

SVOCF Assessment & Evaluation Guide

Purpose

This document is the assessment companion guide for SVOCF (Symbiotic Value Orientation Competency Framework) Levels 1–3. It operationalizes competency descriptors into an executable, auditable, and continuously improvable evaluation process. The guide is intended for assessment providers, partner institutions, candidates, and quality assurance personnel. It specifies assessment methods, evidence requirements, scoring rules, and quality control mechanisms.

1. Document Positioning and Scope

The SVOCF Competency Framework answers: “What is assessed, how many levels, and what each level means.” This guide answers: “How to assess, what evidence to use, who assesses, and how to ensure fairness and consistency.”

Applicable users include:

- Participants in the SVOCF General Path.
- Foundational capability verification for candidates in professional pathways (role-bound and non-clinical).
- Capability maturity self-review and external review for institutions/organizations (evidence-first, narrative-secondary).

2. Assessment Goals and Principles

1. **Evidence-Ready:** Every competency must map to observable behavior, outputs, or process evidence to support spot-checking and re-review.
2. **Progressive Levels:** Levels 1–3 represent growth from self-stabilization, to system regulation, to contribution and regeneration.
3. **Fairness and Comparability:** Comparable across cultures and sectors; equivalent evidence yields equivalent decisions—background and identity are not implicit barriers.
4. **Diagnosable Gaps:** Assessment provides not only a decision but also actionable improvement advice and a clear evidence supplementation pathway.
5. **Auditable and Traceable:** The process, scoring rationales, and evidence chains are traceable; key steps leave records.
6. **Privacy and Ethics First:** Data minimization and purpose limitation; avoid unnecessary harm or labeling.

3. Assessment Architecture Overview

3.1 Assessed Object, Roles, and Deliverables

Assessed object: a candidate's contextualized sustainable action capability within SVOCF domains (integrated Knowledge/Skills/Attitudes), validated through "contextual tasks + evidence chains."

Core roles and responsibilities:

- **Candidate:** Completes self-review, submits evidence, participates in interviews and contextual tasks; responsible for authenticity of materials.
- **Assessor:** Scores against standards and rubrics; records rationales; provides improvement and supplementation suggestions.
- **Moderator:** Re-reviews boundary and sampled cases; calibrates inter-rater consistency.
- **QA Lead:** Maintains process compliance, data governance, and annual improvement; handles appeals and risk events.

Deliverables: assessment record form, evidence index, rubric score sheets, decision notice, and (if passed) certificate and verifiable ID.

3.2 Assessment Units and Minimum Evidence Package (MEP)

Assessment uses "Competency Units" as the basic structure. Each unit includes: definition, observable indicators, optional contextual tasks, evidence requirements, and scoring rules.

To reduce cost while maintaining comparability, this guide adopts the concept of a Minimum Evidence Package (MEP): candidates provide an evidence combination that meets the minimum sufficiency threshold. When evidence is insufficient or disputed, the process moves to supplementation or interview-weighted review.

3.3 Level 1–3 Decision Logic (Principled Description)

- **Level 1: Self-Stabilisation** — Maintain basic self-management and risk recognition in common contexts; build repeatable habits for learning, work, collaboration, and sustainable action.
- **Level 2: System Regulation** — Regulate resources, coordinate relationships, and optimize processes in complex contexts; demonstrate cross-context transferability and continuous improvement.
- **Level 3: Contribution & Regeneration** — Make verifiable contributions oriented toward public value; uplift others/teams and produce reusable methods and tools.

4. Assessment Methods and Evidence System

4.1 Evidence Types

- **A. Observation:** On-site or remote observation records (context, time, observer, conclusions, and rationale).
- **B. Portfolio / Outputs:** Project deliverables, plans, review reports, process maps, tool lists, etc.
- **C. Scenario / Simulation:** Standardized contextual tasks (may be online), including rubric and process records.
- **D. Reflective Log:** Periodic logs / learning records / behavior tracking and self-adjustment evidence.
- **E. Third-party Feedback:** Structured feedback from mentors, peers, clients, or supervisors (relationship + date required).
- **F. Knowledge Check:** Short test/oral check if needed for conceptual understanding (not as sole evidence).

4.2 Evidence Quality Standards

All evidence should meet the following quality requirements (optionally scored 0–2 as an evidence-quality factor):

- **Authenticity:** Clear source; checkable; third-party materials must be verifiable.
- **Relevance:** Directly maps to the target competency indicators and contextual requirements.
- **Sufficiency:** Covers key indicators and supports a stable conclusion, not a one-off performance.
- **Traceability:** Includes timestamps, version information, or process traces; avoids after-the-fact patchwork.
- **Consistency:** No major contradictions across sources; contradictions require explanation and supplementation.

4.3 Evidence Chain Structure and Submission Standards

Use an Evidence Index to organize materials: each item has a unique ID, the mapped competency unit, date, evidence type, summary, verifiable link/attachment, and the candidate's self-notes.

Recommended file naming: SVOCF_[CandidateID]_[UnitCode]_[EvidenceID]_[Date].pdf/jpg/mp4, etc. Do not submit unnecessary originals containing sensitive personal identity information.

5. Scoring and Decision Rules

5.1 Rubric Framework

Each competency unit uses a 4-band performance scale: 0 = Not Demonstrated / Not Applicable; 1 = Basic (unstable); 2 = Competent (stable and repeatable); 3 = Excellent (transferable / can uplift others). Assessors must record an evidence-based rationale.

