

Portfolio File Structure and Document Referencing System

The role of the verifier has changed following the move from the Trading Standards Qualification Framework to the Consumer Protection Competency Framework and is now a single stage process rather than dual stage. Previously portfolio organisation had to be transparent to the internal verifier, and therefore there was generally sufficient clarity once it was submitted to the external verifier. With the single stage verification process, plus the movement of submissions online, it can be difficult and time consuming for verifiers to navigate the submissions to confirm competency without a consistent approach to file structure and document referencing.

There it is proposed that all candidates use a standardised file naming system which may aid in this transparency, that sits within a standardised directory system. Such a process should not be onerous for candidates and will assist at both the assessment and verification stage. Starting with the directory system the following hierarchy is suggested from top to bottom:

1. Candidate Number
2. Portfolio (E.g. generic, investigations or product safety)
 - (i) Assessment plan and amendments
 - (ii) Assessment documents, observation and feedback
 - (iii) Assessment matrices
 - (iv) List of witnesses
 - (vi) Witness evidence
 - (Vi) Work evidence submitted for the assessment*

Following this model will enable verifiers to locate the documents they need to access quickly and easily. When single pieces of work evidence are used in multiple portfolios it is possible to include them in each of the 'work evidence submitted for assessment folder' simply by copying and pasting rather than have the files located in an individual portfolio and cross referencing it, as is currently the practice in some portfolios. All evidence should be included in each of the portfolios it is referenced in.

*There are likely to be multiple folders within this file which makes reference to the investigation/sample/complaint/other piece of work produced. Whilst there is no one method of doing this, and it is left up to candidates to determine with their assessors, the directory system should be transparent and follow a pattern which is logical in the context of the work produced. For example, include the subject matter of the work evidence, and draw all documents related to this together under the same heading so the audit trail of the work and the competency demonstrated is clear to the reader.

File naming protocols also differ between candidates which again can cause a degree of confusion, and therefore the following naming methodology is recommended for assessment documents.

Candidate initials candidate number Assess 1/2/3/4_date of finalisation/upload
For other files the naming should always start with candidate initials and number and be followed with a descriptor which makes it clear what it is, but also provides a reference for use in the matrices. This can be the complaint number, name of the economic operator etc, but also refer to what it is, for example complaint log, witness statement, sampling form etc.

These suggested changes will ensure that portfolio submissions are more transparent than at present, enabling verifiers to work through the documentation in a logical way to build a picture of the quality of the submission and arrive at a decision about confirmation of competency more easily, and will also provide an at a glance review of the documents from the outset providing an opportunity to fill any gaps at the outset, and avoiding the need to refer back to the candidate or the assessor when essential documents appear to be missing.