



Internal Assessment Report 2010: Bricklaying (171)

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

Higher National Units

General comments

All centres verified had a sound working knowledge of the requirements of the national standards and the level of competence and performance that is specific to each Unit being delivered. Practical workshop evidence available for External Verifier scrutiny confirmed that candidates were meeting the standards of the Units being undertaken.

Assessors at all centres were very familiar with the Unit specifications and instruments of assessments. Unit specifications being used were current, and nationally-devised practical workshop activities, checklists and written assessment materials were being used effectively.

Assessors and Internal Verifiers at all centres verified had a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements of the Units within the Advanced Craft Award, and of the nationally-devised assessment materials.

External verification activity focused clearly on confirming sufficiency, appropriateness and authenticity of evidence, and more importantly observing live practical assessments at the centre to confirm compliance with Unit Evidence Requirements.

Written evidence for each Unit was consistent with the Evidence Requirements of each Unit at all centres subject to external verification.

All centres had a structured delivery of assessments, confirming that for each Unit within the Award, candidates were fully prepared for each stage of the assessment process.

Candidate written and practical assessment records sampled confirmed that judgement of candidate performance was appropriate and consistent at all centres.

Robust internal verification activity of assessment evidence and Assessor decisions ensured a high level of quality assurance at all centres.

All centres made candidates available for interview during external verification visits. All candidates were happy with the Award, the quality of the learning environment, the pace of assessment and the feedback they received from their Assessors.

All candidates interviewed were well informed on their progress and achievement to date.

Access to assessment was appropriate and in the main was tailored to individual needs, with no evident barriers to achievement at centres.

Areas of good practice

Several items of good practice were noted during external verification activity, specifically:

- ◆ The professional approach displayed by staff delivering this Award was excellent at centres.
- ◆ There was an excellent, realistic work environment in one centre's workshops.
- ◆ Comprehensive and detailed Internal Verifier feedback reports to the Assessor were very effective at one centre.
- ◆ One centre had implemented individual PLSPs to gauge candidate support needs. This should be viewed as excellent practice.

Areas for improvement

- ◆ All centres must ensure that construction drawings produced by candidates for the Architectural and Landscape Walling Unit (Outcome 1) are of random rubble walling and not coursed random walling.
- ◆ Assessors at all centres should develop a marking schedule for Construction drawings produced by candidates to enable candidates to get feedback on improving poor drawings.

SVQ Awards

Titles/levels of SVQ Awards verified

G88K 22: Bricklaying level 2

G88L 23: Bricklaying level 3

General comments

Almost all centres had a good working knowledge of the requirements of the national occupational standards (NOS) and the level of competence and performance that is specific to each Unit within the Awards being delivered.

Almost all centres had complied effectively with the requirements of the assessment strategy which underpins the NOS. This includes ensuring that Assessors and Internal Verifiers have occupational expertise, knowledge of the NOS and a clear understanding of the assessment strategy.

Assessors at almost all centres were very familiar with the Unit specifications and instruments of assessments and the exemplification materials used to support the training and assessment packs (TAPs) materials.

Generic Units were well embedded and integrated within specialist Units' practical activities at almost all centres visited.

Structured delivery of the Award ensured regular and supportive developmental feedback to candidates at almost all centres.

Some issues were highlighted at a few centres, resulting in holds being placed on certification. There was insufficient evidence of candidate performance, as a direct result of Assessors being unfamiliar with assessment instrument requirements for subjective underpinning knowledge questions in Unit 6.

In almost all centres, Assessors and Internal Verifiers had a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements of the Units within the Award and of the TAPs assessment materials. Secondary evidence such as site evidence reports and generic Units' checklists were being applied appropriately by centre staff.

External verification activity focused clearly on confirming sufficiency, appropriateness and authenticity of TAPs and secondary evidence, and more importantly observing live practical assessments at the centre.

Equal opportunities policies, supported by evidence throughout the candidates' portfolios, confirmed that assessment and reassessment opportunities are being made available to candidates at almost all centres sampled.

However, at a few centres, there was insufficient available evidence of candidate performance for subjective underpinning knowledge questions in TAP Unit 6.

The assessment process was supported well, with ample resources and realistic workshop facilities being readily available to candidates at all centres.

In a few instances, building materials were of a poor standard and this impacted on the assessment process.

Evidence within candidates' portfolios at all centres sampled confirmed that regular supportive and developmental feedback from Assessors is being given to candidates, fully supporting the assessment process.

Effective and supportive internal verification activity ensured that all Units within the Award were quality assured at almost all centres. This process was robust and highly effective in monitoring both practical and written assessment decisions for the Award and contributing to the development of the Assessors.

Almost all centres had candidates available for interview during external verification visits, all of whom were happy with the Award and enjoyed the practical aspects of the assessment process.

All candidates interviewed were well informed on their progress and achievement to date, receiving regular feedback from their Assessor. Evidence throughout the candidates' portfolios confirmed that assessment and re-assessment opportunities are being made available to candidates.

Access to assessment opportunities was appropriate and, in the main, was tailored to individual needs, with no evident barriers to achievement at almost all centres.

Areas of good practice

Candidates at almost all centres demonstrated high levels of practical skills and competence and were given the opportunity to progress to the next level of their programme.

All centres provided appropriate, effective CPD activity, with industry-linked vocational up-skilling to meet the requirements of the assessment strategy.

Almost all centres had a structured delivery of assessments, confirming that all Units within the Award are assessed in a logical and sequential manner. This ensures that candidates are fully prepared for each stage of the assessment process.

One centre had developed a graphical report to record candidate progress. This visual impetus focused candidates on key areas for development.

An innovative collaborative partnership with local employers had been developed at one centre. This enabled candidates to undertake setting out in TAP Unit 2 in a realistic work environment with experienced operatives.

A few centres had implemented individual PLSPs to gauge candidate support needs. This should be viewed as excellent practice.

Areas for improvement

In a few centres, staff had not updated existing D Units to current A or V Units as required by the assessment strategy.

In a few centres, there was insufficient available evidence of candidate performance for subjective underpinning knowledge questions in TAP Unit 6.

Integration and signposting for generic Units within practical activities remains an issue for some centres.

In a few centres, photographic evidence of completed work was included in candidate portfolios. External Verifiers raised issues of authenticity and advised centres to use photographs of candidates carrying out work processes to ensure authenticity.

Issues relating to effective internal verification activity were reported at more than a few centres. Specific issues included:

- ◆ Candidate feedback comments from assessments being addressed to the Internal Verifier rather than the candidate.
- ◆ No ongoing internal verification activity to support the assessment process at one centre.
- ◆ Ineffective internal verification of Assessors' assessment decisions at a few centres.

The majority of centres had development points noted in relation to the poor quality of candidate construction drawings. Guidance from External Verifiers to centres focused on the production of a detailed generic marking schedule to assess all drawings within the Award. This would enable Assessors to give concise and supportive feedback on aspects of drawing that candidates need to develop.

More than a few centres did not have candidates available for interview during external verification visits. This should be a key focus of all verification visits.