



**Scottish Vocational Qualification
in
Leadership & Management for Care Services
level 4**

Group Award Code: G8W8 24

ASSESSMENT STRATEGY and GUIDANCE

General Introduction

This document is based on the final Assessment Strategy which was produced along with the new Standards by the Care Council for Wales, Northern Ireland Social Care Council, the Scottish Social Services Council, Skills for Care and Children's Workforce Development Council who worked in partnership to review the National Occupational Standards and Awards For Registered Managers (adults) and Registered Managers (Residential Child Care) and develop Leadership & Management for Care Services National Occupational Standards (NOS) across the UK.

This guidance on the gathering of evidence and Evidence Requirements has been produced collaboratively and subscribed to by the following UK Awarding Bodies: SQA, Edexcel, CACHE, OCR, City and Guilds, EDI, ASET and the Open University.

Welcome

...to the Scottish Vocational Qualification (SVQ) in Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4. This is a nationally recognised award accredited by the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA), and is suitable for those working in management roles in the care services sector.

In the SVQ in Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4, candidates require to be working in posts with management and/or supervisory responsibilities.

To achieve the SVQ in Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4, candidates must achieve **eight** Units in total — **four** mandatory Units and **four** optional Units.

The full selection of units that make up the SVQ in Leadership and Management for Care Services at level 4 can be found in the Information Sheet.

The following pages offer assessment guidance to candidates, assessors, expert witnesses, internal verifiers and external verifiers — in short — anyone who is involved in the assessment process.

About Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQs)

SVQs are work-based qualifications, which set the level of competence required by care services workers in their particular field. These are called standards and they have been designed and developed by Sector Skills Councils (SSCs)/ Sector Skills Bodies (SSBs) through consultation with employers and practitioners from across the statutory, independent and voluntary care sectors.

SVQs are nationally recognised awards, which cover a wide range of care service activities. They also have levels assigned to them, which are related to the functions and responsibilities of a person's actual job.

What does an SVQ look like?

All SVQs — follow the same format. There are:

- ◆ **Units**
- ◆ **Elements**
- ◆ **Performance Criteria**
- ◆ **Scope**
- ◆ **Knowledge Specification**
- ◆ **Evidence Requirements**

UNITS are simply different tasks that are familiar areas of work to all health and social care workers.

For example, the SVQ Leadership and Management for Care Services, contains **EIGHT UNITS (four of which are mandatory Units)** and a large number of optional Units which reflect the different settings managers and senior staff may be in (e.g. residential care, day care, community project, housing support) — **four** of these must be chosen to complete the SVQ).

Each Unit comprises several **ELEMENTS** — which describe the activities workers are expected to perform.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (PCs) are built into each element and are **the standards** against which the work activities should be measured — and for which evidence of actual performance must be provided.

SCOPE — is a statement to ensure candidates can carry out workplace competences in a variety of contexts and situations. There are suggestions about this in each individual Unit. Although not tracked, the scope guides the candidate to areas where they can demonstrate that their skills have been met.

KNOWLEDGE — this requires that candidates **understand** their actions, and can integrate knowledge and practice.

EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS — are specific for this award, and detail what specific evidence is required for the award in order for a candidate to meet the performance criteria and knowledge. It is important that these instructions are followed. So for example, if it says “the assessor/expert witness **must** observe the candidate”, then observation **must** be done — simulation or witness testimony will not do instead.

Who’s who in SVQs?

the candidate

is the person undertaking the SVQ. The responsibility of a candidate is to meet with the assessor, plan how to undertake the units and then produce evidence to demonstrate competence.

the assessor

is the person who assesses the candidate and makes a decision if he/she is competent, based on a variety of evidence. The assessor is normally (but not always) in the same workplace as the candidate. The assessor has the responsibility to meet with the candidate regularly, to plan, support, judge and give feedback on performance.

the expert witness

is a person who is occupationally competent in the candidate's area of work and can contribute to the assessment of the candidate's competence, where there are no occupationally competent assessors for occupationally specific units. Expert Witnesses must have a working knowledge of NOS for the units on which their expertise is based and have either any qualification in assessment of workplace performance, such as L20 from the Learning and Development suite, Support Competence Achieved in the Workplace, OR a professional work role which involves evaluating the everyday practice of staff. Expert Witnesses are able to make a judgement about competence, but it is still the role of the co-ordinating assessor to incorporate these judgements into the final (or summative) assessment decision for the whole SVQ.

the internal verifier

is someone designated by the assessment centre to ensure that assessors are performing consistently in the use of assessment methods and assessment decisions. This can be carried out by sampling evidence on a regular basis and by ensuring that candidates are being supported to achieve their award.

the external verifier

is appointed by the SQA, the Awarding Body, to ensure consistency in assessment and internal verification across all centres offering the award. Centres are normally visited by an External Verifier at least once a year. SQA's External Verifiers also meet together and with Eva's from other Awarding Bodies to ensure UK wide standardisation.

Required expertise of assessors, expert witnesses and internal verifiers**Assessors**

The assessor is the key to the assessment process. All assessors must:

- be occupationally competent. This means that each assessor must be capable of carrying out the functions covered by the units they are assessing to the standard described within them, according to current sector practice. This experience should be credible and maintained through clearly demonstrable continuing learning and development. In due course, the implementation of regulatory requirements may mean that assessors will need to hold appropriate care/health and/or management qualifications gained within a care setting. Awarding bodies will be notified of any changes in regulatory requirements for assessors by the appropriate regulatory bodies.
- have knowledge and experience of management within health and social care settings, the regulation, legislation and codes of practice for the service (where applicable), and the requirements of national standards at the time any assessment is taking place.
- hold or be working towards, an appropriate assessor qualification. Achievement of the qualification will need to be within appropriate timescales
- be able to assess holistically the values contained and embedded in the values section of the National Occupational Standards
- take the lead role in the assessment of observed candidate performance. Assessors are expected to take on this role in relation to at least the core units of the award.

