



Ofqual – Regulated Qualifications for England and Wales
Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022
NVQ Construction Technician

Verification group number: 626

Introduction

This report relates to Ofqual qualifications in Construction Technician delivered in centres in England and Wales in 2021–22. The qualifications externally verified were

[Level 3 Diploma in Occupational Work Supervision \(Construction\)](#)

[Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Built Environment Design](#)

[Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations](#)

[Level 3 NVQ Diploma in Occupational Work Supervision \(Construction\)](#)

[Level 4 NVQ Diploma in Construction Site Supervision \(Construction\)](#)

[Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations Management](#)

[Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Design and Management Coordination](#)

[Level 6 NVQ Diploma in Construction Site Management \(Construction\)](#)

In September 2021 SQA introduced the Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) strategy, developed to meet [Ofqual's CASS](#) requirements for all centre-marked assessments. This has changed the way Ofqual allocations are selected and issued to external verifiers (no longer allocated by verification group at the beginning of a session but by centre and Ofqual families throughout the year). This new way of working has impacted greatly on external verifier availability to accept allocations as a 6–8 week turn around is required (for this verification group a slightly longer period of time has been allowed 8–10 weeks due to low numbers of external verifiers and availability).

Seven centres were selected for sampling in the 2021–22 session, all of which were successfully externally verified via virtual visits using Microsoft Teams.

There were no centres recorded as ‘deferred’ or ‘not running’ on QAMs.

All units identified in the Sample Control Document produced by SQA covering qualifications GK1D 84, GK03 80, GJ53 84, GJ57 84, GK1C 84 were externally verified with additional units recorded by the individual EV as and where appropriate. In addition, all endorsement routes were clearly identified where applicable.

The units verified were: H6TF 80, H6TJ 83 H81384, H81G84, H81T84, FX75 83, FX75 88, H6TM 84, H7KD 80, FX75 83, H6TN 84, H6TY 84, FX75 88, H6TJ83, H5TV80, H6TW83, FJ4G8, H6TX84, FJ79 84 H6TF 84, H818 84, H8M8 84, H812 84 H81G 84.

All centres delivering the Ofqual NVQs were private training providers.

All centres verified attained a high confidence rating following external verification monitoring visits.

Evidence was provided via a specified sample requested by the external verifier and access gained either by a digital upload to SQA Centre HUB or secure access to the centre’s own online storage facility, for example OneDrive.

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.

All assessors and internal verifiers at the centres visited were able to provide sufficient evidence of relevant occupational experience. Almost all were able to provide evidence of holding the required assessor/internal verifier qualifications and of having the required level of occupational experience. Most were experienced assessors.

Almost all assessors and internal verifiers provided adequate and relevant CPD records.

The CPD records produced by some assessors and internal verifiers did not provide sufficient detail to indicate their currency of up-to-date subject knowledge. It was noted, however, that this was mainly due to some lasting effects of the COVID-19 situation having a significant impact on assessors and internal verifiers gaining site access and industry experience.

Example EV comment

Assessor and internal verifier continue to provide detailed, award-specific CPD documentation, logging back over a 5 year period. Good to see a centre that recognises each award they offer may have differing CPD requirements and takes the time to present only what is necessary to that particular award, external verifier/audit.

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

All centres were able to demonstrate ongoing reviews of assessment environments, requirements, equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials. All centres were able to provide evidence of ongoing review by providing minutes of centre standardisation meetings involving centre co-ordinators, internal verifiers and assessors.

All centres' assessment instruments for the qualifications were based on the National Occupational Standards. The assessment materials used were taken from the SQA site resource and in some cases adapted by centres to meet the candidates' needs.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

All centres were able to demonstrate that they had considered candidates' prior achievements, prior experiences and current job role during their induction to the centre and the qualification.

Almost all centres carried out a skills scan prior to registration on the award.

All centres were able to provide evidence showing that candidate needs and prior achievements were being considered and recorded prior to the candidate undertaking any assessment.

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

All centres provided evidence of regular assessor review of candidate progress. Assessment plans with scheduled assessor–candidate meetings and assessor reports were provided by all centres. There was a clear connection between assessment planning and review with candidates at all centres.

