



**Scottish Vocational Qualifications 2011
Internal Assessment Report
Customer Service**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Higher National and Scottish Vocational Qualifications in this subject.

SVQ awards

Titles/levels of SVQ awards verified

Customer Service level 1 (G8NM 21 and GA38 21)

Customer Service level 2 (G89X 22 and GA39 22)

Customer Service level 3 (G89W 23 and GA52 23)

Customer Service level 4 (G8NN 24 and GA3R24)

General comments

We have had a full programme of visits during 2010–11 with 24 external verification visits taking place. The visits were all successful with no Holds being placed. The visits for this session were mostly for the old awards (G8NM 21, G89X 22, G89W 23 and G8NN 24) with the new awards being seen at the end of the session.

The awards are, in the vast majority of centres, delivered effectively and candidates have produced work of a good standard which is presented in a clear, accessible format.

Almost all External Verifier (EV) reports commented on the high level of commitment of the staff at centres. It is encouraging that centres generally responded well to development points in previous EV reports and this also contributed to the good standard of delivery of the awards.

The new SVQs in Customer Service became live in January 2011. The new standards are very similar to the old awards. The SVQs retain the same themes and many of the Units will be familiar to existing users. However, it is important to note that the structures of the awards are more complex than the previous awards and, as such, centres should carefully consider the options available, ensuring they meet the requirements of the full SVQ.

The reports confirm that centres continue to find the standards easy to work with. The new awards enable centres to give more choice to candidates, which helps to fit Units in an SVQ Customer Service as closely as possible to the needs of the candidates and the employers.

The trend towards e-portfolios has continued, even where electronic systems are not used directly for delivery, considerable use is being made of electronic methods to record candidate progress and to enhance communication between the assessment teams and between candidates and their assessors.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Evidence from EV visit reports suggests that assessors are very familiar with and confident in using the specifications to assess candidates. The assessment methods used are robust, varied and fit for purpose. The assessors' consistent judgement of candidates' performance also demonstrates sound knowledge of the requirements of the awards.

Evidence Requirements

The current awards are now very familiar to assessors and Internal Verifiers (IVs); the Evidence Requirements are clear to assessors and are referenced separately in the portfolios.

Administration of assessments

All assessors and IVs are subject specialists and occupationally competent, as specified in the assessment strategy.

The EVs have recorded that assessment plans, reviews and internal verification records meet the requirements of the strategy.

Clear feedback and recommendations are being given by the IVs with any action being recorded by the assessors.

Internal verification strategies vary from centre to centre, but all meet the requirements.

All centres have regular standardisation meetings which are well documented.

Staff records of continuing professional development are kept up to date in all cases.

Further general feedback

The quality and quantity of feedback given by assessors on candidate performance was adequate and supportive. Feedback from candidates indicates that they value the awards, the candidates are happy with the support given, and the quality of provision and feedback both pre- and post-assessment.

There was evidence of fair access to assessment. This was achieved through the individual assessment plans and negotiated assessment with the candidates and the employers. Where necessary, assessors were willing to work outside normal hours to meet the needs of the candidates.

While CPD activities carried out by assessors and IVs are adequate, it is important that the nature and record of the CPD activities should be accurate and up to date. Also, where appropriate, the CPD activities should be varied and extended to reflect the learning and development needs of the assessors and IVs.

Areas of good practice

There were examples of good practice noted in most reports. A recurring theme has been the quality of the candidates and the work being produced. Assessment decisions were valid and reliable.

Evidence in the portfolios was clearly structured with cross-referencing from the optional Units into the mandatory Units. There were excellent examples of evidence-tracking checklists which were used to track evidence against performance criteria, knowledge and Evidence Requirements.

Portfolios were easy to follow with good numbering systems used. Centres were aware of the requirement to follow the Customer Service assessment strategy. There was evidence of good use of professional discussions. Witness signature lists were used to help identify those involved with the assessment. Level 3 candidates were in appropriate job roles to enable the achievement of the award.

Many of the points of good practice have been mentioned in previous reports but it is worth mentioning some of them again:

- ◆ The use of e-portfolios.
- ◆ More and better use of digital voice and video recording.
- ◆ Improvement in procedures and development of documentation.

- ◆ Professional discussion is well structured.
- ◆ Issues of confidentiality being dealt with by using signposting, witness testimony and discussion.
- ◆ Good support for candidates.
- ◆ Good preparation for EV visits.
- ◆ Implementation of development points from EV visits.
- ◆ Spreading internal verification throughout life of the portfolio, rather than end-loading.

Specific areas for improvement

The SVQs in Customer Service are now very familiar to assessors and IVs so the areas for improvement are limited.

Development points tend to be about minor issues, eg missing dates, missed signatures, the wrong title being given to evidence.

The visits for this session have all been successful with no Holds and no major problems being reported.

It is worth mentioning the following points:

- ◆ It is important that CPD records indicate what was gained from the CPD activity and how this will be implemented.
- ◆ Evidence must be clearly annotated to show what it is and how it meets the performance criteria.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged to get their line manager/supervisor to authenticate their evidence.
- ◆ Where Performance Evidence is not included in the portfolio, it should be clearly signposted.
- ◆ Documents which contain sensitive information can be made anonymous.