Assessors who are working towards the A Unit and have the necessary occupational competence and experience, can be supported by an appropriately qualified assessor who does not necessarily have the occupational expertise or experience, but must have:

- occupational competence across some units
- a relevant occupational background

- an appropriate assessor qualification.

If more than one assessor is required, assessment needs to be coordinated. A named lead assessor must be identified and will draw together all assessment decisions made by specialist assessors, and the contributions from expert witnesses across the whole qualification.

Expert Witnesses

The use of Expert Witnesses is encouraged as a means of contributing to the evidence presented for assessment of the candidate's competence, where there are no occupationally competent assessors for occupationally specific units.

The expert witness must:

- have a working knowledge of NOS for the units on which their expertise is based
- be occupationally competent in their area of expertise
- have either any qualification in assessment of workplace performance, such as L20 from the Learning and Development suite, Support Competence Achieved in the Workplace, OR a professional work role which involves evaluating the everyday practice of staff.

Internal Verifiers

The internal verifier is key to the quality assurance and verification of the assessment of performance evidence in the workplace.

Internal verifiers must:

- be occupationally competent in the area they are verifying. It is crucial that internal verifiers understand the nature and context of the assessors' work and that of their candidates, due to the critical nature of the work and the legal and other implications of the assessment process
- have working knowledge of management within health and social care settings, the regulation, legislation and codes of practice for the service (where applicable), and the requirements of national standards at the time any assessment is taking place
- occupy a position that gives them the authority and resources to co-ordinate the work of assessors, provide authoritative advice, call meetings as appropriate, visit and observe assessments and carry out all the other internal verification roles as defined by the relevant national occupational standard (i.e. V1)
- hold, or be working towards, the appropriate IV qualification. Achievement of the qualification must be within appropriate timescales.

Internal verifiers who do not yet hold the appropriate assessor or verifier awards but have the necessary occupational competence and experience, can be supported by a qualified internal verifier who does not necessarily have the particular occupational expertise or experience. However, the supporting internal verifier must have relevant occupational expertise as a manager or trainer. This can also be used as a method of supporting the accreditation of trainee internal verifiers.

External Verifiers

The external verifier is the key link for awarding bodies in the quality assurance and verification of the assessment of candidates' performance in the workplace.

External verifiers must:

- be occupationally knowledgeable and have gained their knowledge through working within the sector or appropriate professional/occupational area and demonstrate updating through regular and recent CPD activities
- hold, or be working towards, the appropriate EV qualification. Achievement of the qualification must be within appropriate timescales
- have a working knowledge of management within health and social care settings, the regulation, legislation and codes of practice (where applicable) for the service, and the requirements of national standards at the time any assessment is taking place

External verifiers who do not yet hold the appropriate assessor or verifier awards but have the necessary occupational competence and experience, can be supported by a qualified external verifier who does not necessarily have the occupational expertise or experience. This can also be used as a method of supporting the qualification of trainee external verifiers.

Service Users & Carers

Service Users and Carers are in an advantageous position in relation to having direct experience of care service provision. Their views of the service received should be seen as relevant and important in the assessment of the candidate's performance, alongside other sources of evidence.

Service users and carers may provide witness testimony. Final decisions about the status of this testimony in the candidate's assessment will be made by the assessor.

Service users and carers said the following about contributing to assessment:

“Conversations with users and carers can elicit useful information and should be taken into consideration”.

Assessment Methods

There are a number of methods of assessing evidence which can be used to demonstrate a candidate's competence. These are:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| DO | D irect O bservation by the assessor of real work activities. For this Award, the assessor must do the observation for the Core/Mandatory Units, although the Expert Witness may provide additional evidence if required. |
| RA | R eflective A ccount by the candidate, which is a detailed description of real work activities. Sometimes this reflection on practice can take the form of a Professional Discussion (which also must be recorded). |
| EW | Evidence provided by an E xpert W itness — this can be either observation of practice or questioning/professional discussion on a particular area of work. The expert witness could also give a candidate feedback on a reflective account. |
| WP | W ork P roducts – these are usually reports and recordings made by candidates as part of their normal work duties. Projects and assignments from college or in-house courses could also be considered as products, as well as Achievement of Prior Learning (APL). |

- Q** **Questioning**— can be used to cover some gaps in PCs, for clarification of observed practice or to supplement knowledge.
- WT** **Witness Testimony** — this is a statement or comment by someone who was present while the candidate was carrying out an activity (e.g. colleague, service-user, carer or other) and can confirm that the candidate’s evidence is authentic. Care and sensitivity must be exercised if service-users are providing this.
- PD** **Professional Discussion** - this is a planned and structured review of practice which takes place with the assessor and candidate. It is based on evidence, with the outcomes captured by means of oral recording or written record. These are particularly useful to provide evidence that the candidate can evaluate their knowledge and practice across the qualification.
- CS** **Case Studies** – these must be based on real work practice and experiences, and must not be a theoretical exercise.
- P/A/A** **Projects/Assignments/APL** – candidates may have already completed a relevant project or assignment. You could also use evidence of previous training courses or programmes you have completed showing professional development.

It is not acceptable for a portfolio to be completed in pencil – nor to delete details using correction fluid as this still does not ensure confidentiality of information. In addition, too many alterations can result in a very unprofessional looking portfolio inconsistent with the role of a manager.

In addition to the evidence requirements for this award SQA from time to time issues 'assessment guidance' where it is thought that guidance may assist the process of assessing a candidate. This information is provided on the Care Scotland web pages on the SQA website, www.sqa.org.uk. In addition, the **Care Scotland Bulletin**, which is published by SQA twice per year, and distributed to all assessment centres, gives the same information.

Evidence

Direct Observation

The assessor records judgements of observed practice, showing the skills demonstrated by a candidate, and records how performance criteria and knowledge have been evident in the candidate's practice. It is not acceptable for candidates to record assessor observations: if this is done, then it has the status of a Reflective Account.

