



**National Vocational Qualifications (RoUK)**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018**

# **Construction Technician**

Verification group: 626

## **Introduction**

In session 2018–19, 19 external verification (EV) events took place out of 22 allocations with three centres not running. In five visits it was necessary to issue an action plan with detailed advice for centre staff to resolve the deficiencies. The outcome rating in these cases was deemed 'reasonable confidence' in four instances with one instance of 'minimal confidence'. For the remaining 14 visits, the outcome rating was deemed 'high confidence'.

The following units and qualifications were reviewed during session 2018–19:

### **NVQ/RoUK — awards/units verified**

GJ53 84	Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Site Management
GJ57 84	Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Site Management (Construction) — Residential Development
GJ52 83	Level 5 NVQ Diploma in Controlling Lifting Operations — Planning Lifts (Construction)
GK03 80	Level 4 NVQ Diploma in Construction Site Supervision
GK08 79	Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations: Planning.
GK0D 79	Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations: Surveying
GK1D 84	Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations Management.

## **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 appropriate to the vocational areas in which they operated. However, more than a few staff in centres had either out of date, irrelevant or minimal CPD records, and more than a few of these were presented in a poor format.

Some were also chartered institute members, or in the process of working towards membership, and some were pursuing academic or professional CPD opportunities offered by chartered institutes. In some centres, there was active reflection on and evaluation of CPD activities in relation to programme delivery. The evaluation of CPD activity within centres is seen as an improvement on previous years and is being actively promoted by external verifiers during verification activities.

### **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 evidenced through minutes of standardisation meetings, assessment reports, internal verifier reports and candidate feedback.

The format of the initial and ongoing reviews varied from centre to centre. However, in almost all centres there was an observed routine of pre-delivery verification, regular meetings of the delivery and assessment team, standardisation processes and curriculum reviews.

In addition, there was clear evidence of review and risk assessment for almost all on-site assessment events. In almost all cases the assessment environments are the candidates' places of work, and 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.

In all cases, assessment instruments for the NVQ were taken from the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for the qualification, and the assessment materials used are most often adapted to a more candidate-focused 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, evidence was readily available of candidate development and support needs being identified at induction. 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 NVQ. In many cases, candidates' employers are consulted to confirm candidates' suitability for the SVQ. In cases where potential candidates undertake an NVQ as part of employer upskilling programmes, employers are most often involved in the candidate selection process.

Most centres had processes and procedures in place to allow candidate development needs to be identified and appropriate support provided, and these were being implemented effectively at most centres. Most centres were developing bespoke candidate training assessment plans to reflect individual needs.

### **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 many 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, external verifiers are unable to meet candidates due to the varied and remote locations of candidates' workplaces. However, in some cases, external verifiers contacted candidates by telephone to confirm that satisfactory assessment arrangements were in place. In almost all cases, there was evidence that candidates had contacted their assessor by telephone, text, email or video calls.

In more than a few cases, action plans were issued to specifically record the agreement between the candidate and the assessor on what evidence needed to be produced, how this would be assessed, and when this should take place.

## **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 many 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.

Most centres have very clear and supportive guidelines for assessors, internal verifiers and candidates to follow and advise on their responsibilities. It was clear, in many cases, through assessor and internal verifier reports and candidate feedback, that policies and procedures are being applied by centres. In many cases, there were well-defined and embedded assessment processes and a good approach to the delivery of the Construction Site Management/ Supervision and Contracting Operations qualifications. In most cases, quality sampling appears robust and all appears to be fully compliant with SQA requirements for the delivery of these qualifications.

In more than a few cases there were anomalies. These included: the absence of current internal verification sampling; observations that had been indicated in the assessment plans but had not been supported by any observation report; reviews not completed with the required detail; no current method of referencing candidate evidence to the assessment criteria of qualification units; and no current evidence of monitoring the accuracy and consistency of assessment judgements for Construction Technician qualifications. Hence, in a few cases, it was necessary to issue an action plan with detailed advice given to the centre staff in order to resolve the deficiencies.

### **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 basis of 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 the most effective way.

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. In most cases, 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. In all cases, there was evidence from paper/digital evidence within the candidate portfolios of use of appropriate assessment methods, and a consistent approach to the assessment planning process.

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

Most centres were able to confirm the authenticity of candidate evidence through assessor reports. Most of the evidence was generated through direct observation and 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. However, in more than a few cases there were issues over validity and reliability, which would remain until all assessment paperwork was completed consistently and to the required standard.

**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. In many cases, accurate assessment reports confirmed that the candidates' work is accurately and consistently judged by the assessor. Completed digital/paperwork was contained within the assessor/candidate's portfolio and progress folders. Many centres provided good, clear and comprehensive feedback to candidates, 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, almost all of these centres had other suitable assessors and internal verifiers who could be deployed if required.

In more than a few cases, there was limited evidence of assessor and candidate interaction and assessment planning. Hence, in more than a few cases the planning was not supported by evidence produced, eg observation, and there was no accurate system of referencing candidate evidence against any assessment criteria.

**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. Many 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 EV review.

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

All centres that were subject to EV provided suitable and well documented minutes from standardisation meetings to disseminate feedback from external verifiers to all relevant staff on assessment practices.

Minutes from standardisation meetings included required actions, the person responsible for undertaking the actions, and completed action timescales.

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

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

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ good quality of documentation to support the assessment and internal verification process
- ◆ good quality of assessor reports
- ◆ use of e-portals and e-portfolios to provide all evidence in a clear and easily navigated format
- ◆ good use of audio and video evidence
- ◆ excellent partnership arrangements with employers

## **Specific areas for development**

The following areas for development were reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ accurate system of referencing candidate evidence against any assessment criteria needed
- ◆ compliance needed with consolidated assessment strategy and SQA's requirements for internal verification (five centres only)