Scottish Vocational Qualifications and Professional Development Awards

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018
Roofing Occupations

Introduction

There was extensive qualification verification activity throughout 2017–2018 for qualification GF1X 23 and GM7Y 23 SVQ 3 Roofing Occupations (Construction) and a single qualification verification visit for GM88 22 Level 2. Almost all qualification verification reports were positive, and there was clear evidence that these qualifications are being delivered in a professional and effective manner at almost all centres.

GM88 22, SVQ Level 2, GF1X 23 and GM7Y 23 SVQ Level 3 Roof Slating & Tiling
The following units were verified:

F7A2 12	Roofing External Cement — Bands and Artificial Stonework
F7A3 12	Vertical Plain Tiling
F7CY 12	Random Slating to Vertical Surfaces
F7D1 12	Random Slating to Hip and Valley Roofs
H10F 12	External Cement Work Plain Render and Ashlar Finish
H10G 12	External Cement Work — Textured Finishes
H10H 12	Fibre Cement Slating to Battened Roofs
H10J 12	Plain Tiling Hips, Valleys and Curved Eaves
H10K 12	Plain Tiling — Gable to Abutment
H10L 12	Random Slating to Gabled Roofs
H10M 12	Regular Sized Slating to Battened Roofs
H10N 12	Regular Sized Slating to Boarded Roofs
H10P 12	Single Lap Tiling Fixed Gauge Tiles Gable to Abutment Wet Verges and Ridges
H10R 12	Single Lap Tiling Fixed Gauge Tiles Hip and Valley
H10S 12	Single Lap Tiling Gable to Gable Dry Details
HK51 46	Single Lap Tiling Hip and Valley Dry Detail
HK52 46	Single Lap Tiling Gable to Abutment Dry Detail
H10W 12	Regular Sized Slating to Hip and Valley Mitred Details
HK53 46	External Cement Work Textured Finishes
HK54 46	External Cement Work and Artificial Stonework
H109A 12	Phase tests

CREWS

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.

Qualification verification reports for the SVQs and PDAs in Roofing confirmed that assessors and internal verifiers at all centres were competent and well qualified (or working towards qualifications for their vocation); all staff also had extensive industry experience. All staff at centres verified undertook and recorded appropriate continuing professional development (CPD) activity to ensure they maintained academic and occupational currency, and that they complied fully with the requirements of the assessment strategy. Good practice was commended at one centre for their involvement with local trade groups.

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

All centres visited have effective ongoing processes and procedures in place to review accommodation, assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials. These processes and procedures were being implemented effectively in all centres visited. Due to changes within the qualification, most centres are having to remodel/restructure practical workshop areas, and the qualification verifier commented on the improvements which had been or were being undertaken.

A few centres were commended for their good practice in relation to online records of team meetings and CPD events, which allow staff to access information readily, and for a first-class learning centre specifically set out for roofing students.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

At all centres, evidence was provided to demonstrate that staff were implementing the correct procedures to identify candidates' development/support needs effectively. Most centres undertake diagnostic testing within the first three weeks of the course. The results of these tests enables the centres to decide when and where additional support is required. Centres also use the Training and Assessment Programme (TAP), to identify those candidates who require skills development.

For those candidates who registered on the SVQ prior to the 2017–2018 session, the effective use of Candidate Records of Evidence from the Workplace (CREWs) ensured that candidates' experience and learning from the workplace was matched to unit requirements at all centres.

Candidates were able to identify and discuss areas of the qualification that they needed to improve on and develop during professional discussions with their assessor/lecturer.

Qualification verifiers commended good practice in most centres, highlighting the proactive approach of one centre in dealing with trainee core skills, in which trainees were given numerous opportunities to highlight any issues they might have, and ask for assistance. They also commended one-to-one meetings as an excellent way to find out if a candidate is ready to undertake this award. Such an approach allows the centre to offer learning development support to individuals. Candidates can monitor their achievements through their Personal Learning Plans, which allow for a more in-depth consideration of any support candidates might require. Also valuable are student contracts, which ensure that candidates' prior achievements and additional support needs are recorded, along with other information.

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

At all centres visited, SVQ and PDA candidates received well-structured, purposeful feedback/support on their progress, for both specialist and generic unit competences.

Qualification verifiers highlighted good practice in a variety of areas in most centres. They further noted the excellent, constructive feedback given to candidates, which celebrated what they had achieved, and highlighted areas requiring development or improvement. This allowed the students to monitor their own progress and take action on areas requiring development. Candidates' own plentiful feedback on assessment sheets showed that candidates are taking great pride in what they are doing, that centre staff are going to considerable lengths to support candidates, and that candidates are aware of their own progress within the award.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres verified had well-established assessment and verification processes and procedures in place.

Qualification verifiers' reports stated that all centres' assessors and internal verifiers were implementing their centres' assessment and verification procedures effectively. In a few centres, visiting verifiers commended the internal verifiers' supportive feedback to new assessors.