Evidence quality acts as an adjustment factor: where performance sits at a boundary and evidence quality is insufficient, prioritize supplementation; where evidence quality is high and multi-source consistent, a more robust boundary decision is possible.

5.2 Recommended Level Thresholds

These thresholds may be localized for sector mapping, but must be pre-announced and kept consistent within a cohort:

- Level 1: core-unit competence rate $\geq 70\%$, with no critical red-line items unmet.
- Level 2: core-unit competence rate $\geq 80\%$, with at least 30% of units rated “Excellent”.
- Level 3: core-unit competence rate $\geq 85\%$, with at least 50% of units rated “Excellent”, and at least one verified contribution evidence item (positive impact on others/team/community).

5.3 Supplementation, Re-Review, and Validity

When evidence is insufficient or conflicting, the candidate may supplement within a defined window. Re-review should target disputed units only to avoid unnecessary burden. A recommended certificate validity period is 24–36 months; renewal uses a simplified review with an updated evidence pack and sampled verification.

6. Candidate Journey (Process Flow)

7. **6.1 Registration & Declarations:** Identity verification as required, privacy consent, conflict-of-interest declarations; assign CandidateID.
8. **6.2 Self-Review & Plan:** Candidate self-review against the framework and submits an improvement plan (optional).
9. **6.3 Evidence Submission:** Submit MEP via Evidence Index; system checks format and completeness.
10. **6.4 Initial Review:** Assessor conducts desk review and produces preliminary scores and questions.
11. **6.5 Interview / Scenario Tasks (if needed):** Structured interview and/or simulation for boundary, disputed, or higher-level applications.
12. **6.6 Moderation & Decision:** Moderator samples cases; QA Lead reviews compliance and releases the final decision.
13. **6.7 Feedback & Improvement:** Provide unit-level feedback, improvement actions, and supplementation pathway.

14. **6.8 Appeals:** Candidate may appeal within the defined window; handled independently with records.

7. Assessor Requirements and Scoring Consistency

7.1 Assessor Qualification (Recommended)

- Familiar with the SVOCF framework and this guide; complete standardized training and calibration testing.
- Have relevant practice experience (e.g., education & training, organizational development, facilitation, coaching, sustainability practice) or recognized equivalents.
- Possess basic evaluation literacy: evidence interpretation, structured interviewing, documentation, and feedback.

7.2 Calibration and Inter-Rater Consistency Control

Hold at least quarterly calibration sessions using anonymized samples for parallel scoring, discrepancy discussion, and guidance updates. For critical units, consider dual scoring or sampled re-review to control drift.

8. Quality Assurance, Reliability, and Validity

8.1 QA Mechanisms

- **Standardization:** Unified task descriptions, evidence requirements, rubrics, and record templates.
- **Sampling Review:** At least 10% of cases enter moderation; higher-level applications prioritized.
- **Anomaly Detection:** Monitor score distributions, pass rates, and assessment duration to identify anomalies.
- **Continuous Improvement:** Annual synthesis of candidate feedback, disputes, and case library to revise guidance and training.

8.2 Forward-Looking Enhancements for Evidence Validity

As digital assessment capacity improves, the system may gradually introduce: voluntary data upload with purpose limitation, process-based learning analytics, and AI-assisted evidence pre-classification and consistency checks. AI is strictly assistive and must not replace human final judgment; it must remain explainable, appealable, and optional.

9. Data Governance, Privacy, and Ethics

9.1 Data Minimization and Retention

Collect only what is necessary for assessment. A recommended retention period for evidence and assessment records is 36 months for spot-checking and dispute resolution; after expiry, anonymize or securely delete where permissible.

9.2 Candidate Rights

- **Informed consent:** Clear notice of data use, access roles, and retention window.
- **Withdrawal and correction:** Support withdrawal/correction requests where compatible with audit obligations.
- **Appeal and re-review:** Provide actionable appeal channels and timelines.

9.3 Ethical Red Lines

Prohibited: discriminatory uses of results; public disclosure without consent; fear-based or dependency-forming messaging. Feedback should remain supportive and action-oriented, avoiding diagnostic labeling.

Appendix A | Forms and Templates (Examples)

The following templates are recommended structures. They may be adapted to system implementation, but field logic should remain consistent.

A1 Candidate Declaration & Consent (Fields)

- **CandidateID:** System-generated identifier.
- **Authenticity Declaration:** Candidate confirms materials are authentic and verifiable.
- **Privacy Consent:** Data purpose, retention, and access scope.
- **Conflict of Interest Declaration:** Disclosure of relationships with assessors/institutions.
- **Signature & Date:** Electronic or handwritten signature.

A2 Evidence Index (Template)

Columns: EvidenceID | Competency Unit | Evidence Type | Date | Summary/Link | Self-Notes

A3 Rubric Score Sheet (Example)

Columns: Competency Unit | Indicator | 0 Not Demonstrated | 1 Basic | 2 Competent | 3 Excellent | Score | Rationale (Evidence IDs)

A4 Interview / Scenario Task Record (Fields)

- **Interview Date / Duration:** YYYY-MM-DD / minutes
- **Scenario / Task Context:** Task description and constraints
- **Key Probes:** Structured question list
- **Candidate Response Summary:** Key points

- **Decision & Recommendations:** Decision, supplementation points, improvement actions

A5 Appeal / Re-Review Request (Fields)

- **Appeal Scope:** Unit/indicator/procedure
- **Rationale and Evidence:** Specific basis and supplementary material IDs
- **Preferred Handling:** Re-review / correction / re-interview, etc.
- **Intake and Handling Record:** Handler, timeline, outcome