Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022

Health and Safety

Verification group number: 104

Introduction

All verification activity was on the delivery of the following units as part of SVQ awards at private training providers:

H8VP 04   Make sure your own actions reduce risks to health and safety
H8VT 04   Develop procedures to safely control work operations
H8VV 04   Safely control work operations
H8VW 04   Promote a positive health and safety culture
H8VX 04   Conduct a health and safety risk assessment of a workplace
H8WA 04   Promote a positive health and safety culture
H8WD 04   Develop and implement effective communication systems for health and safety information
H8WE 04   Develop and maintain individual and organisational competence in health and safety matters
H8WL 04   Influence and keep pace with improvements in health and safety practice
H8WH 04   Develop, implement and review reactive monitoring systems for health and safety

There was a total of five visits, all of which involved verification of GK51 23 SVQ 3 Occupational Health and Safety at SCQF level 7. For two of the visits, the SVQ Occupational Health and Safety Practice SCQF level 9 was also verified.

All of the visits resulted in high confidence outcome ratings.

Category 2: Resources

Criterion 2.1: Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.

All centres were given a green rating for this criterion.

At all centres the qualification verifier reported that assessors and internal verifiers had appropriate CPD activity and records, and either had or were working towards appropriate qualifications for assessing/verifying. The qualification verifier reported that evidential records were seen for all centres.

For most centres the qualification verifier also reported on the extensive industrial experience of staff.

At one centre that qualification verifier reported as good practice the use of an online e-portfolio system to monitor staff CPD activity and qualifications.

Criterion 2.4: There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.

All centres were assigned a green rating against this criterion.

For all centres the qualification verifier reported that appropriately detailed site selection checklists were in place. This ensured that candidates had access to all necessary resources to complete the award. The qualification verifier also reported on co-operative meetings with employers, and for some centres commented on formal standardisation minutes.

The qualification verifier recommended for one centre, which currently only had one candidate, that they should ensure site selection checklists are in place for all candidates going forward if provision grows.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

All centres were assigned a green rating against this criterion.

All centres had comprehensive formalised processes in place for identifying candidate prior achievements and development needs. In all centres, there were very thorough formal written records in place. For some centres, there were good practice aspects identified, including training needs analysis, skills audit, and 'skillsmatch'. In one case the qualification verifier reported these could be seen as sector leading.

It is clear that in all respects centres were providing very strong, documented evidence to support verification of this criterion.

Criterion 3.3: Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.

All centres received a green rating for this criterion.

For all centres the qualification verifier reported that contact with the assessor was appropriate to the requirements of the qualification. In all cases there was formal documentation provided to the qualification verifier recording these meetings and their outcomes. These meetings ensured that candidates had appropriate feedback and that both they and the assessor were able to monitor progress towards the award.

For some centres the EV commented that there has been some disruption due to restrictions associated with COVID-19 (for example, difficulties with site access) but that these had now been remedied and candidates were making good progress. For one such centre, the qualification verifier recommended a further increase in frequency of meetings moving forward.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

Criterion 4.2: Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.

All of the centres were assigned a 'green' for this criterion. In all cases the qualification verifier commented that the centre had appropriate policies and procedures in place and that these were being implemented and full records being kept.

For all centres there were records of standardisation activities. Though in one case the qualification verifier recommended that the frequency of these should be increased. The qualification verifier further commented that if the centre were to develop a matrix to map candidate evidence then this could reduce the assessment burden on the candidates.

Criterion 4.3: Assessment instruments and methods and their selection and use must be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

All centres were assigned a green rating for this criterion.

All centres were seen to be using the current NOS.

For all centres there was clear documented evidence of consideration given to selection of methods and instruments of assessment and of assessment decisions. These included assessor and internal verification procedures, meeting minutes, and standardisation records.

The qualification verifier commented that the current award for GH52 34 is in its lapsing period.

Criterion 4.4: Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.

All centres were assigned a green rating for this criterion.

For all centres the qualification verifier both expressed confidence that this criterion had been met and that the centre had supplied sufficient evidence to confirm this. This evidence included professional discussions, witness testimony, candidate declarations, and site visits.

Criterion 4.6: Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.

All centres were assigned a green rating for this criterion.

For all centres the candidate evidence was consistently and accurately judged against the award criteria for performance and knowledge and understanding. The qualification verifier agreed with all sampled assessment decisions.

For one centre the qualification verifier recommended that candidates should be encouraged to submit evidence as soon as available, thus getting earlier feedback.

Criterion 4.7: Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.

All centres were found to retain evidence, both paper-based and electronic for at least the minimum required period.

Criterion 4.9: Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.

All centres were seen to have an appropriate process in place for dissemination of qualification verifier feedback. In all cases this involved records of actions in standardisation/internal verification meetings where appropriate.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2021–22:

♦ Use of an internal e-portfolio system to monitor staff CPD.

♦ Extensive, well developed processes in place to support candidates from induction through to completion. Examples include the use of training needs analysis and well structured assessment planning for each unit.

♦ Extensive skills audit prior to the candidate commencing on each individual unit — this identifies and informs additional training that needs to be in place to ensure that the candidate has the necessary skills and knowledge to complete the unit.

♦ Standardisation given a very high priority within the centre and highly detailed records kept with progress on actions recorded.

♦ Assessors using very well structured and planned professional discussions together with reflective accounts to allow candidates to demonstrate their underpinning knowledge and understanding processes.

♦ Use of 'completion videos' with candidates.

♦ Very comprehensive 'Skillsmatch' documentation covering the whole range of candidate prior achievements, experience etc — coupled with an induction process ensures the candidate's needs were fully matched to the award.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2021–22:

♦ Centres were advised that current framework for GK52 34 was in its lapsing period and were encouraged to make preparations for transition to the revised framework.

- ♦ With relaxation of COVID-19 restrictions assessors should look at reviewing the frequency of candidate review meetings.
- ♦ Centres are encouraged to use e-portfolios to record candidate feedback etc.
- ♦ Centres could consider additional standardisation meetings as candidates submit evidence and use a matrix to review potential cross-referencing of evidence — thus potentially reducing volume of evidence required from the candidate.
- ♦ Candidates should be encouraged to release evidence as it is available — this would allow the assessor and/or internal verifier to give feedback and provide the candidate with a greater sense of achievement of progress through the award.