National Vocational Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2015
Occupational Work Supervision

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

NVQ awards

General comments

The staff in all centres that were subjected to external review exhibited a broad and comprehensive understanding of the requirements of the national standards embraced by these awards.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All assessors were fully aware of, and familiar with, Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and training and assessment packs as prepared by SQA. It was apparent in all centres that as new assessors are appointed there are robust induction and mentoring strategies in place to support the new appointees in their familiarisation period.

Evidence Requirements

Many of the centres that were subjected to verification audit this session have successfully delivered NVQ awards for several years. It is obvious from verification reports that, within those centres, there is a comprehensive understanding of the Evidence Requirements laid down in the Unit specifications.

Administration of assessments

Each centre has its own well developed approach to assessment activity. Much of this activity takes place on active construction sites where individual candidates are located. As a result, assessment events are planned and executed to suit individual candidate's needs with full observation of health, safety and welfare requirements.

Most centres have regular reviews of candidate activity and progress. However, considerable flexibility is obvious in all centres as candidates respond to the ease of access to assessors during evidence production and portfolio compilation.

An increase in the use CD and DVD recording of professional discussions and observation of work activities has been noted again this session. Full transcripts of discussion were produced in some centres. None the less, in most cases, there was clear indexing and cross-referencing of this evidence to the Performance Requirements of the awards.

General feedback

Generally, feedback to candidates has been very good indeed and has been comprehensively documented in candidates' portfolios and in the centres' forms of documentation. As assessment activity is on an individual basis, feedback was observed to be targeted to the candidate, valid, relevant, appropriate and supportive.

Feedback from candidates praised the assessors and the centres for their professionalism, accessibility, flexibility and the support and guidance offered by them.

There were no observed barriers to assessment. In fact, most assessors positively encouraged assessment activity with sound forward-planning strategies that supported and guided the candidates through their evidence production.

Areas of good practice

As usual, some of the reported elements of good practice that have been broadly observed in most centres this session have also been identified as areas for improvement in a small minority of centres. However, that minority is reducing each year.

Considerable good practice was observed by External Verifiers as follows:

♦ Planning and implementation of targeted CPD activity
♦ Annual summary of CPD activity for each member of staff
♦ Robust risk assessment process prior to any on-site assessment activity
♦ Excellent feedback to candidates, fully documented
♦ Accessibility to assessors offering flexibility in assessment activity
♦ Sophisticated centre-devised documentation that facilitates management of assessment and internal verification activities
♦ The recording of professional discussions on CD and/or DVD is highly effective and provides a permanent, contemporary record of activity
♦ Refined indexing and cross-referencing of evidence systems to enhance effectiveness and transparency

Specific areas for improvement

As noted earlier, good practice observed in some centres proves challenging in others:

♦ Indexing and cross-referencing of evidence in some circumstances was ineffective in linking evidence to standards
♦ Recording of Knowledge and Understanding evidence was ineffective
♦ Indexing and cross-referencing of integrated Knowledge and Understanding evidence was inadequate
♦ Lack of documented evidence of standardisation and internal verification activity
♦ SQA codes not used to identify awards and Unit specifications