Reflective Account

Describes the candidate's actions in particular situations and reflects on the reasons for practicing in that way. This is particularly useful to provide evidence that they can evaluate their knowledge and practice across the qualification. The candidate is expected to indicate the PCs and knowledge, which are demonstrated in the practice. The reflective account should always explicitly focus on the candidate's real work and not on what *might* be done

Professional Discussion

Should be in the form of a planned and structured review of the candidate's practice, based on evidence, with the outcomes captured by means of recording or written record. These are particularly useful to provide evidence that can evaluate their knowledge and practice across the qualification.

Products

Any work product that shows how a candidate meets the PCs and knowledge can be used as evidence. PCs that indicate that the candidate should have recorded information are best met by products. A statement must be attached which explains what the product is, the date it was prepared and its purpose. Products must be the candidate's own work or refer to work that they have contributed to e.g. A Care Commission Report. It is not necessary for work products to actually be in the portfolio, as long as the assessor/IV and EV has access to them on request and there is an audit trail.

Case Studies

These must be based on real work practice and experiences, and must not be a theoretical exercise.

Questions

Can be asked to supplement the evidence demonstrated through observations, products and reflective accounts, oral or written questions may be used; a record must be kept of questions and response.

Projects/Assignments/APL

Projects and assignments can be set by assessors to allow the candidate to demonstrate the application of theoretical knowledge to practice; these may also be used to meet some gaps in performance and knowledge evidence. Assignments from college courses in related areas may also be useful and

contribute to knowledge evidence. Prior achievements of the candidate can be used to evidence the PCs and knowledge, provided there is an audit trail. However, current practice must also be included to show that the candidate still has the skill at the time of completing the qualification. Candidates using work from, for example, a pre-assessed assignment must clearly indicate on the evidence the PC's and knowledge being claimed.

Witness Testimony

If someone other than an assessor sees the candidate carry out some work, then the assessor can request confirmation of this from a witness. Whereas a witness can make a qualitative comment on the performance of the candidate, it is the assessor who makes the judgement of the witness testimony matched against the specific PCs, and knowledge.

Expert Witness

Is a person who is occupationally competent in the candidate's area of work and who may see the candidate working on a daily basis — more so than the main or 'co-ordinating' assessor. They are able to make a judgement about competence, but it is still the role of the assessor to incorporate these judgements into the final (or summative) assessment decision for the whole SVQ. The expert witness can observe and record practice for any of the Optional Units, question and record the candidate's answers or give feedback on a reflective account. The candidate should not record the observation done by the Expert Witness. Who can be an Expert Witness must be determined and agreed in advance with the SVQ co-ordinator in a Centre.

Knowledge specification

Each Unit lists the knowledge and understanding that is required to effectively carry out the specific area of work practice. Most of the knowledge should be inherent in the candidate's work and must be explicitly evident in the recording of reflective accounts, professional discussion, assignments or by answers to questions.

Further Guidance on Knowledge Evidence

Competent practice is a combination of the application of skills and knowledge informed by values and ethics. When reading the knowledge specification for a particular Unit, **it is important to read the knowledge requirements in relation to expectations and requirements of your job role and function,**

You need to provide evidence for **ALL** knowledge points in every Unit (**NB: assessors beware of duplication!**) and you can do this in a number of ways:

- ◆ Can be claimed in Reflective Accounts, assignments and /or in Professional Discussion — but needs to be explicit. If not explicit enough, then additional questioning on the practice may be necessary — this must be recorded.
- ◆ Can be claimed on assessed work from previously studied courses (e.g. degree assignments or similar) — if so, the Knowledge Evidence numbers should be marked in the relevant sections of the assignment. However, candidates would still have to demonstrate through questioning or discussion with the assessor that they are still able to put this knowledge into practice, especially if the course work was done some time ago.

- ◆ Can be claimed by evidence from in-house courses — provided it is clear how and on what the candidate was assessed. If there was no assessment, then the course content can be used along with additional questioning/professional discussion with the assessor to ascertain application of knowledge — or by the candidate’s own comments in Reflective Accounts/assignments showing how they are using the knowledge.

It is essential that knowledge evidence is primarily recorded through Reflective Accounts and Professional Discussion as only using questions diminishes the importance of the integration of knowledge and practice. ‘Question banks’, which have their place, are **not** acceptable as forms of gathering knowledge evidence.

In each case, the evidence number where a particular knowledge point is to be found should be entered into the box beside that knowledge point.

Remember, the ‘amount’ and ‘depth’ of knowledge required should be consistent with your job role.

A glossary of terms related to each specific SVQ is included in the candidate portfolio.

How to get started

The above guidance and explanations should be sufficient to allow an assessment to commence.

The best way to fully understand an SVQ award is **simply to start!**

At the start, the assessor and candidate should meet and draw up an **ASSESSMENT PLAN**.

The first assessment plan should contain some general decisions about how often candidate and assessor will meet — and where. It may be important to agree a place where meetings will not be interrupted. Subsequent plans should be specific about what evidence is suitable for the particular Unit(s) being discussed, when this evidence will be collected and should include review dates.

It is encouraging to try and start with a familiar area of everyday work, and be very specific about what piece of work the assessor will observe. The candidate, with the help of the assessor, should also leave the planning meeting with a very clear idea of what has to be written for the Reflective Account. Finally, a date should be agreed when the assessment plan will be reviewed and a target date set for completion.

At subsequent planning sessions it is recommended that candidates and assessors take a more ‘holistic’ view of both the job role and the assessment of competence. What this means is that you are encouraged **not** to approach the SVQ on a Unit by Unit basis, but to see how normal day to day, workplace activities will provide evidence of competence for several SVQ Units. This “holistic approach” may not happen when you start your SVQ as some people may prefer to simply focus on one Unit. However, after this you and your Assessor will be more familiar with the standards and should use this more holistic approach to your work.

The exemplars ahead provide an insight into how this might be tackled including an example of an assessment plan.

Possible links between SVQ Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4 and SVQ Health and Social Care (Adults) level 4.

