Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018
Food Manufacture

Introduction

Eight centres were visited during the year offering awards across the range of food and drink manufacturing industries qualifications at SCQF levels 5 and 6. Five centres are training providers, one is a college, and two centres are workplace centres. The units verified were as follows:

GFOH 23   Food Manufacture Excellence SCQF 6
GG6C 23   Food and Drink Operations (Meat and Poultry Skills) SCQF 6
GJ1M 23   Food and Drink Operations (Fish and Shellfish Industry Skills) SCQF 6
GG51 23   Food and Drink Operations SCQF 6
GG49 23   Food and Drink Operations (Supply Chain Skills) SCQF 6
GFOG 22   Food Manufacture Excellence SCQF 5
GG4W 22   Food and Drink Operations (Distribution Skills) SCQF 5
GG6A 22   Food and Drink Operations (Meat and Poultry Skills) SCQF 5
GG50 22   Food and Drink Operations (Food Sales and Service Skills) SCQF 5
GG4Y 22   Food and Drink Operations (Production and Processing Skills) SCQF 5
GG55 22   Food and Drink Operations (Meat and Poultry Skills) SCQF 5
GG68 22   Food and Drink Operations (Food Sales and Service Skills) SCQF 5
GG52 22   Food and Drink Operations (Fish and Shellfish Processing Skills) SCQF 5

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 centre staff have the relevant assessor and verifier awards. Almost all assessors were given adequate support and guidance from the internal verifier. Almost all centres have staff with the relevant qualifications and occupational competency for the awards delivered.

Where centres are offering awards in other food and drink sectors, they must ensure that assessors have the relevant competency for the specific industry sector. At one centre, the assessor did not hold a relevant qualification in food hygiene/safety, as recommended in the sector skills council assessment strategy for the awards.

Almost all centre staff provided evidence of sufficient currently relevant CPD. One centre was advised that staff CPD records should be relevant, up-to-date and sufficiently detailed to meet the requirements of the awards.

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

Almost all centres have very effective ongoing reviews. They provided documented evidence to demonstrate that they completed scheduled reviews of assessment environments, assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials. Checklists were available for each workplace where candidates are located.

One centre did not provide documented evidence of meetings where the most up-to-date published reference materials, equipment and assessment environments for the award are discussed and recorded. The centre was advised to ensure that published reference and learning materials are current and in line with industry practice, and that assessments meet the National Occupational Standards for the awards.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

Almost all centres have application and induction processes, and procedures that identify prior achievements and individual development needs. Candidates with additional learning and support needs are identified, and individual plans are shared with assessors and verifiers. Where required, special assessment requirements are included in individual assessment/learning plans.

One centre, where SCQF 6 level candidates have English as a second language, was strongly recommended to assess candidates before they undertake the awards, to ensure they have the required level of oral and written English.

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

All candidates have regular contact with their assessor during scheduled visits. All candidates have assessment plans in place, and feedback from the assessor allowed them to review their own progress and development.

Almost all centres have a candidate review and progress record which the assessor and candidate sign, and this is used to plan the next assessment activity. All SCQF 5 and 6 candidates have regular contact with assessors via e-mail, text and telephone.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Most assessors and internal verifiers apply their centre's policies and procedures for assessment and verification appropriately.

One centre had no internal verification documentation available. One centre carried out assessment at SCQF level 6 in a language other than English, and there was no evidence of standardisation across assessment.

Almost all centres presented completed pre-delivery documentation before delivering units. Meeting notes confirmed that assessments were appropriate and up-to-date, with action points, and that internal verification feedback was recorded and acted upon accordingly.

All centres reviewed their policies and procedures for assessment and internal verification annually, and recorded the reviews.

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

All centres completed pre-delivery checklist/unit summary forms to confirm that assessment instruments were valid, reliable, practical, equitable and fair.

All centres are using the current sector skills council National Occupational Standards for the awards, and the completed checklists confirmed that the assessments were fit for purpose.

Centres use appropriate assessment methods for the awards. These include witness testimony, observation, photographs and personal statements.

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

All centres ensure candidates sign and date a disclaimer at the start of the award. After each assessor visit, and on completion of each unit, candidates sign their evidence to confirm the work is their own.

Disclaimers are regularly reviewed, and documented evidence was available in the centre's master folders. Almost all assessors countersign and date all completed candidate units, confirming that the evidence generated is the candidates own work.

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

Almost all assessors complete unit checklists to match evidence in portfolios against SQA requirements and NOS. For awards at SCQF level 5, assessment is via observation, and knowledge and understanding questions. External verification visits confirm that almost all candidates completing SCQF level 6 awards have full access to any company documentation required to complete units.

The evidence provided confirmed that almost all candidate work is consistently and accurately judged by assessors across all units and awards. One centre had candidate evidence that was insufficient to meet the standards for awards at SCQF levels 5 and 6. The centre had to re-assess the candidates in English, and in line with the standards for the awards.

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

All centres retain candidate evidence according to their centre policies and procedures, and evidence was available in quality manuals. Where requested, evidence was available for external verification. Centre policies and procedures all meet SQA retention requirements. Internal verification procedures and sampling forms confirmed that evidence was available for internal verification.

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

Almost all centres included feedback from qualification verification as an agenda item at verification/moderation meetings, and any action points are recorded. Good practice is discussed and any areas for improvement recorded and actions are implemented. Meeting notes were available to relevant staff and circulated as appropriate.

One centre was unable to provide any evidence that qualification verification reports were discussed or circulated to centre staff. Centres were advised that assessors and internal verifiers may wish to use this as CPD evidence.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

♦ All centres use current SSC National Occupational Standards, and assessment strategy for the awards.

♦ Excellent minutes of quarterly meetings confirming assessment and learning material are discussed at every stage of delivery.

♦ All centres have sound policies and procedures in place for assessment and internal verification; these are all regularly updated and recorded.

♦ Candidates undertake and complete REHIS Elementary Food Hygiene prior to starting the qualification.

♦ Candidates and assessors complete statements for each unit on completion, confirming the evidence is the candidate's.

♦ Increase in number of candidates undertaking SCQF level 6 awards.

♦ Increase in number of candidates and centres using e-portfolios to plan assessment and record evidence.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2017–18:

♦ To conduct and record standardisation reviews, team meetings and share good practice. Reviews should include assessment instruments, learning material and assessment practice. Assessors are required to check that the evidence provided in candidate portfolios meets the evidence requirements for units.

♦ Supplementary evidence should be cross-referenced and mapped to specific units.

♦ It is recommended that the centre assesses candidate's English before undertaking awards to ensure they have the required level of written and oral English.

♦ Feedback from qualification verification reports should be discussed, recorded and disseminated to all relevant centre staff.

♦ Assessor and internal verifier CPD should be relevant for the awards delivered — assessors and verifiers need to demonstrate competency for the food and drink area they are assessing.

♦ Centres should use SQA unit numbers to eliminate any confusion with SSC Unit numbers.

♦ Centre staff should use standardisation meetings as evidence for CPD.