



**Scottish Vocational Qualifications**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018**

**Construction Technician**

## Introduction

This report is for Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQs) within VG 161 Construction Technician. 19 different SVQs were externally verified by the team of six external verifiers (EVs).

Delivery of the SVQs was mostly provided by private training providers in Scotland. However, some colleges in Scotland and some centres in England and Wales also delivered the SVQs.

The following SVQs were externally verified during session 2017–18:

GL27 23	Construction Contracting Operations: Site Technical Support
GC4J 24	Built Environment Design
GL26 24	Contracting Operations Management: General
G95L 23	Contracting Operations: Site Technical Support
GC2A 23	Construction Contracting Operations: Estimating
GL24 24	Construction Contracting Operations Management: Estimating
GL92 23	Built Environment Design
GJ19 24	Site Management: Building and Civil Engineering
GJ1C 23	Construction Site Supervision:
GJ1D 23	Construction Site Supervision: Highways Maintenance and Repair
GF5N 23	Occupational Work Supervision
GJ19 24	Construction Site Management
GK7C 25	Construction Senior Management
GC4V 25	Construction Senior Management
GC4P 24	Construction Contracting Operations: Surveying
GC2C 23	Construction Contracting Operations: General
GC4M 29	Construction Contracting Operations: General
GL8Y 24	Built Environment Design
GJ1A 24	Construction Site Management: Highways Maintenance and Repair

## **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.**

Almost all assessors and internal verifiers have extensive and relevant occupational experience and have sufficient competence related to the qualifications delivered. Almost all assessors and internal verifiers have gained the required training and development qualifications, as required by the assessment strategy for the qualifications. More than a few assessors and internal verifiers are working to the standards, and all in this position provided evidence of registration for the qualifications with completion dates.

Most staff provided very good records of recent and relevant CPD activity. However, some staff in centres had either out of date, irrelevant or minimal CPD records, and some were presented in a poor format.

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

Almost all centres demonstrated very effective ongoing reviews of assessment procedures. This was evidenced through minutes of standardisation meetings, assessment reports, internal verifier reports and candidate feedback.

EV reports confirmed that, in almost all cases, the assessment environments are the candidates' places of work, so site selection checklists are used to confirm that the environments are safe and conducive to assessment. In a very few cases assessment was conducted at the centre's premises or in a group workshop in other premises.

In all cases, assessment instruments were taken from the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for the qualifications, and assessment materials are adapted to an often more 'user friendly' format by centres.

## **Category 3: Candidate support**

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

In almost all centres, it was evident that robust pre-registration measures are in place to take account of candidates' needs, prior achievements and suitability to undertake the qualifications.

Most centres use a 'skills match' profile to identify candidates' prior achievements, prior experiences and current job role to establish and confirm the suitability of potential candidates to undertake the SVQ. In many cases candidates' employers are consulted to confirm candidates' suitability for the SVQ. In cases where potential candidates undertake an SVQ as part of a modern apprenticeship, employers are most often involved in the candidate selection process.

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

EV reports confirmed that, in all cases, centres provided suitable assessment plans with scheduled assessor/candidate meetings. Assessor reports also confirmed that scheduled formal contact takes place to review progress and revise assessment plans, where required.

In most cases EVs are unable to meet candidates due to the varied and remote locations of candidates' workplaces. However, in many cases, EVs contacted candidates by telephone to confirm that satisfactory assessment arrangements were in place. In more than a few cases, EVs did meet with candidates individually at their places of work or at group workshops at centres' premises, where some examples of best practice was observed.

In almost all cases there was evidence that candidates had contacted their assessor by telephone, text, e-mail or video calls.

## **Category 4: Internal assessment and verification**

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

EV reports confirmed that, in almost all cases, centres demonstrated robust quality assurance of the assessment and internal verification process through assessment policies and procedures, internal verification policies and procedures, and assessment and internal verification reports. Almost all centres have very clear and supportive guidelines for assessors, internal verifiers and candidates to follow and advise on their responsibilities.

It was clear, in almost all cases, through assessor and internal verifier reports and candidate feedback, that policies and procedures are being applied by centres.

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

All centres use the NOS as the assessment instrument for the qualifications being delivered. Almost all centres develop their own in-house style of assessment instrument, in line with the NOS requirements, to enable a more suitable format of presenting the assessment requirements to candidates.

All assessors used a variety of assessment methods to generate evidence, including direct observation, questioning and answering, product evidence, witness testimonies and audio/video evidence.

In all cases assessment instruments and methods were valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

EVs stated that there had been an increase in the use of electronic portals, and centres were commended for the good practice that was observed in the use of the e-portals.

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

Almost all centres were able to confirm the authenticity of candidate evidence through assessor reports. Most of the evidence was generated through direct observation and also by assessor/candidate question and answer sessions conducted in the candidates' workplaces. Assessors also had direct questioning sessions with candidates relating to product evidence submitted by candidates, to confirm authenticity.

Almost all centres have developed clear policies and procedures on malpractice and plagiarism, and require candidates to sign a disclaimer regarding submitting only their own work.

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

Assessor reports, internal verification reports and EV reports confirmed that, in almost all cases, candidates' work had been accurately and consistently judged by assessors. In many cases, assessor reports were comprehensive in nature and provided good quality, supportive feedback to candidates. Internal verifier reports, for many centres, provided good, clear and comprehensive feedback to assessors, with action points where required, to confirm accurate and consistent assessor judgement.

In more than a few centres, there is only one assessor and one internal verifier. However, of those centres, almost all had other suitable assessors and internal verifiers who could be deployed if required.

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

All centres demonstrated a thorough knowledge of SQA requirements on the retention of candidate evidence and associated documentation. Some centres retain documentation electronically and the candidates' hard copy scripts and portfolios are stored securely. There were no issues reported relating to the retention of evidence for the purposes of external verification review.

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

Almost all centres provided suitable, well-documented minutes from standardisation meetings to disseminate feedback from EVs on assessment practices to all relevant staff.

In cases where centres did not attain a 'high confidence' statement, centres agreed actions and timescales to address the issues identified in order to attain a 'high confidence' statement.

## **Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers**

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ High quality of documentation developed by centres to support the assessment and internal verification process.
- ◆ The use of electronic portals to provide all evidence in a clear and easily-navigated format.
- ◆ The use of group workshops to provide assessor and peer support to candidates.

## **Specific areas for development**

The following area for development was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ Recording of current and relevant CPD activity by some centres.