



Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018

Occupational Work Supervision

Introduction

This report is for Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQ) within verification group 604 Occupational Work Supervision. Nine centres were externally verified by the team of three external verifiers (EVs). Only one centre failed to attain a high confidence statement, which was mainly due to insufficient evidence being available. One centre delivered the SVQ as part of the Modern Apprenticeship in Occupational Work Supervision.

All delivery of the SVQ was provided by private training providers in Scotland.

The SVQ qualification externally verified during session 2017–18 was:

GM3A 23 SVQ in Occupational Work Supervision.

There has been an increase in the delivery of the SVQ in Occupational Work Supervision in Scotland during 2017–18. The increase in demand was mainly driven by the requirement within the industry for a responsible person to oversee much of the groundworks and drainage activity and, therefore, the need to attain the appropriate CSCS card.

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.

EVs reported that, in a very few cases, assessors and internal verifiers have not, as yet, gained the required qualifications. However, in all cases where this applied, the staff are working to the required standards and each provided evidence of registration for the qualifications with agreed 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 However, some staff in centres had either out of date, irrelevant or minimal CPD records and some were presented in a poor format.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.

EV reports confirmed that almost all centres demonstrated very effective ongoing reviews of assessment procedures, evidenced through minutes of standardisation meetings, assessment reports, internal verifier reports and candidate feedback.

In almost all cases the assessment environments are the candidates' places of work, where 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 are taken from the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for the qualification, and assessment materials are adapted to an often more 'user friendly' format by centres. Some excellent examples were observed by EVs.

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 is 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 and experiences, development needs, and current job role. This enables centres 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.

Almost all centres provided suitable assessment plans with scheduled assessor/candidate meetings and assessor reports to confirm 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 some 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.

In almost all cases candidates also contacted their assessor by telephone, text, e-mail or video calls.

In one centre, some candidates were employed in a sensitive and secure industrial environment. In this case, the centre put special measures in place by meeting candidates outwith their workplaces to discuss product evidence and conduct question and answer sessions. Witness testimonies were also used to good effect by the centre.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

In almost all cases, centres demonstrated robust quality assurance through their policies and procedures for assessment and internal verification and in the subsequent 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 present the assessment requirements to candidates in a more candidate focussed format.

All assessors used a variety of assessment methods to generate evidence, including direct observation, question and answer, product evidence, witness testimonies and audio/video evidence. EVs reported that much of the candidate evidence available in centres was verified through e-portals and, in such cases, EVs stated that the evidence was in a very clear format, with good signposting to evidence requirements.

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

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

Almost all centres confirmed the authenticity of candidate evidence through assessor reports that confirmed that much of the evidence was generated through direct observation and question and answer by the assessor in the candidates' workplaces. Questioning also relates to product evidence submitted by candidates to confirm authenticity. Some of the direct observation evidence was available in audio or video format.

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 most cases, assessor reports were comprehensive in nature and provided good quality and 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, in those cases, 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 and well documented minutes from standardisation meetings to disseminate feedback on assessment practices from EVs to all relevant staff.

In the one case where the centre did not attain a 'high confidence' statement, the centre agreed actions timescales to address the issues and 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.