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

All centres visited continue to use SQA's most up-to-date TAP (Training and Assessment Programme) and the CREW (Candidate Record of Evidence from the Workplace) to carry out assessments for the roofing apprentices registered on group award GM88 22 and GF1X 23. The use of the TAP ensures validity, equitability and fairness in assessment.

Candidates registered on group award GM7Y 23 have been working towards collating workplace evidence for their portfolios. Qualification verifiers indicated that assessors were making good progress in guiding and supporting candidates.

In one centre, the qualification verifier reminded staff that all candidates must use the same material whilst undertaking the same assessment. Some candidates had been installing three-way mitres as per assessment requirements, while others were only doing two-way mitres.

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

All centres continue to use SQA's TAP framework to document and record candidate evidence. The TAP ensures that the evidence is the candidates' own work: a signature from the candidate, the assessor and — on occasion — the internal verifier is required within the feedback sheets.

In almost all centres — before, during and after assessment — photographic evidence was taken to further authenticate the candidates' work.

Centres have been using evidence generated from the workplace and the use of CREWs with industry experts/supervisors to sign off candidate's industrial competence for the SVQ qualification.

Qualification verifiers noted good practice at one centre, where feedback given to students was very positive, allowing candidates to gauge their performance at college. They issued a recommendation to one centre to ensure that candidates sign all pages that require a signature and a date. Some candidates had only signed and dated the first and last pages.

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

Assessment judgements were reported as being both accurate and consistent at most centres which undertook the verification process. Both practical and knowledge-based evidence confirmed that candidates were meeting the requirements of units and were achieving the national standards.

Qualification verifiers issued a recommendation to one centre to ensure that candidates have written feedback from assessors for the assessments completed. Candidates had been writing a reflective report for assessments, however assessor feedback could be added to this. The qualification verifier also submitted an action to a centre emphasising the importance that tick sheets for tolerances match candidates' work. Moreover, every candidate's feedback should be a reflection of their own work, rather than just a generic feedback sheet. Assessors have been made aware that this needs rectified for the sessions going forward.

Following oral feedback from assessors to all candidates for every assessment, which was clarified on the day of the verification visit through interviews with candidates and assessors, no further action is required for this assessment this session. Centres must ensure that all assessment written feedback and tick sheets are appropriate for the individual candidate.

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

Qualification verifiers reported that all centres were retaining candidate evidence and assessment records in line with SQA requirements. In all centres, retention policy exceeded SQA requirements. All centres complied fully with Qualification Verification Visit Plan requirements in relation to candidate evidence being sampled.

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

All centres had clear policies and procedures in place for the dissemination of information from qualification verifiers to assessors and internal verifiers. Staff at all centres implemented centre procedures effectively and there was good evidence of improvements and enhancements being taken to develop assessment practice.

Areas of good practice

The following examples of good practice were reported during session 2017–18:

♦ Involvement with local trade groups (Criterion 2.1)

♦ First-class learning centre specifically set out for roofing students (Criterion 2.4)

♦ Online record of team meetings and CPD events, which allowed staff to access information readily (Criterion 2.4)

♦ Proactive approach to trainee core skills; there are numerous opportunities for trainees to highlight any issues they may have and ask for assistance if required (Criterion 3.2)

♦ One-to-one meetings as an excellent way to find out if the candidate is ready to undertake an award, and to find out whether learning development support is required (Criterion 3.2)

♦ Use of Personal Learning Plan (PLP) folders allows candidates to monitor their achievements, and helps staff to assess whether support is required (Criterion 3.2)

♦ Use of student contracts to ensure recording of candidates' prior achievements and additional support needs

♦ Descriptive and constructive feedback given to candidates, on both their achievements and areas where further input may be required (Criterion 3.3)

♦ High-quality student feedback allows the students to monitor their progress and take any action on areas requiring development (Criterion 3.3)

♦ Candidates adding their own reflective feedback on the assessment sheets, which shows that candidates are taking great pride in what they are doing, and that centre staff has been going over and above to ensure candidates are covering all they should (Criterion 3.3)

♦ Supportive feedback from the internal verifier to the new assessor (Criterion 4.2)

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2016–17:

♦ The importance of candidates using the same material in the same assessment. Some candidates were installing three-way mitres as per assessment requirements; others were only doing two-way mitres (Criterion 4.3)

♦ Ensuring candidates sign all pages that require a signature and a date (Criterion 4.4)

♦ Ensuring that candidates receive written feedback from assessors for the assessments completed, and don't just rely on their own, reflective report (Criterion 4.6)

♦ The important of tick sheets for tolerances and feedback matching candidates' work. Assessors should make sure that each candidate's feedback is a reflection of their own work instead of a generic feedback sheet, and that written feedback and tick sheets are appropriate for individual candidates