be filed/stored together in candidates' portfolios
- ◆ there is confusion between assessors observing candidate evidence production and the actual product evidence generated by candidates. If an assessment is observed, product evidence from the activity should also be submitted
- ◆ SQA should amend the forms used in the monitoring exercise to more effectively meet the requirements of SVQ qualifications — they are currently designed to facilitate reporting on HN standards