Scottish Vocational Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2016
Healthcare Support (Non-Clinical)

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

SVQ awards

General comments

This report is based on feedback from visits undertaken by external verifiers for SVQ Healthcare Support (Non-Clinical) at Levels 2 and 3.

Verifiers noted a good 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 for the award, in the main. Though one centre felt they would benefit from a development visit post-verification. This was subsequently carried out.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Two of the centres verified were producing a high standard of work, with one centre judged as satisfactory. Assessors and verifiers generally demonstrated a good understanding of the requirements of the awards.

Comments from the reports included:

- *Site selection checklists are used and form part of the initial induction checklist.*
- *There was evidence of induction and initial meetings with candidates.*
- *Good assessment planning and support was evident within the portfolios.*
- *Regular reviews were carried out in line with SQA, college and NHS requirements.*
- *Detailed assessment plans provided the candidate with targets to progress and achieve the award.*
- *Centre induction highlights malpractice and plagiarism and is supported by appropriate policies.*
- *Minutes of standardisation meetings confirm ongoing discussion about the delivery of the awards.*

Evidence requirements

Verifiers reported that the evidence requirements for the award are being met by centres. Candidates' work sampled complied with the assessment strategy and VARCS principles. Assessment and verification decisions were appropriate in the work sampled.

Comments from the reports included:

- *There was sufficient evidence in terms of quality and quantity, which is appropriate and matches standards.*

- *Clear processes are in place (eg one-to-one meetings and assessment planning) that focus on generating evidence in the workplace and should ensure that assessment is valid and fair.*
- *There was evidence of induction and ongoing development needs being addressed in advance of the candidates undertaking the award.*
- *The centre utilises an individual training plan for candidates and this contains areas for development.*

Administration of assessments

There was evidence within the reports of robust systems in place to support the delivery of the awards.

Comments included:

- *CPD records were available within the centre and all staff hold appropriate assessor/verifier qualifications.*
- *The centre utilises a robust assessment and verification strategy which was clearly evidenced.*
- *There was a detailed IV sampling plan and the feedback sampled was appropriate.*
- *External verification report is shared with the team and discussed at standardisation meetings.*
- *Minutes of standardisation meetings confirm ongoing discussion on the delivery of the awards.*

General feedback

There was clear evidence in the reports of close working relationships between centres and NHS and college colleagues. Candidates interviewed were happy with the support offered by assessors and with the choice of units within the awards.

Comments included:

- *The candidate identified excellent support from the assessor whilst undertaking the award.*
- *Candidate also identified the relevance of the award to the area they are working in.*
- *Knowledge obtained supports the job role.*
- *The ongoing relationship between the college and hospital staff involved…has continued to develop.*

Areas of good practice

There was evidence within the reports for this award that candidates are offered very good support by their assessors, and that centres are working hard to maintain high standards in delivery.

Specific areas for improvement

There were a few comments in a couple of the reports around more specific standardisation minutes and decision logs being kept. One new centre requested a development visit after qualification verification to support the delivery of the awards.