Health and Social Care: Imported from the SVQ Health & Social Care Framework

- DK9K 04 - Unit LMC A4 – (HSC446) Manage a dispersed workforce to meet the needs and preferences of individuals at home
- DK6A 04 - Unit LMC C2 – (HSC450) Develop risk management plans to support individual's independence and daily living within their home

The following units from other awards also appear in SVQ Leadership for Management in Care Services Level 4

Management: Imported from the SVQ Management Framework

- DR3Y 04 - Unit LMC A5 – (MSC D6) Allocate and monitor the progress and quality of work in your area of responsibility
- DR5T 04 - Unit LMC E8 – (MSC E2) Manage the finances in your area of responsibility
- DR5J 04 - Unit LMC E11 – (MSC F1) Manage a Project
- DT4K 04 - Unit LMC E12 – (MSC F2) Manage a programme of complementary projects

Candidates who already hold these units will be granted automatic certification for them within the Leadership and Management for Care Services framework

WORKED EXAMPLES

Scottish Vocational Qualification in Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4

Group Award Code: G8W8 24

The following pages contain **some** worked examples of how to write evidence of performance and knowledge and how to match it against the units, elements, PCs, and knowledge of the standards. The examples do not **necessarily** show all the evidence which would be required for a complete Unit.

Using assessments based on these examples does not guarantee successful verification — it is still your responsibility to ensure that internal quality assurance procedures are followed.

We hope you will find the worked examples helpful. Please note that the worked examples are for the SVQ Leadership and Management for Care Services level 4 and will provide guidance on the appropriateness/type of evidence generated for this award. Whilst you are requested to use the SQA recording documentation, it is recognised that candidates and assessors will have different styles describing, explaining and writing about events and incidents. You should do this in the way most suitable to you.

ASSESSMENT PLAN cont

Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	2/2/08

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM

EVIDENCE NO:	1
DATE:	15/2/08

Identify Evidence Type

DIRECT OBSERVATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	EXPERT WITNESS	<input type="checkbox"/>
QUESTIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>	WITNESS TESTIMONY	<input type="checkbox"/>
WORK PRODUCT	<input type="checkbox"/>	CASE STUDY	<input type="checkbox"/>
REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROJECT/ASSIGNMENT/APL	<input type="checkbox"/>
PROESSFIONAL DISSCUSSION	<input type="checkbox"/>		

CANDIDATE NAME:	May Bee
------------------------	---------

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>One of the key responsibilities that any Project Manager has is that of effective management of financial resources. Within Treetops there are two budgets, as Project Manager they are my responsibility.</p> <p>The main Treetops Project has a total budget of £ 304,620; 80% of which is met by the 3 local authorities we work with on a 50%,35%,15% basis with £60,924 being contributed by Fixit in relation to our voluntary funds. Despite the project having a Youth Justice focus the 3 authorities have used the "Changing Services Fund" monies to fund their contributions. This is especially significant as our current funding ends in March 2008 and this source of funding will no longer be available from the Scottish Government. At present it is likely that the local authorities will get at least a significant proportion of this monies; however it will be paid into the GAE that authorities already receive and will not therefore be "ring fenced " for specific types of work or new incentives. For Treetops this means that we will therefore be competing with some of the statutory service providers within the councils for the same limited funds.</p> <p>The other budget that I have responsibility for is that of the Treetops Early Intervention Project. This has gone through several changes in the last few years both in terms of funding and focus. We were able to secure one year Community Regeneration Funding which looks likely to cease on March 08. The total cost of the project is £ 55,581 of which one Local Authority contribute £38,942 and Fixit £16,639 from voluntary funds. Prior to 07 Fixit did not contribute voluntary funds to Treetops EIP. However, we did contribute time to manage the project.</p> <p>It was apparent at the time of the funding proposal that the Regeneration Board were looking more favourably at proposals that brought in monies from others sources. In consultation with my Director it was agreed that in an effort to keep the project going we should contribute financially, in part because of the potential contribution that the project could make to</p>	<p>E5.1.2</p> <p>E8.1.1</p> <p>E8.1.1</p>	<p>E5 K13</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>working knowledge of especially the parts of the budget that they directly have an input to. Generally the team falls into two groups: those that are by nature quite restrictive in their spending and those who if they think that there is money there it should be spent whether this is needed or not and it is the manager's task to ensure that budgets are balanced and that they have no responsibility/accountability. In broad terms it remains my view that it is the manager's task to ensure that the team have the necessary resources to undertake their work with children and families, both in terms of financial resources but also with time and training. However, it is in the job specification that workers have to bring a certain amount of creativity to their work and I see no reason why this cannot be used to assist in reducing expenditure. Within the project we are agreed that we should not be involving children in activities etc which is beyond the ongoing financial support of their parents. On occasions it has been apparent to me that a lack of planning has led to workers spending money on outings that have not been thought out and have not been seen as part of the child's action plan.</p> <p>Initially I tried to give the team the specifics in terms of how much money we had to spend per month on Hobbies & Recreation, food and mileage to give them a more accurate understanding of the how much money we have to work with. I also tried to be clear that we are a needs-led service and that if we needed something to support our work with a particular family then I saw it as my responsibility to ensure that we could do this. I was also able to acknowledge that, as we were not working to capacity, we all had a bit more flexibility when it came to arranging individual activities or activities over the holidays that we would do as part of, for example, the summer programme. For the most part this worked reasonably well with most workers speaking to me about any activity over £10. However, there were clearly some members of staff who wanted to know exactly how much this equated to per family per week, which was not really supportive of my needs-led approach.</p> <p>As expected this year's budget has been much tighter than ever given that we are for the first time in years working to capacity. In reality this means £8 per month per family for activities and outings and this does not account for any activities that take place over the holidays. As a result there have been several discussions with the team regarding what we want to spend the money on, the need to reflect on whether expenditure is necessary etc. They have been very good at, despite getting agreement from me to pay for swimming lessons, seeking contributions from SWS or, where appropriate the family, to ensure that there are other monies available for other children. There have also been times, for example just after the summer holidays, that I have stated that we have overspent over the summer months and that to have money at Christmas we need to recoup some monies by not spending over the next two months. On the whole the team has been supportive of this.</p>	<p>E8.1.3</p> <p>E5.2.3a</p> <p>E8.1.12</p> <p>E5.2.3b</p>	<p>E8 GK6</p> <p>B1 K13b</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>Over the last two years I have endeavoured to work within the budgets given to me and thus far I have been able to achieve this. However, based upon managing the team for two years on the same level of money it would be my view that to continue to encourage and support the children that we work with into diversionary activities we need some additional monies.</p> <p>Given that Changing Children's Services Fund money will no longer be available, it is going to be difficult to get local authorities to pay what they are already paying and therefore politically it does not seem to be sensible to ask for any additional monies, even a small amount, over and above the cost of living increases. As a result the project administrator and I spent time prior to the budget forecast meeting to redistribute some of the monies to different budget headings, which more accurately reflect the needs of the project. Although I am well aware that it is the bottom line that counts I do not see the sense of having budget headings which are either obsolete or inaccurate. I chose to share some of this with the team especially the fact the admin staff have given some of their budget for activities with the children and therefore are working with less money to cover the bases they already do. There had been times when this budget was used to buy paper for art materials and this went unnoticed by the rest of the staff group. It was important to me to recognise this, use this as an example of us all, working together to a common goal, which is to provide the best level of service that we can for the children and families that we work with.</p>	<p>E5.1.6b</p> <p>E5.3.4b</p>	<p>E8 Ind K1</p>

