



**OFQUAL Regulated Qualifications
Qualification Verification Summary Report 2021
Construction Technician**

Verification group number: 626

Introduction

This report is for OFQUAL National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) within verification group 626: Construction Technician. Seven different NVQs were externally verified by the team of seven external verifiers.

Delivery of the OFQUAL NVQs was mostly provided by private training providers across Scotland, England and Wales. However, some colleges also delivered the NVQs.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic all external verification was conducted virtually using Microsoft Teams. As a result of this, sampling was restricted to six candidates per centre and one piece of evidence per candidate uploaded to a secure location accessible by the external verifiers.

GJ53 84 Diploma in Construction Site Management
GJ57 84 Diploma in Construction Site Management (Construction) — Residential Development
GK00 80 Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Residential Development
GK03 80 Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Building and Civil Engineering
GK08 79 Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations: General
GK1D 84 Diploma in Construction Contracting Operations Management: General
GK04 79 Built Environment Design: Architecture

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 the appropriate qualifications, occupational experience and competence to deliver the qualifications verified.

Almost all assessors and internal verifiers have undertaken the required training and development to meet the requirements of the assessment strategy.

Some assessors and internal verifiers are working towards assessor and verifier qualifications and provided evidence of registration and expected completion dates.

Most staff had CPD records which were well documented, but COVID-19 had a major impact on the ability of staff to undertake new activities.

There were some centres where undertaking CPD was an issue, clear logging of CPD was not consistent and CPD was not mapped to specific awards.

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

In almost all cases external verifiers' reports confirmed that the assessment environments were the candidates' place of work.

In accordance with the Consolidated Assessment Strategy, site selection checklists are used to confirm that the assessment environments are safe and conducive to assessment.

In all cases centres had devised assessment instruments using the National Occupational Standards (NOS). The assessment materials are presented in a more user-friendly format by centres to assist in the assessment process.

There was evidence of good practice noted in some centres that were using SMART systems for recording assessment activity and review of the processes.

Another area of good practice noted was the use of a quality assurance log to record and review assessment activities.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

Almost all centres used comprehensive enrolment/registration systems which took account of candidates' development needs, prior achievements and suitability to undertake the qualifications.

Most centres use some form of 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 NVQ.

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

In all cases it was evident that centres produced assessment plans for each candidate. Assessor reports confirmed that scheduled contact takes place to review progress and revise assessment plans, where required.

Almost all centres had used technology to great effect during the COVID-19 pandemic to keep in contact with candidates. Candidate progress was severely affected by the pandemic but assessors managed to keep candidates engaged.

In most external verification visits verifiers were able to speak to candidates, employing a range of methods, confirming that satisfactory assessment arrangements were in 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 almost all cases, centres implemented their internal verification and assessment policies and procedures. Internal verification reports demonstrated a 'risk management' approach which complied with SQA's requirements.

Almost all centres have very clear and supportive guidelines with advice on responsibilities for assessors, internal verifiers and candidates.

All documentation and evidence requested by external verifiers was made available prior to the visit in line with SQA's requirements. Centres commented on the benefits of this new approach and were keen to see this facility continue after the COVID-19 restrictions were lifted.

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 to devise their assessment instruments for the qualifications being delivered.

Almost all centres have developed their own in-house style of assessment instrument which is a more user-friendly format of presenting the assessment requirements to candidates.

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 almost all cases assessment instruments and methods were valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

Some centres were not ensuring candidates were clearly identified in photographic evidence.

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

Almost all centres were able to confirm the authenticity of candidate evidence through assessor reports.

Most of the evidence was generated through direct observation and also by assessor/candidate question and answer sessions conducted in the candidates' workplaces. Almost all candidate scripts were signed by the candidate and assessor at the time of the 'live' observation.

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.

An area of good practice was noted in one centre where, in the current circumstances, remote assessment has had to take the place of face-to-face assessment. A three-part identification process was used: the candidate's SCN, National Insurance number and post code. This was considered a robust method of authentication.

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

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.

However, in some cases assessors were not recording professional discussions as evidence. Formal and informal discussions were also not being recorded or used as evidence.

For many centres, internal verifier reports provided good, clear and comprehensive feedback to assessors confirming accurate and consistent assessor judgements.

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.

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

Almost all centres had minutes from standardisation meetings which had dedicated agenda items for the discussion of external verification reports. Any recommendations or actions were allocated to a member of staff with agreed timescales for completion.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2020–21:

- ◆ One centre's internal quality assurance log allows for capturing and reviewing of any relevant information and changes or updates to the assessment environments, for example on-site delivery updates due to COVID-19 restrictions. This is recorded through emails and entered into the centre's IQA log. The information captured is reviewed twice monthly and formally recorded in standardisation meeting minutes
- ◆ SMART Assessor records all assessment decisions, feedback and internal verification activity
- ◆ A digital recording index for professional discussions including timings of appropriate and relevant evidence related to each unit within the NOS, making the cross-referencing exercise a very straightforward process
- ◆ Detailed, award-specific CPD documentation, logging back over a 5-year period
- ◆ In the current circumstances, where remote assessment has had to take the place of face-to-face assessment, a three-part identification process was used: candidate SCN, National Insurance number and post code. This was considered a robust method of authentication

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2020–21:

- ◆ It was recommended that annual staff development reviews be included to aid the planning and reviewing of staff development and CPD
- ◆ It is recommended that both formal and informal discussions on the assessment and verification of SQA qualifications be recorded for standardisation purposes
- ◆ CPD records were not detailed enough in relation to the award, standardisation or industry related updates. Current COVID-19 circumstances are limiting industrial activity, however the CPD records could be made clearer in terms of training and new assessor support taking place