Almost all centre assessors maintained contact with candidates by telephone, Microsoft Teams or Skype or when allowed in person. (The COVID-19 situation still affected ‘in person’ meetings in some cases.) This was recorded accordingly.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres used different approaches for recording the information including on-site meetings, in real-time ‘live’ Teams or Skype meetings, voice recorded professional discussions, and written profiling of candidate experience and qualifications.

All centres were able to demonstrate adequate quality assurance of the assessment and internal verification process through correct assessment and internal verification practices and compliance to procedures. All centres continued to use candidates’ own knowledge and experience with no simulation taking place.

In a few cases, incomplete internal verification records were presented or candidate evidence had not been adequately referenced to the qualification unit assessment criteria.

All centres were able to produce clear procedures for assessment and internal verification. Almost all centres were able to provide clear evidence that policies and procedures were being applied appropriately.

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

All centres use the National Occupational Standards as the basis of the assessment instrument for the qualifications being delivered. Many centres develop their own in-house style of assessment instrument, in line with the NOS requirements. This allows assessment

requirements to be presented in a more, candidate-focused, user-friendly format. Some in-house assessment instruments had been prior verified before use.

All assessors used a variety of assessment methods to generate evidence, including direct observation live on site, in real-time using Teams or Skype where appropriate, questioning and answering, product evidence, witness testimonies and recorded discussion.

In all cases 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.

All centres confirmed the authenticity of candidate evidence through authenticity statements of candidates, assessor reports, and internal verification sampling reports.

Almost all centres require candidates to sign a disclaimer during their induction, informing them that they must only submit work for assessment that is their own, and generated under the required conditions.

All centres require candidates to undergo induction and in almost all cases require the candidate to sign an induction record that confirms that they understand the centre's malpractice policy.

There were no instances of plagiarism reported by external verifiers.

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

All assessment judgements sampled by the verification group 626 external verification team were found to be VARCS compliant. In almost all cases detailed feedback to the candidate was given, and in some cases this was signed by the candidate and assessor (very much depending on how portfolio evidence was gathered, assessed and signed off).

Almost all centre internal verifier reports provided clear, comprehensive, supportive feedback to assessors with action points where required, confirming accurate and consistent assessor judgements being made.

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

All centres were able to demonstrate a knowledge of SQA requirements on the retention of candidate evidence (including the updated requirement due to the COVID-19 situation). Some centres retain documentation electronically and the candidates' hard copy scripts and portfolios are stored securely. Almost all centres have policies that require them to retain candidate evidence longer than the period required by SQA.

There were no issues reported relating to the retention and availability of candidate evidence.

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

Almost all centres produced minutes of standardisation meetings that provided suitable and adequately documented reviews held at the centre, including the dissemination of feedback from external verifiers.

Some centres use a standard agenda for their standardisation meetings which includes an item to review feedback from SQA and qualification verifiers.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ There is a good use of audio recording to capture the candidates' responses to Q&A, or to enable the assessor to extract more information from the candidate, if the provided information is lacking in any way.
- ◆ Assessor and internal verifier continue to provide detailed, award-specific CPD documentation, logging back over a 5 year period. Good to see a centre that recognises each award they offer may have differing CPD requirements and takes the time to present only what is necessary to that particular award, external verifier/audit.
- ◆ Candidate requests for the capturing of evidence are taken into account. The centre doesn't mandate a particular method of gathering knowledge evidence, so the candidate is not uncomfortable with the assessment method.
- ◆ Recorded face to face 'in real-time' professional discussion is used as the main form of assessment. This audio and video evidence is then matched against relevant unit criteria and, where required, also supports primary and secondary product evidence. As responses are unrehearsed, spontaneous and 'in real-time' this undoubtedly supports assessment decisions regarding candidates' competence and job knowledge.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ A two-stage induction process takes place with initial contact being made by the SQA co-ordinator to make sure the candidate is placed on the correct level of award and receives and understands the content of the candidate pack etc. The second stage is completion of the induction which is signed off by the assessor and the candidate. It was recommended that both stages are logged in the candidate's portfolio to allow for tracking of initial and ongoing support.