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE & CLARIFICATION

<p><i>This may be used to record additional questions or the candidate may use it to write an additional paragraph</i></p>		
--	--	--

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK TO CANDIDATE

If Witness Testimony used please state who supplied testimony and relationship to candidate.

This is a good clear account of your role and responsibilities it also demonstrates your management of the team and the style of leadership you adopt to ensure that the delivery of the service is effective.

Expert Witness Signature (if applicable):	
Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	15/2/08

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM

EVIDENCE NO:	2
DATE:	21/2/08

Identify Evidence Type

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| DIRECT OBSERVATION | <input type="checkbox"/> | EXPERT WITNESS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| QUESTIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> | WITNESS TESTIMONY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| WORK PRODUCT | <input type="checkbox"/> | CASE STUDY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PROJECT/ASSIGNMENT/APL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| PROESSFIONAL DISSCUSSION | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

CANDIDATE NAME:	May Bee
------------------------	---------

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>Relevant Background Information</p> <p>E is currently 10 years old and was referred to Treetops by Education Services as a result of his oppositional and defiant behaviour at school. There were also concerns that his mother M was having difficulty managing his behaviour at home and he was isolated within the community primarily as a result of his difficulty in making and sustaining friends. We began this piece of work with E and his family in January 06</p> <p>I have known E and his family since he was approximately 3 years old. There had been at least two child protection investigations prior to his 5th birthday in terms of alleged sexual abuse and chronic neglect. Although there was insufficient evidence to proceed in relation to concerns re sexual abuse he had been subject to compulsory measures of care and his name had been on the Child Protection register.</p> <p>There are three significant adults in E's life, his mum, M, who herself has had a childhood which does not appear to have met her emotional needs and who was convicted of a schedule 1 offence following an incident when she assaulted SE's 14 yr old daughter from his first relationship, his dad, SE, who has had care of the children from a previous relationship but has a history of choosing women over his children and who at first meeting says all the right things. When this is further explored there seems little evidence to support the claims that he is making and no evidence of having an understanding of E's needs, and his step father B who is significantly older than the birth parents and who has a very traditional view of children and parenting. He has sustained a relationship with E primarily as he sees that this is necessary to maintain a relationship with M. It has been evident that the relationships between these three</p>	B4.1.2	<p>C1 K7b</p> <p>B1 K20e</p> <p>B4 K15</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>adults are at best enmeshed, including a lack of sexual boundaries, and at worst three adults who are involved in the sexual abuse of children.</p> <p>Between the ages of 3 - 6 E spent much of the time moving between living with M and SE and then M and B. M initially met B when she was baby-sitting for him and his ex wife, who was her cousin. She later moved to reside with him when E was aged 3 yrs, apparently with SE approval as part of a benefit fraud. SE is currently in a relationship with B's first wife. The other significant person in E's life is his younger sister S who is 7 years old.</p> <p>In terms of our work with E we have always worked with the parents in relation to their parenting of both E and S. This support has also been offered to SE; however, he has refused this, advising that he has no difficulties in managing E. Since the original referral there has been evidence that E has been involved in sexually harmful behaviour, which has been in relation to both other children in the community of different genders and also in relation to S. This has therefore been the focus of one of our individual weekly contacts with E.</p> <p>The last two years were the most difficult time for this Local Authority both in terms of the significant staff shortages and that the management team i.e. the Service Manager and the two Team Managers were relatively inexperienced, as were the three seniors. This had arisen as both me, my colleague Team Manager and the Service Manager had left the L.A within a two month period. I therefore had to be aware that I was a) no longer a Team Manager in the Local Authority and b) having been the Team Manager this potentially, could create issues for others. It is also worth stating that my move to Fixit was the first time in 18 years that I was not working in a statutory organisation and that I was aware that I was, and still do, struggle with not having the level of "clout" and decision making that I had in my previous post. That said I do believe that I am clear about my role and responsibilities and I have learned many valuable lessons regarding how difficult it can be to make other agencies hear expressions of concern, how much other agencies can know about children and families, and have got smarter at how I express concerns. I would like to think that I will be able to retain this learning should I return to the statutory sector.</p> <p>Partnership Working</p> <p>As a result of the concerns that have been and are currently around for E and M there have been other agencies involved with this family: primarily the two educational establishments that the children attend and also Social Work. When E's sexually harmful behaviour became apparent (he was simulating sex with S and this resulted in my project making a CP referral) I was clear that we had to be very explicit as to who was doing what and ensure that this was conveyed to both E and his family in a way</p>	<p>C1.2.3</p> <p>A1.1.1a</p> <p>B1.3.2b</p> <p>E5.2.3a</p>	<p>B4 K17</p> <p>E5 K2a</p> <p>B1 K17c</p> <p>E1 K25</p> <p>E5 K2a</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>Although I had an awareness of this at the time, reflection has clearly highlighted that in this case Treetop, and I include both the worker and myself in this, have been driving things from behind in terms of both in trying to get an appropriate service for this family including a comprehensive assessment in terms of E's needs and the risks that he presents to others.</p> <p>An initial Child Protection Case Conference was convened in November 06 as a result of the concerns that had been raised. Although we had been working with E for ten months he recently had a change of worker as a result of someone moving on from the project and she had a teaching background. Although she was in many ways very able, especially in her ability to get alongside E and his family and her clarity on the issues of concern, her knowledge of Child Protection procedures and processes were very limited. Therefore we spent time ensuring that the report that we submitted was informative and accurate and written to a standard that was appropriate for a CPCC. It was shared with the family prior to the meeting and had a clear statement of our assessment and view on registration.</p> <p>From my previous experience of chairing CPCCs I was particularly keen to ensure that our view could not be dismissed as "not really that important as we were just from the voluntary sector" as Treetops and the school had, in my view, a much more informed and accurate assessment of this boy's needs and risks. I also attended the CPCC and was clear with the worker that this was ostensibly to support her as this was her first CPCC and also because I was seeking to influence the outcome of this CPCC as in my view registration was necessary to get the support that was needed for this family and recognise the current risks that both E and S were subject to.</p> <p>In reality the decision to place the child's name on the Local Authority Child Protection register was unanimous. However, there was some debate in relation to the category: a choice had to be made from Neglect, Physical Injury, Non Organic Failure to Thrive, Sexual Abuse. The categories selected were Neglect and Sexual Abuse. The Chair was very much trying to send a message to the parents involved regarding the certainty that E had been the victim of some form of sexual abuse even though there was no disclosure. Although this was without the support of the Social Worker I felt that this was an important message to give and therefore I agreed with the Chair.