



**Regulated Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2016
Occupational Work Supervision**

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

RQF qualifications

General comments

In general, the staff in all of the centres that were subject to external review demonstrated a thorough and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the national standards embraced by the awards.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Evidence from external verifiers' reports confirmed that all assessors and internal verifiers are very familiar with the unit specifications, the guidance and the support materials issued by SQA.

Evidence requirements

Many of the centres that were subject to verification this session have successfully delivered NVQs (and, for some, SVQs) 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 needs with full observation of health, safety and welfare requirements.

Most centres have adopted a monthly review of candidate activity and progress as a baseline. However, considerable flexibility is obvious in all centres as candidates respond to the ease of access to assessors when producing evidence and compiling portfolios.

There was one exception identified in one of our centres this session, caused by delayed recruitment of a suitably qualified and competent assessor. There was a gap in delivery and assessment activity to the detriment of candidates' progress. No candidate and assessment evidence was available to review at external verification.

An increase in the use of CD and DVD recording of professional discussions and observation of work activities has been noted again this session. Full transcripts of discussions were produced in a small number of centres. None the less, in most cases, there was clear indexing and cross-referencing of this evidence to the performance requirements of the qualifications.

Most centres apply internal verification processes at pre-delivery, mid-delivery and completion stages of each award with routine sampling of each unit on a two or three-year cycle.

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, and found to be valid, relevant, appropriate and supportive.

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

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. The one exception to this has already been noted above and the situation is now resolved.

Areas of good practice

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.*
- ◆ *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.*
- ◆ *No candidate evidence available for external verification.*
- ◆ *Lack of detail and evaluation of CPD activities.*
- ◆ *Ineffective assessment planning by assessor.'*