



**Scottish Vocational Qualifications and
Professional Development Awards**

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018

Bricklaying

Introduction

All SQA centres delivering the Scottish Vocational Qualification (SVQ) and Professional Development Award (PDA) in Bricklaying went through a significant transition in academic year 2017–2018. The source of candidate assessment evidence for this SVQ moved from being generated via a CREW (Candidate Record of Evidence from the Workplace) to evidence of practical competence gathered from the candidate's natural working environment, and recorded in a candidate's portfolio. Consequently, all centres delivered two models of SVQ qualifications in 2017–2018. Candidates registered in 2017–2018 undertook the new SVQ, while candidates registered prior to August 2017 undertook the old SVQ.

To help centre staff make this transition, SQA provided each centre with extensive support throughout the academic year, with centres being offered three support visits over the academic session, along with ongoing support in the form of e-mails and phone conversations.

GF22 23 and GM7R 23 SVQ 3 Bricklaying and PDA Bricklaying

DY0W 04	Erect Masonry Structures
F00F 04	Set Out Masonry Structures
F00B 04	Set Out Complex Masonry Structures
DY0H 04	Erect Complex Masonry Structures
F7A9 04	Confirm Work Activities and Resources for the Work
F7AA 04	Develop and Maintain Good Working Relationships
F7AB 04	Confirm the Occupational Method of Work
FN2J 04	Conform to General Workplace Health, Safety and Welfare

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.

Qualification verification reports for the SVQ and PDA in Bricklaying confirmed that staff at all centres complied with assessment strategy requirements for staff competence and qualifications. Assessors and internal verifiers at all centres were competent, well qualified — both vocationally and professionally — and had extensive industry experience. Staff at most centres undertook and recorded appropriate Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activity to ensure they maintained occupational currency. Good practice was identified at a few centres for the range of CPD offered, and the analysis of staff needs prior to providing CPD.

At more than a few centres, however, qualification verifiers made CPD-related recommendations. These included ensuring that CPD records are recorded and updated, and that CPD opportunities are made available to staff to ensure they are up to date in their field of vocational expertise.

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

Visiting qualification verifiers for the SVQ and PDA in Bricklaying identified that all centres had appropriate ongoing processes and procedures in place to review assessment environments, including workshops and classrooms, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials. Qualification verifiers reported that these processes and procedures were being implemented very effectively in all centres. There was ample evidence of improvements and enhancements subsequent to these reviews.

At one centre the qualification verifier identified good practice for the frequency and output from standardisation meetings. They did, however, recommend that meeting agendas and minutes be more detailed in summarising improvements relating to this criterion.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

At all centres, staff effectively implemented centre procedures to identify candidate development needs, either at induction or registration. Candidates had the opportunity at all centres to receive support from staff when specific needs were identified. Candidates were referred for support where required and alternative assessment arrangements were available where necessary.

Skills development needs for all candidates were identified through Training and Assessment Programmes (TAPs) assessor feedback comments. These comments identified areas for further training and skills development, as well as any improvement required in relation to construction practices.

These processes of identifying candidate development needs are augmented by Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) reviews, which focus on candidates' overall progress within the qualification. At one centre, the qualification verifier commended the quality of information available to candidates about the core skills support sessions.

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

External verifier reports for SVQ and PDA Bricklaying qualifications confirmed that candidates at all centres had well-planned and purposeful contact with their assessors. These interactions enabled candidates to receive effective feedback on course progression, with assessors confirming what had been achieved and identifying areas for improvement or skills development where necessary. At more than a few centres qualification verifiers reported that all candidates received consistently good and constructive feedback from their assessors.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres had well-established assessment and verification processes and procedures in place to support the effective delivery of the assessment and verification process. Qualification verifiers reported that assessors and internal verifiers at almost all centres implemented these procedures effectively and efficiently to ensure a standardised approach to assessment and internal verification practice.

At more than a few centres, however, action plans were put in place to address a lack of internal verification planning and candidates' failure to wear mandatory personal protective equipment (PPE) to meet SQA unit requirements during formal assessments.

At one centre, good practice was reported for the prompt way that the assessor closed out actions and recommendations identified by the internal verifier.

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

For all candidates registered for Group Award GF22 23, candidates were being assessed effectively using the SQA-devised Training and Assessment Programmes (TAPs). The use of TAPs ensures that all assessment instruments and their methods are valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

This session saw several recommendations for photographic evidence to show that candidates were actively involved in the construction processes and to improve the quality of technical drawings.

For those centres delivering Group Award GM7R 23, almost all have made good progress in the development of a portfolio model and assessment documentation for collating and assessing evidence from the workplace, which is valid and reliable for use in a construction context. Moreover, all centres have made excellent progress in supporting candidates to generate evidence from the workplace. Centre staff have clearly benefited from the SQA centre support visits, which have taken place across the academic year.

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

Almost all centres were continuing to use SQA-devised TAPs evidence-recording documentation very effectively to confirm individual candidate assessment evidence. Assessment records at almost all centres were signed and dated by the candidate and the assessor and — where appropriate — the internal verifier. Completed practical checklists and photographic evidence further authenticated this evidence. In the SVQ qualifications programme, evidence from the workplace, and Candidate Records of Evidence from the

Workplace (CREWs), were signed by industry supervisors to confirm receipt of industrial experience on site.

At one centre, however, the qualification verifier reported that some candidate knowledge, practical assessments and assessment records had not been signed or dated by the assessor or by the candidate.

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

Qualification verifiers reported that assessor judgements were accurate and consistent at almost centres delivering Bricklaying SVQ and PDA qualifications.

Sampled practical work and knowledge evidence confirmed that candidates were meeting the requirements of all units and were achieving required national standards.

At one centre, an action plan was put in place to address inconsistent and inappropriate assessment decisions in practical assessments, due to some candidates not wearing the mandatory PPE required for the units.

At a few centres, qualification verifiers recommended that candidate scripts be signed and dated by the candidate and the assessor, and that appropriate PPE be worn by candidates during workshop activities.

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

All evidence identified on visit plans was readily available during qualification verification activity. Centres had a clear understanding of the awarding body's requirements regarding retention of candidate evidence and assessment record policy.

All qualification verifier reports for SVQ and PDA Bricklaying confirmed that centres continued to retain candidate evidence and assessment records in line with SQA requirements. Retention policies at most centres exceeded SQA requirements.

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

All centres had clear policies and procedures in place for the dissemination of information from qualification verifiers to assessors and internal verifiers. Staff at all centres implemented centre procedures effectively and there was good evidence of improvements and enhancements being taken to develop assessment practice.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The following examples of good practice were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ vocational continuing professional development (CPD) (Criterion 2.1)
- ◆ feedback to candidates (Criterion 3.3)
- ◆ core skills support sessions (Criterion 3.2)
- ◆ standardisation meetings (Criterion 2.4)
- ◆ site diaries for recording on-site evidence (Criterion 4.6)

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ recording occupational/vocational CPD (Criterion 2.1)
- ◆ minutes of meetings being more detailed (Criterion 2.4)
- ◆ feedback given by the assessor to each candidate (Criterion 3.3)
- ◆ assessment paperwork being signed and dated (Criterion 4.4 and 4.6)
- ◆ candidates wearing appropriate PPE in workshops (Criterion 4.3)
- ◆ quality of technical drawings (Criterion 4.3)
- ◆ actions identified by the internal verifier being closed out by the assessor (Criterion 4.2)
- ◆ internal verification sampling (Criterion 4.2)
- ◆ inconsistent assessment decisions with regard to the wearing of mandatory PPE (Criterion 4.6)