</p> <p>Since then there have been numerous and varied challenges within the case the biggest has been trying to work in effective partnership with Social Work, holding the line with regard to our role and responsibilities but doing all that we could to reduce the risks and effect the changes that we had identified that needed to be made. For example, immediately after</p>	<p>A1.1.1b</p> <p>B1.3.6</p> <p>E5.2.6</p> <p>A1.3.4a</p>	<p>E1 K2a</p> <p>B1 K8g</p> <p>B4 K7b</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>the CPCC it was apparent that both M and B were distressed and in many ways uncomprehending of what had to change. It was always my experience that this was the role of the Social Worker to revisit the decisions of the CPCC and to agree with the family what we were going to work on, what would have to change to reduce the worries and concerns to a level that people were able to feel confident that the risks have reduced therefore both E and S names could be removed from the register. When this was raised with the worker she stated that she would not have time to do this within a meaningful time frame therefore we offered to do this task as I was of the view that this was a key time to engage a family in working to effect change. It was made apparent to the family that we would be sharing this work with Social Work and they were in agreement to this. Doing things on behalf of and because the Social Worker stated that she had insufficient time, has been a key feature in this case. I recognise that this has not been without its difficulties; however, I justify much of this in the belief that if we had not undertaken the tasks they would have been done. The work was jointly between myself and a project worker, we undertook two family therapy sessions identifying risk, risk management and agenda for change.</p> <p>For a period of several weeks the Social Worker was on sick leave and again there was insufficient staff to cover even the basic Child Protection visits. As a result we agreed to undertake the CP visits for a time limited period as part of our work and forward summaries of our weekly contact and assessment to the CP register holder. This was clearly unusual however, was a pragmatic solution to a situation which in reality would at best have resulted in a series of different workers visiting with no one taking ownership and probably mixed advice being given to the parents regarding managing the sexually harmful behaviour which they were still in denial about, none of which would have been helpful to the parents, E or S.</p> <p>When faced with the possibility of undertaking tasks that would normally sit with Social Work or indeed any agency I find myself asking three key questions with my colleagues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do we have the skills to undertake this task? If so 2. How likely is it that we will be able to persuade the usual agency to do this task, if this is not going to be possible would it be in the family's interest for us to undertake this task? 3. By doing this task will we have compromised ourselves in anyway? <p>I believe that the LA decision to ask us to undertake this task was at least in part as a result of my past association with that LA. However, it has been interesting to see how this has been viewed during the recent internal Child Protection audit of the project. This identified several issues suffice to say that I came in for criticism for agreeing to this even within this very</p>	<p>B1 1.4a</p>	<p>E1 K2g</p> <p>B1 K12e</p> <p>B1 K13c</p> <p>E1 K6</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>unusual set of circumstances and within tight parameters.</p> <p>During the recent HMIE Child Protection within this authority this child and his sister's circumstances were part of the sample that was audited. This meant that the files for these children within Social Work, Education, Health, Police and SCRA were reviewed and in this case all the relevant professionals who had direct involvement were interviewed including me and his project worker. It was evident from the questions that were being asked by the Inspector with whom we spoke that there were a number of worries in relation to this case, a key one being that S in terms of the Social Work files was the "invisible" child. The Inspector also commented that it was interesting that the parents and the child were happy to be interviewed within the project but not when asked by the Social Worker.</p> <p>We are due to be part of the HMIE Child Protection in a neighbouring authority; however, our first experience has left me with several questions regarding how HMIE view voluntary organisations namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By not asking and reviewing our files does this imply something about how our role is viewed within child protection? ▪ The key agencies were invited to a meeting for verbal feedback on the main findings - none of whom were voluntary organisations ▪ The written draft report has been shared again with key people, again not voluntary organisations - indeed despite our project having more direct involvement with this family on a weekly basis over a period of eighteen months than Social Work, Health, the Police and SCRA I will have access to this report when it becomes public property. <p>In general terms, working in partnership with this case has been a reasonably positive experience and importantly there has been a sense of working together with the best interests of the children. For example when E was referred to the reporter in relation to two charges of lewd and libidinous behaviour I was able to have a discussion with the reporter regarding the pros and cons of these charges being put as grounds of referral or my preferred option that they were included as lack of care grounds, as this centre holds the responsibility to care for and supervise E with the three adults in his life, that I contacted the reporter. The reporter was very willing to listen to my argument and was persuaded by it. Again this is something that I would have expected to have done in my previous post as I saw this as a role for Social Work but, given that they were not undertaking this task, I felt strongly enough that it was not helpful for this child to have these charges labelled against him into adult life. It was helpful that the reporter and I have had a positive previous working relationship. However, I think what was actually more important is that Treetop has a positive reputation with SCRA of providing intensive support to families, doing what we say that we will do and assessments that are from an informed basis. I have a sense that unlike some other</p>	<p>B1.1.1b</p> <p>E5.2.3a</p> <p>B1.1.7</p> <p>E5.2.2a</p> <p>B1.2.4</p>	<p>B1 K24a</p> <p>E1 K2a</p> <p>B1 K20g</p> <p>E5 K6h</p> <p>B1 K26</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>It was therefore agreed that an alternative placement had to be found - the consequences of the assessment not being completed has meant that this LA had to find a care placement not a placement that could meet his care and educational needs as well as having access to therapeutic intervention. We are now in a position where I do not think that this residential placement has the experience or knowledge to care for a child with sexually harmful behaviour and we have a child who has no education provision and no clear sense of what is likely to happen next.</p> <p>At the recent planning meeting I posed the question, "if I was an outsider looking in on this I would have to wonder, with all the professionals that are involved with this family, all the history and knowledge that we have, how on earth have we managed to get into the situation that we all agreed had to be avoided in the first place i.e. if E had to be accommodated it had to be planned, the family had to feel involved and E be given a clear message this was not a punishment etc and that we had to be sure that the identified placement was able to meet the complexities of his needs." Previously there was a recognition that if the aforementioned was not achieved this could be potentially more damaging than even the current risks to E.</p> <p>Hand on heart I am not clear that we have just not changed the risks and that these risks are not necessarily any less damaging to E. Currently the family is angry, as they feel that they are not being heard and are frustrated at the lack of contact from Social Work. I have to ask myself with all my experience and knowledge why is this how I feel, what should I have done differently and what can I do now to try and make it right for E?</p>		<p>E5 K3</p> <p>B4 K22</p>

