Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022
Construction Technician

Verification group number: 711

Introduction

This report relates to SVQs in Construction Technician delivered in centres in 2021–22. There are 19 qualifications at five different levels in this verification group. In session 2022, the qualifications offered were:

Built Environment Design SCQF level 6
Built Environment Design Management SCQF level 9
Construction Contracting Operations: Estimating SCQF level 6
Construction Contracting Operations: General SCQF level 6
Constructing Contracting Operations: Site Technical Support SCQF level 6
Construction Contracting Operations: Surveying SCQF level 6
Construction Contracting Operations Management: Estimating SCQF level 9
Construction Contracting Operations Management: General SCQF level 9
Construction Contracting Operations Management: Planning SCQF level 9
Construction Contracting Operations Management: Quantity Surveying SCQF level 9
Construction Senior Management SCQF level 11
Construction Site Management (Construction): Building and Civil Engineering SCQF level 10
Construction Site Management (Construction): Highways Maintenance and Repair SCQF level 10
Construction Site Management (Construction): Residential Development SCQF level 10
Construction Site Management (Construction): Retrofit SCQF level 10
Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Building and Civil Engineering SCQF level 7
Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Highways Maintenance and Repair SCQF level 7
Construction Site Supervision (Construction) Residential Development SCQF level 7
Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Retrofit SCQF level 7

During this session, 18 centres that were registered for the awards were successfully externally verified via virtual visits using Microsoft Teams.

Qualifications verified on a sample basis during session 2021–22:

GL27 23 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations: Site Technical Support SCQF level 6 at seven centres
GL92 23 SVQ Built Environment Design SCQF level 6 at seven centres
GJ1C 23 SVQ Construction Site Supervision (Construction): Building and Civil Engineering SCQF level 7 at seven centres
GL25 23 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations: General SCQF level 6 at two centres
GL23 23 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations: Surveying SCQF level 6 at one centre
GL2A 23 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations: Estimating SCQF level 6 at three centres
GJ19 24 Construction Site Management (Construction): Building and Civil Engineering SCQF level 9 at seven centres
GL24 24 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations: Estimating SCQF level 9 at two centres
GL26 24 SVQ Construction Contracting Operations Management: General SCQF level 9 at six centres
GK7C 25 SVQ Construction Senior Management SCQF level 11 at seven centres

Almost all centres delivering the SVQ 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 were able to provide sufficient evidence of their relevant occupational experience. All were able to provide evidence of related assessor/internal verifier qualifications and of having the required level of occupational experience. Almost all 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.

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 awards.

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 reviews 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 observation/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 with procedures. All centres continued to use candidates' own knowledge and experience with no simulation taking place.

In some cases 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 adhered to.

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 or use the SQA portfolio template provided. 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, professional discussions, 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 711 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 were 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. Some 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. All are single-centre comments:

♦ The frequency of standardisation meetings (monthly) is good practice and goes beyond SQA requirements.

♦ An in-house, robust four-day induction programme is delivered to each candidate prior to registering them on the award. This gives clear insight into the content and level of the award and what the candidate is required to do. It also clarifies the assessment process including planning and reviews.

♦ The assessor has started to visit sites where possible to meet with candidates, responding to the recommendation suggested in the previous EV report. The visits have proved to be advantageous by enabling direct observation activities to take place, but also providing industry related CPD opportunities.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2021–22. All are single-centre comments:

♦ Internal verification reports could be further enhanced, by including more specific examples to underpin the comments and feedback provided.

- Although standardisation meeting minutes include standard topics, the content of the minutes could be further developed to include reference to specific issues and problems that have been discussed. For example, under the Review of Evidence heading, the content could be expanded to include examples of acceptable/unacceptable evidence.
- Professional discussion recordings could be further enhanced by the assessor referring to the unit and unit title when several units are being referred to during the same recording; this should assist in the tracking of evidence.
- Consideration could be given in the next academic year to planning, (as part of the college timetable), to accommodate opportunities for both the assessor and internal verifier to be able to undertake site visits with candidates together, where companies will allow. This could reinforce the existing robust internal verification process.
- Introducing the progress matrix currently used for other qualifications could provide candidates working towards GL92 23 and GL27 23, with a visual view of their progression, and could complement existing materials.