



**OFQUAL: Regulated Qualifications for England and Wales
Qualification Verification Summary Report 2020–21**

Occupational Work Supervision

Verification group number: 523

Introduction

This report relates to OFQUAL qualifications in Occupational Work Supervision (Construction) delivered in centres in England and Wales in 2020–21. The qualifications that were externally verified this session were GD3Y 57 Level 3 Diploma in Occupational Work Supervision, GROH 79 Level 3 NVQ Diploma Occupational Work Supervision (Construction), and the lapsing version GE1Y 79.

Due to the impact of COVID-19 and associated restrictions on centre operations, only 17 of the 33 centres registered for the awards were operating. All 17 were successfully externally verified via virtual visits using Microsoft Teams. 13 were recorded as 'not running', and three were recorded as 'not running' deferred.

However, all units within qualifications GD3Y 57, GE1Y 79 and GROH 79 were externally verified on a sample basis during session 2020–21, and endorsement routes were clearly identified where applicable.

Almost all centres delivering the NVQ were private training providers. All centres verified attained a high confidence rating.

Throughout the verification activities, centres provided their evidence via a specified sample requested by the external verifier, either uploaded to SQA Centre HUB or via secure access to the centre's own online storage facility, such as 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.

Almost all assessors and internal verifiers at the centres visited were able to provide sufficient evidence (via digital upload to the SQA Centre Hub) of their relevant occupational experience. Almost all were able to provide evidence of holding the required assessor/internal verifier qualifications, of having the required level of occupational experience and of being experienced assessors.

Almost all assessors and internal verifiers provided adequate and relevant CPD records. Some CPD records produced by assessors and internal verifiers did not provide sufficient detail to indicate the currency of their subject knowledge. It was noted however, that this was mainly due to the COVID-19 situation having a significant impact on their ability to gain site access and industry experience.

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 minutes of centre standardisation meetings involving centre co-ordinators, internal verifiers and assessors.

All centres' assessment instruments for the qualifications were taken from the National Occupational Standards. The assessment materials used were taken from the SQA site resource and, in a few cases, were 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 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/Teams or Skype or, when allowed, in person (the COVID-19 situation affected 'in person' face to face meetings in all cases during the period of lockdown).

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Centres used different approaches for recording the information including live Teams or Skype meetings, recorded professional discussions and written profiling of candidate experience and qualifications.

Almost 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. Most 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 assessment instrument. 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 (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 declaration 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 sign an induction record that confirms that they understand the centre's malpractice policy.

No instances of plagiarism were reported by external verifiers.

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

Internal verifier reports in almost all centres, provided good, clear and comprehensive feedback to assessors with action points, where required, to confirm accurate and consistent assessor judgements 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 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.

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

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 2020–21:

- ◆ In current circumstances where remote assessment has had to take the place of face-to-face assessment, a three-part identification process (Candidate SCN number, National Insurance number and post code) was considered a robust method of authentication.
- ◆ Evidence of good articulation routes by one centre was noted, candidates clearly had the opportunity to progress from trade level through to OWS and management.
- ◆ Digitisation of all aspects of delivery and assessment has had to take place — the use of SMART Assessor records, OneNote, OneDrive and other digital web-based software for assessment decisions, feedback and IV activity. There was also the opportunity (using SMART Assessor) for the EV to sign off sampled units where appropriate.

Specific areas for development

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

In some cases, referencing of candidate evidence was not adequately specific. However, this only applied to very few centres. Recommendations:

- ◆ A front sheet could be added to the knowledge questions contained in the candidate's portfolio listing all assessment activity and signed and dated by the assessor.

CPD recording, although improved from 2019–20, in some cases still inconsistent within centres. CPD records were not detailed enough in relation to the award, standardisation or industry related updates. Recommendations:

- ◆ A centre-devised CPD document, when adopted by all assessors and internal verifiers, offers a standardised approach.
- ◆ 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 to date.
- ◆ All assessors could consider recording standardisation meetings on their CPD forms. This allows tracking and triangulation of evidence to be completed.