



Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Healthcare Support (Clinical)

Introduction

The following awards were verified during session 2016–17:

GD0R 23 SVQ 3 in Healthcare Support (Clinical) at SCQF level 7.

This qualification is now in its lapsing period and will finish on 02/06/2020.

GD0V 22 SVQ 2 in Healthcare Support (Clinical) at SCQF level 6.

This qualification is now in its lapsing period and will finish on 02/06/2018.

GL41 23 SVQ in Healthcare Support (Clinical) at SCQF level 7

GL40 22 SVQ in Healthcare Support (Clinical) at SCQF level 6

This report is based on feedback from the 14 allocated visits undertaken by external verifiers in the session 2016–17.

The awards are delivered to a high standard generally and 13 centres received green ratings from external verifiers at the time of the visit. One centre had a minor action point raised, which was quickly rectified.

Verifiers noted an excellent level of support provided to candidates by their assessors and internal verifiers. There was clear evidence recorded of robust and standardised assessment and adherence to the assessment strategy.

Category 2: Resources

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

Staff at all centres were found to be occupationally qualified and competent to deliver the awards, with almost all being registered healthcare practitioners and all having gained professional experience in a healthcare setting. This is in line with the assessment strategy for the awards. Assessor/verifier qualifications were held, or were actively being worked towards in all centres. Almost all centres undertook and kept robust evidence of continuing professional development (CPD) related to both occupational and assessor competence. Assessor and verifier qualification certificates were presented by one centre, and the CPD records for all involved were detailed, with excellent evidence from Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) re-validation being used to demonstrate reflection on practice.

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

This criterion was well evidenced, with all centres receiving a green rating. Comments from all reports were positive. For example, reports noted:

- ◆ Assessment environments and equipment used were all within the candidates' workplace and therefore are subject to yearly review by the NHS.
- ◆ Assessment took place in the workplace and site selection checklists were in place for all environments.
- ◆ Assessment materials were current and documents version-controlled and regularly reviewed.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

Development needs and prior achievements were discussed at application and on induction at all centres. Mandatory and statutory training within the NHS was used to good effect and the awards have been mapped to the NHS induction standards. All centres within the NHS are attempting to streamline training and development opportunities. Some reports noted:

- ◆ Good use of prior achievements such as mandatory/LearnPro modules which were correctly matched to the requirements of the awards.
- ◆ Continued use of the candidate selection guide, which applies strict criteria to all SVQ applicants.
- ◆ Mandatory training must be completed, and the line manager must approve any application to the award.
- ◆ One centre has an alternative assessment requirement report, which asks the candidate about development needs.

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

Most centres have some form of learning agreement or action plan with candidates. All centres provided evidence of documented assessment planning and most kept contact records in addition to these.

The following are examples taken from reports:

- ◆ One centre has a learning contract in which all parties sign to agree the conditions.
- ◆ Assessment plans within portfolios clearly showed regular contact between assessor and candidate, which was confirmed to the external verifier in discussion with the candidate.
- ◆ Assessment plans within the e-portfolio system for a number of candidates clearly showed regular meetings between assessor and candidate.
- ◆ Detailed assessment plans were available at verification, which evidenced appropriate guidance/support/information which would allow candidates to progress with their SVQ.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

This was well evidenced, with all centres receiving a green rating. Assessment and verification policies and procedures were found to be robust in all centres. It was noted that one centre uses a three-stage verification process, with evidence of verification activity across units. External verifiers were able to view detailed IV sampling plans within candidate portfolios, and noted that IV feedback was clear and supported assessor decisions.

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

All centres were using appropriate assessment methods to support the robust delivery of the awards which are in line with validity, authenticity, reliability, currency and sufficiency (VARCS) principles. One report noted that assessment was holistic in both planning and observation and any additional needs were taken into account. There were no action points identified.

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

All centres provided good evidence for this criterion and were graded green.

Examples taken from reports included:

- ◆ All assessments carried out were within the candidate's own workplace using real work activities.
- ◆ Malpractice and plagiarism were discussed at induction, with relevant supporting policies.
- ◆ Candidate portfolios contained a candidate disclaimer. Direct observation, professional discussion and appropriate signatures confirmed evidence was candidate's own work.

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

There was robust evidence from all centres that assessor judgements were standardised and supported by clear IV feedback and guidance. Verifiers reported that the evidence requirements for the award were being met by centres. Candidates' work sampled complied with the assessment strategy and VARCS principles. Assessment and verification decisions were robust, standardised and appropriate in the work sampled.

Some examples from reports to support this included:

- ◆ Consistent judgements, supported by regular standardisation meetings where actual candidate evidence was standardised. IV feedback was detailed, supportive and clear.
- ◆ Regular standardisation meetings were held, and there was evidence of discussion around discrete units, knowledge and performance criteria.

- ◆ The standard of work produced by the candidates was excellent and correctly referenced all the relevant units.

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

This was well-understood by centres who were all fully compliant with this criterion.

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

There was clear evidence presented in all centres to demonstrate compliance with this criterion. All staff interviewed confirmed that they were kept up to date by the centre co-ordinator with SQA feedback. Generally, this was covered in most centres by a standing item on the standardisation agenda.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

- ◆ Centre is planning an APL exercise to identify how relevant mandatory training can be mapped to the requirements of the SVQ.
- ◆ The guaranteed 10-day feedback on candidate work is excellent practice and greatly appreciated by the candidates.
- ◆ The centre utilises the healthcare support worker induction standards within units to a good standard.
- ◆ The centre generated their own internal verification record, which has more detailed sections for feedback to the assessors on assessed work.

Specific areas for development

No suggestions for improvement were identified in the reports on visits to centres during this session.