



Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019

Waste Management

Verification group: 345

Introduction

This session, activity in the sector was low, with five centres being approved. Two of the centres have not had an external verification visit yet. These are due to be completed in September 2019. Three centres have had an external verification visit (two private and one council centre). One centre is closing.

The qualifications delivered by centres in this period are:

SCQF level 5

SVQ — Frontline Environmental Services
SVQ — Team Leading
SVQ — Waste Operations: Waste Collection Driver
SVQ — Waste Operations: Waste Collection Operative
SVQ — Waste Operations: Waste Site Operative
SVQ — Waste Operations: Waste Team Leader
SVQ — Waste Operations: Waste Weighbridge Operative
Certificate in Principles of Sustainable Resource Management

SCQF level 6

SVQ — Waste Supervisory Management
Certificate in Principles of Sustainable Resource Management

SCQF level 7

Diploma — Waste Management Operations: Managing Physical and Chemical Treatment — Hazardous Waste
Diploma — Waste Management Operations: Managing Physical and Chemical Treatment Non-hazardous Waste
Diploma — Waste Management Operations: Managing Transfer Hazardous Waste
Diploma — Waste Management Operations: Managing Transfer Non-hazardous Waste

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.

Staff at all centres undertook appropriate professional and vocational continuing professional development (CPD) activities to ensure that they maintained currency. CPD records were completed effectively by staff at all centres.

This sector has benefited from assessor standardisation events twice per year. The first event was in June and was hosted by SQA. The second event was jointly hosted by SQA and WAMITAB. Generally, centres continue to use industry practitioners to deliver these awards to ensure the most current practices are assessed and to reflect best practice in service delivery.

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

Assessors at all assessment centres were familiar with the unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. There was evidence at all centres of ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials. All centres used waste management facilities for a realistic assessment environment.

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 there was evidence that candidates' development needs, prior achievements, previous training and support from the employer and the centre were being taken into account. All centres had a robust process for collating this information and matching the candidate to the correct award.

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

All centres had evidence of scheduled contact between candidates and their assessors to review progress. A variety of approaches were used by centres. For example some centres had lots of contact with candidates, so contact between assessors and candidates could be on a frequent basis. Other centres had more remote candidates, so contact between assessors and candidates was by phone call, email and web communications. In all cases, candidates were being supported throughout the duration of the qualification.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

There was evidence of internal assessment and verification procedures being in place at all centres. There was clear evidence of this throughout the portfolios provided. All centres provided evidence of standardisation meetings, where approaches to internal assessment and standardisation were discussed and agreed.

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

All centres had assessment instruments and methods that were valid for the qualifications being assessed. There was evidence of valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair assessment decisions being made in all the portfolios that were inspected.

In one centre, where most candidates had online portfolios, they had a good system in place for recording assessment decisions to ensure the validity of assessments.

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

All the centres ensure open communication between the assessor teams and centre teams in case queries arise about the authenticity of candidate work or SQA assessment conditions. It was clear from the evidence provided by centres that candidates had submitted their own work and that procedures were checked to ensure this work was generated under SQA conditions.

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

At all centres, assessment evidence had been clearly mapped against the relevant standards, and cross-referenced, where applicable. The evidence within the centres was fairly judged by assessors, and verified to meet the SQA requirements.

During discussions, it was clear that the centres held appropriate standardisation meetings to ensure consistent and accurate assessment judgements.

An assessor from one centre made excellent use of video evidence and the centre is keen to extend this approach to their other candidates.

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

At all centres, candidate evidence is retained in line with SQA requirements. Evidence was made available for both internal and external verification visits. Centres using e-portfolio systems allowed the external verifiers to access and review their candidates' e-portfolios before the verification visit. (This is only effective if the external verifier is familiar with the e-portfolio system being used.)

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

The minutes of standardisation meetings were available in all centres. This demonstrates a clear process of disseminating external quality assurance information and action points that affect the assessment of candidates.

A number of the standardisation meeting records showed evidence of proposed improvements and changes to the way qualifications were delivered. Adapting and improving the methods of delivery of qualifications is encouraged within the centre as it helps candidates and centre staff to improve assessment standards and delivery.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ 2.1 — the use of internal verification and assessor self-assessment checklists is an excellent way of ensuring that the requirements of the assessment strategy are met.
- ◆ 3.2 — one centre recently undertook standardisation relating to RPL, which was shared across other centres via the SQA standardisation event in June 2019. This shows a forward-thinking approach to engagement with assessors and verifiers in the centre and across the sector.
- ◆ 3.3 — there is a move to provide candidates with a targeted completion date to reduce the number of delayed and drop-out non-completions. The contact diary within Learning Assistant is used to chase up and seek updates from candidates on a monthly basis, including with the line manager, to encourage support and time to be provided to work through the awards.
- ◆ 4.2 — clearly defined centre policies and procedures, right down to team meeting agendas and process flowcharts are excellent and easy to follow.
- ◆ 4.4 — in one centre, the use of video evidence was exemplary. Taking the approach of a site, or task, walkthrough, the interaction between candidate and assessor enabled both contextual evidence and knowledge and understanding to be captured. This is something the head of centre is looking to standardise in the centre.
- ◆ 4.9 — clearly defined team meeting agendas and standardisation processes are good examples of ensuring all relevant information is captured and passed on within the team.

Specific areas for development

The centres value SQA's standardisation meetings. These events are well attended and are valuable to the sector because they allow centres to discuss and share good practice.

No formal areas of development were noted during session 2018–19.