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE & CLARIFICATION

<p><i>This may be used to record additional questions or the candidate may use it to write an additional paragraph</i></p>		
--	--	--

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK TO CANDIDATE

If Witness Testimony used please state who supplied testimony and relationship to candidate.

The content of this account is supported by my observation of you at the point of the most recent child protection concerns, and confirms for me that my judgement of your knowledge and understanding of the situation were accurate and professional.

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM cont

Expert Witness Signature <i>(if applicable):</i>	
Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	21/02/08

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM

EVIDENCE NO:	3
DATE:	6/03/08

Identify Evidence Type

DIRECT OBSERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXPERT WITNESS	<input type="checkbox"/>
QUESTIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>	WITNESS TESTIMONY	<input type="checkbox"/>
WORK PRODUCT	<input type="checkbox"/>	CASE STUDY	<input type="checkbox"/>
REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT	<input type="checkbox"/>	PROJECT/ASSIGNMENT/APL	<input type="checkbox"/>
PROESSFIONAL DISSCUSSION	<input type="checkbox"/>		

CANDIDATE NAME:	May Bee
------------------------	----------------

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>This observation is based on a visit to May at the project where we were reviewing her progress and adjusting the assessment plan to move forward with her award.</p> <p>As we worked on her portfolio a member of staff came to the office, she was quite distressed and advised May that the police had called to ask if they could come to the project and enforce a place of safety warrant on the son of one of the families who use the project. May brought the worker into the office, sat her down and gently began to ask for a fuller explanation of what had been said. As she listened to the worker she made notes of the relevant factual information at the same time she reassured the worker and calmed her down. Together they made a planned response to the police and a detailed plan of action as to how they would advise the family and if necessary enable the process to take place with the minimum of disruption to the young person.</p> <p>May then asked the worker to advise the other members of staff and to respond to the police in the manner they had agreed. She made some notes that would ensure she was able to record factual information on the organisations intranet recording system as required to comply with the child protection policy. May was able to explain the policy and the compliance requirements clearly to me.</p> <p>May then explained some of the background to me and we agreed that in order to help her to clarify her thinking she would prepare a very full process recording in the form of a reflective account which we would use as evidence for her award. May agreed that this way of putting her thoughts on paper would be useful as she has very strong feelings about this young person and how she believes that the care system has consistently failed him over a long period of time. May was clear that her role now was to ensure his safety and</p>	<p>C1.3.3b</p> <p>A1.4.7b</p> <p>B4.3.6a</p> <p>B4.1.2</p> <p>E1.3.3a</p>	<p>E5 K4</p> <p>B4 K4</p>

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>that the role of the project was to provide a safe environment to allow the family and the relevant authorities i.e. the police and social work department to fully share their concerns and to reach a position that would ensure that the welfare of the child was placed in the centre of the actions that would be taken.</p> <p>May then went to the staff room to check on progress and to ensure that all members of staff were fully briefed; she answered questions related to policy and procedure and also ensured that staff members felt competent to deal with the family and with the other professionals who might become involved as the day went on.</p> <p>We agreed that we would use some product evidence from this situation as evidence for the portfolio; specifically we would refer to the case conference report she would have to prepare. While we would not include the actual report I would be given sight of it and together we would identify which parts of the knowledge evidence and performance criteria would be met by the contents.</p> <p>I was particularly impressed by the way May interacted with her staff, she remained calm and was able to ensure that all members of the team did so too, she also kept focused and ensured that staff were knowledgeable enough and confident enough to deal with the events that had taken place and those which would take place later that day and over the next few days and weeks. Her knowledge of the organisational policies, procedures and systems were also sound and I was confident that the best interests of the child would be strongly advocated for by this manager.</p>	<p>B1.3.5</p> <p>B4.3.5</p> <p>E1.1.4b</p> <p>B4.3.5</p>	<p>B4 K18</p>

