



THE FOLLOWING IS TAKEN FROM CARE SCOTLAND'S STANDARDISATION EVENT WORKSHOPS. THE WORKSHOPS EXAMINED THE EXPECTATIONS THAT CENTRES HAVE REGARDING EVs, AND WHAT EXPECTATIONS THE EVs THEMSELVES HAVE.

THE POINTS RAISED DO NOT CONSTITUTE OFFICIAL SQA POLICY, MERELY REFLECTING THE ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF THE CENTRES AND EVs WHO TOOK PART IN THE EVENTS.

Standardisation Event Early Years 16 & 18 February 2010

1.

Expectations:

From EVs

- E portfolios – EV's would like some training in this area also, it is important that the centre has someone present at the visit to assist in navigating the system.
- Centre to look at EV visit as being supportive.
- EV looks at work of IV
- EVs would like the use of a mobile phone/laptop especially when working in remote areas
- EV's like the idea of meeting with candidates at the visits
- If a hold is given and development visit or follow up visit is required this should be carried out by another EV
- EV feels that supportive advice should be given to the centre
- Paperwork such as policies, H&S, Assessment Plans, IV reports CPD etc should be available as per visit plan for the EV.
- Folders from a variety of candidates – as requested in the visit plan should be ready for sampling.
- Assessors & IVs to be aware of the areas being looked at (identified in the visit plan)
- Folders to have clear information about candidates/individual style ie if any special assessment requirements

- EVs would like to meet other assessor and IV staff not just SQA Co-ordinators
- EVs would like a suitable area to work in free from interruptions
- Continuity of visiting EVs to see progress and discuss developments from previous year
- Assessment planning should take into consideration individual needs and learning style to enable assessor to work and plan the assessment, eg when working with candidates who have been out of education for a while.
- EVs would like to see what level of practical training input is given to candidates prior to assessment
- Guidance of good practice areas (suggestions seen)
- Practical development of awards (Updates)
- Updates on new practice/legislation etc. should be made available
- EV8a – hold criteria – centre should be aware of what this is.
- Continuity of EV – 3 years same EV
- EVs to copy their report to Senior EV.
- Common practice for one EV was that she would provide a time for meeting candidates etc and would let the centre know of this in advance, which enabled them to arrange this easily – centres would like this to be standard practice.
- Discussion took place around CPD of Assessors, IVs and EVs and it was felt that all should have current practice of the vocation and should maintain quite rigorous CPD records.
- It was suggested that the EV might like to undertake the visit at the nursery/centre to see actual practice occurring as oppose to being off site.
- It was felt that EVs should be given a named contact whilst in the centre, so they can be reached at any time throughout the visit.

2.

Centre views

- Concerns that person is not qualified to EV award they are verifying, therefore it is difficult for them to understand the knowledge requirements
- Some awards have longer time between EV visit, ie Skills for Work – therefore centres might not know about changes. Would like more updates
- Good to have 2 – 3 years with same EV – then a fresh pair of eyes is good
- Sometimes centres have had to approach EVs to ask what portfolios they want to see – issue if candidates are a long way away

- Development visit useful
 - Professionalism – want an EV who knows about current issues to be able to update and advise centres
 - A concern is that some Nurseries who are delivering VQs but get poor Care Commission or HMI reports – how can they deliver qualifications if their own practice is perceived as being poor
 - Concern that candidates are over assessed due to direction from EVs , that the candidate should write Reflective Account of Assessors Observations. This point was discussed with the group and it was agreed that the Assessment Strategy must be adhered to therefore candidates should not be asked to write reflective accounts of the assessors observations.
 - Some groups felt that most EVs were quite flexible in terms of meeting with Assessors, IVs and candidates.
 - One centre had had a different EV every year for 5 years, which threw up some consistency issues as different EVs were asking for different things. It was felt that a centre should have the same EV for around 3 years so relationships can be established, which would provide more support for centres.
 - It was felt that some EVs conveyed personal choice during visits; this should not be the case as objectivity is a must.
 - Centres wanted to be made more aware of ‘HOLD’ criteria.
 - It should be made clear that Professional Discussion need not only be verbal and that the use of Dictaphones is not mandatory.
 - Some centres complained that some EVs appear to be on a “power trip” and are “too personal”
 - Questions raised about background and currency of EVs
 - Some centres did not like having visits arranged in December.
 - Some concerns over lack of clarity in EVs feedback also that the written feedback should match the verbal.
 - Some centres concerned about too many EV visits in the same time scale (PDA, HNC, CCLD etc) would like more time between visits.
 - E-Portfolios good or bad? One centre was hauled over the coals for disadvantaging candidates who were not IT literate, this triggered lots of discussion about the expectations at levels 3 and 4. SCQF etc.
 - One centre complained that the same HNC units were chosen every year!
 - Most people found process supportive and effective.
-

