



**Regulated Qualifications  
Internal Assessment Report 2016  
Construction Technician (Ofqual)**

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

# NVQ awards

## General comments

Only two centres were subjected to external verification activity this session. The staff in those centres exhibited a broad and comprehensive understanding of the requirements of the National Occupational Standards embraced by these awards.

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The external verifier reports confirmed that all assessors are familiar with the unit specifications. There is little in the way of SQA-prepared exemplification materials for the Construction Technician NVQs. However, since much of the assessment activity takes place in observed conditions on the candidate's active construction site, assessors are highly experienced in the development and application of appropriate assessment instruments and strategies that meet the demands of the evidence requirements and SQA.

## Evidence requirements

As indicated above, the evidence in external verifier reports confirms that assessors and internal verifiers have comprehensive knowledge and clear understanding of the evidence requirements stated in the unit specifications.

## Administration of assessments

It was found that each centre has a well-developed and robust administrative process in place to support all aspects of delivery and assessment of the NVQs. In each centre, there was a very strong observance of health and safety processes and activities because much of the assessment activity takes place on active construction sites.

The centres maintain regular contact with their candidates, nominally monthly. However, many assessors supplement these regular meetings with other communications by e-mail, mobile and social media. These forms of communication prove particularly effective when candidates are operating remote from the centre.

## General feedback

The quality of feedback to candidates varied over the two centres. The assessors in one centre offered full and thorough feedback to candidates, while feedback in the second centre was somewhat generalised and not very constructive. As assessment is carried out on an individual basis, the recording of feedback had been correctly documented in the candidates' portfolios.

For the most part, feedback from candidates praised the assessors and the centres for their professionalism, accessibility, flexibility, support and guidance.

There were no perceived barriers to access to assessment. It was obvious that assessment activity was encouraged and promoted by clear forward planning and advice, support and guidance offered to candidates.

### **Areas of good practice**

This was the first round of verification activity in this new verification group.

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
- ◆ Excellent feedback to candidates, fully documented
- ◆ Accessibility of assessors offering flexibility in assessment activity
- ◆ Sophisticated centre-devised documentation that facilitates management of assessment and internal verification activities

### **Specific areas for improvement**

As highlighted in other reports, good practice observed in some centres can also prove to be challenging in others:

- ◆ Feedback to candidates was too generalised to be fully effective.