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE & CLARIFICATION

<p><i>This may be used to record additional questions or the candidate may use it to write an additional paragraph</i></p> <p>I felt it was important that I ended my visit at this point, May and her team had work to do that my presence could have inhibited, I also felt it would not be appropriate for me to be present when either the family or other professionals arrived.</p>		
---	--	--

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK TO CANDIDATE

<p><i>If Witness Testimony used please state who supplied testimony and relationship to candidate.</i></p> <p>May you handled a potentially volatile situation well, you remained calm and controlled in your actions and in your dealings with the staff, I realise that you did not feel either calm or in control but I also recognise that your concern was for the young person and your desire to ensure that he received the best possible outcome.</p>
--

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM cont

Expert Witness Signature <i>(if applicable):</i>	
Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	6/03/08

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM

EVIDENCE NO:	7
DATE:	20/02/08

Identify Evidence Type

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| DIRECT OBSERVATION | <input type="checkbox"/> | EXPERT WITNESS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| QUESTIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> | WITNESS TESTIMONY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| WORK PRODUCT | <input type="checkbox"/> | CASE STUDY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT | <input type="checkbox"/> | PROJECT/ASSIGNMENT/APL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| PROESSFIONAL DISSCUSSION | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

CANDIDATE NAME:	May Bee
------------------------	----------------

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>I am employed as a finance manager by Fixit and in this capacity I am responsible for delegating project budgets to the Project Managers.</p> <p>I can confirm that I have worked with May Bee in developing the budget for Treetops.</p> <p>I have observed May undertake good stewardship of her budgets and act within a model of good stewardship over her time in this post.</p> <p>I met with May this week to consider the budget for the next financial year, May was well prepared for the meeting and brought a list of relevant questions in addition to the information I had requested she prepare. We discussed the overall funding of the project and it was apparent that May had given considerable thought to ways of working with the local authorities that would maximise the funding received from them while at the same time recognising the need to provide the best possible service for the children and families who are reliant on her project.</p> <p>She had undertaken a stringent review with her administrative staff as well as other team members in preparation for our meeting and was able to suggest to me how some of her funding could be vired to better meet her needs.</p>	<p>E.5.1.1</p> <p>E.5.2.4b.</p> <p>E.5.3.1</p>	

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE & CLARIFICATION

<i>This may be used to record additional questions or the candidate may use it to write an additional paragraph</i>		
---	--	--

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM cont

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK TO CANDIDATE

If Witness Testimony used please state who supplied testimony and relationship to candidate.

Expert Witness Signature (if applicable):	Edina Cloud
Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	20/02/08

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM

EVIDENCE NO:	8
DATE:	3/03/08

Identify Evidence Type

- | | |
|---|---|
| DIRECT OBSERVATION <input type="checkbox"/>
QUESTIONS <input type="checkbox"/>
WORK PRODUCT <input type="checkbox"/>
REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
PROFESSIONAL DISCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> | EXPERT WITNESS <input type="checkbox"/>
WITNESS TESTIMONY <input type="checkbox"/>
CASE STUDY <input type="checkbox"/>
PROJECT/ASSIGNMENT/APL <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|---|

CANDIDATE NAME:	May Bee
------------------------	----------------

EVIDENCE	Unit, Element, PCs	Knowledge
<p>During our monthly business meeting the Team Seniors and I discussed the need to advertise for two full time project workers and two relief project workers. The full time worker posts are required due to staff leaving and the project the relief workers are required due to the pool of workers now being insufficient to cover annual leave, sickness and training requirements in the project.</p> <p>The decision to recruit to the relief pool was based on an analysis of the hours that current relief staff are able to cover and identifying that there are gaps in terms of shifts that still require to be covered. We have additional young people in the project and some need to have a one to one staff ratio due to challenging behaviour so we also have to consider the qualities and skills we need to attract into these posts.</p> <p>I drew up an advertisement and submitted this to HR, I then reviewed the job descriptions for both full time and relief staff and ensured that we had made it clear that we wished to recruit staff with relevant qualifications and/or experience in working with young people and challenging behaviour. I ensured that HR were fully aware of the need to comply with the safer recruitment guidelines and to make applicants aware that the interview would be over a period of two days and includes spending time in the unit and meeting the young people as part of the formal interview.</p> <p>While waiting for HR to receive and sift the applications the team seniors and I reviewed the safer selection procedure and process and agreed on the need to have an external service manager as part of the interview panel. We also prepared a series of written questions for the candidates to answer, and decided on the topics for discussion in the group interview. The relevant paperwork was then drawn up and kept confidential to the members of the interview panel. Seven applicants were short listed for interview and we decided that they should all undertake the group discussion</p>	<p>E5.2.4c</p> <p>A3.1.2a A3.1.4c</p> <p>A3.1.1</p> <p>A3.2.1</p>	<p>A3 K14a</p>

EVIDENCE GATHERING FORM cont

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK TO CANDIDATE

If Witness Testimony used please state who supplied testimony and relationship to candidate.

This is a good start to looking at the process of recruitment and selection I would like you now to reflect on your decisions and to begin to develop some plans to support your new workers in post over the six month induction period.

We will plan to review this by means of a professional discussion which we can plan for at our next meeting.

Expert Witness Signature <i>(if applicable):</i>	
Candidate Signature:	May Bee
Assessor Signature:	Maureen Portently
Date:	3/03/08