



**National Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2012**

Construction Technician

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

National Qualifications (NQ) Awards

Titles/levels of NQ Awards verified:

G8Y3 46 NC in the Built Environment at SCQF level 6
G8Y2 46 NC in Civil Engineering at SCQF level 6

General comments

The evidence presented in the External Verifiers' reports confirms that there is clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards in all centres that were subjected to external review. Inevitably, a few queries of interpretation arose, but these were very minor and the External Verifiers responded appropriately with consistent, coherent and co-ordinated direction.

Course Arrangements, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All assessors are thoroughly familiar with the Course Arrangements and the full array of Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and Assessment Support Packs (ASPs). This is clearly demonstrated in all centres by the quality of the design and content of alternate instruments of assessment and associated marking guidelines which have been prepared and internally verified by the centres' staff.

Evidence Requirements

Throughout the entire external verification process this session, there has been no significant instance of misunderstanding or misinterpretation of any of the Evidence Requirements of any of the Units.

Administration of assessments

In most cases, centres had used the SQA-devised ASPs as the preferred instruments of assessment this session. However, the centre-devised assessment materials had been designed carefully to match in structure, content and rigour those contained in the ASPs prepared by SQA. All of the materials had been subjected to the centres' IV processes before presentation to the candidates.

Post-assessment internal verification was carried out in each centre to structured sampling strategies for each constituent Unit. These were seen to be very effective and the Outcomes were being used to inform the design and delivery of the ensuing programmes.

Areas of good practice

Generally, learners' support materials had been developed to a very good standard in both paper and electronic formats.

One centre had developed Unit evaluation forms that provided the opportunity for learners to comment on all aspects of the Units undertaken. These provide valuable feedback to delivery staff to assist with the improvement of future provision.

The candidates interviewed all commented on the encouragement, support and guidance given by the staff, which obviously enhances the student experience.

Specific areas for improvement

It was felt by the External Verifiers that feedback generally to candidates could be more detailed and more specific by providing written commentary on scripts and drawings/sketches to enhance candidates' knowledge and understanding and to appreciate how performance could be improved.

Advice and guidance was given to centre staff on these philosophies during the external verification processes.

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified:

EB47 11 Contributing to Health and Safety in the Workplace

General comments

Only one centre was identified for audit of this subject area this session. There was some evidence to demonstrate that assessors had clear and accurate understandings of the requirements of the national standards. However, there were no clear, consistent or coherent quality assurance policies in operation in this particular centre.

It was noted that the centre was in the middle of a major staffing restructure, with the majority of new staff still to take up their posts. Nonetheless, there were significant and fundamental deficiencies in the quality assurance processes.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The assessors were very familiar with the Unit specification, instruments of assessment and exemplar materials. The assessment process was being applied correctly, with clear progression through the stages of planning, assessment, review and feedback.

Evidence Requirements

The assessors and Internal Verifiers demonstrated a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements of the Unit. This was further confirmed by the content of the candidates' portfolios.

Administration of assessments

The quality assurance process was not managed effectively or consistently. Much of the documentation was poorly prepared and the policies were inaccurate and incomplete.

Areas of good practice

There was insufficient relevant evidence available to make an informed decision of good practice within this particular centre.

Specific areas for improvement

The full quality assurance process within this centre requires review. Examples are as follows:

- ◆ There was no induction policy or process for assessors and Internal Verifiers.

- ◆ The role description of assessors omitted key elements such as assessment planning, support and guidance of candidates, and contribution to the internal quality assurance process.
- ◆ Candidates' induction documentation made no mention of remediation or re-assessment opportunities. In addition, there was no mention of access opportunities/policies for candidates with disabilities or additional learning support needs.