Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2021
Warehousing and Distribution

Introduction

SVQs in Warehousing, Storage and Distribution and Logistics Operations

There were seven visits to centres in session 2020–21. The following SVQs were verified:

GR0T 22   SVQ in Warehousing, Storage and Distribution (SCQF level 5)
GM6M 22   SVQ Warehousing, Storage and Distribution (SCQF level 5) — lapsing
GM6L 23   SVQ Warehousing, Storage and Distribution (SCQF level 6) — lapsing
GM6W 23   Logistics Operations (SCQF level 7) — lapsing

All seven centres are very experienced, established and competent with well qualified and knowledgeable staff delivering sound, well documented and organised qualifications.

There have been major issues with COVID-19 forcing all seven centres to support and give guidance to candidates. Many were furloughed and assessors were unable to meet candidates. However, packages such as Microsoft Teams or Zoom allowed assessors to keep in touch with candidates, ensuring support and guidance was given.

Despite the challenges facing these centres over the whole lockdown period, access is slowly being allowed for centre assessors to meet candidates and go over their qualifications. All centres are generally coping well.

With COVID-19 in mind, a lot of centres have been looking at new technology to deliver the qualification safely using online assessment programmes to allow assessors and candidates more flexibility but without compromising standards.

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.

Assessors and internal verifiers in the centres that were sampled were occupationally competent and either held, or were working towards, appropriate assessor and internal verifier awards. Staff were experienced in the delivery of work-based qualifications and had a full understanding of the requirements. Comprehensive continuous professional development (CPD) records were being maintained for all members of the assessment and verification team.

In a lot of centres, CPD records showed not only the course and training attended but also the impact of the learning by staff on the assessment process. Examples include:

♦   What did you do that contributes to your CPD?
♦   What did you learn from this activity?
♦   How have/will you use this?

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

Video conference calls ensured that centre assessors were kept up to date during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. When workplaces are used, these are checked to ensure

their appropriateness in relation to equipment, accommodation, and learning and reference materials, to support different awards.

Centres are still using a workplace checklist, ie Site Selection Checklist, to ensure that all appropriate equipment is available. This process also checked that candidates had proper access to appropriate reference and learning material, and checked that the health and safety aspects of the policy were regularly reviewed to ensure best practice.

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 seven centres had completed a comprehensive initial assessment of each candidate. This was conducted during the induction process for the award. Previous certificates, profiles showing Core Skills, along with candidate job roles, were all reviewed and signed. Appropriate units and levels of the awards were correctly selected for the candidates. A lot of time is taken at this crucial stage to ensure that the correct level of an award is identified and that the units that are chosen are appropriate to the candidate's work role.

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

There was clear evidence of assessment planning to support all candidates during the COVID-19 pandemic. Most assessments were well planned and carried out with good feedback given. In all the centres there was good documentation to support the assessment planning process.

One thing that must be mentioned is that all candidates were given a lot of on-going assessor support. Feedback from candidates who were interviewed mentioned the excellent support — especially during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

In all centres, assessment and internal verification procedures were fully documented. The candidate portfolios, internal verification reports and sampling plan confirmed implementation. Standardisation meetings took place throughout the COVID-19 pandemic using packages such as Microsoft Teams and Zoom. Minutes were available which detailed the discussions that had taken place.

In almost all centres, there was evidence of a good system of internal verification providing good feedback to both the assessors and candidates.

In all centres, there were opportunities to attend both formal and informal meetings to support standardisation between assessors. The formal meetings were minuted.

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

Almost all the candidate portfolios were well presented and well assessed. All candidates had access to the assessment process. There was a good variety of evidence with a good account of both performance evidence and supporting evidence. Some examples of work product evidence included screenshots to confirm assessments.

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

In all centres, assessors knew their candidates well, which resulted in good candidate support. This, in turn, helped to ensure the authenticity of evidence submitted by each candidate. Authenticity was also supported using witness testimonies — an approach that was used more during the COVID-19 pandemic.

A lot of centres are now using e-portfolios. These were password protected which also helped to ensure authenticity.

In all seven centres, there was evidence that all candidates undertook an induction programme when they started their qualification. This included informing candidates of the implications of plagiarism. They were also required to sign a statement confirming that they were aware of the centre's policy and would comply with it during the duration of their award. They were also required to sign a declaration to confirm that all work produced for their portfolio was their own work. Again, there was no evidence of malpractice in any of the centres visited during the 2020–21 session.

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

In all the centres visited, there were regular formal meetings to support standardisation between assessors (often using Microsoft Teams or Zoom). These meetings were minuted. There were also many informal opportunities for standardisation discussions to take place.

In almost all centres, the assessment decisions were consistently and accurately judged against the standards and done so in a fair manner. Evidence was being assessed against the current and valid standards.

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

All centres were aware of the extension to the period for retention of evidence for SVQs during the COVID-19 pandemic, (unless a centre had been notified of an impending verification visit).

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

All seven centres used different methods and procedures to disseminate the findings of qualification verifier reports to all relevant staff. This was part of the centres' assessment and internal verification procedures. All centres shared the feedback electronically and this is normally followed up with a staff meeting where the qualification verifier report is discussed in more detail especially, if any action needs to be fulfilled within a timescale set by SQA.

Areas of good practice

The following good practice was reported by qualification verifiers during the 2020–21 session:

♦ Good examples of evidence of assessment planning during the COVID-19 pandemic that provided excellent support to candidates
♦ More use of e-portfolio systems being implemented
♦ Good balance of performance evidence and supporting evidence
♦ Improvement on relevant warehousing and distribution entries on CPD records

Specific areas for development

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

♦ Continue to have more CPD entries relating to warehousing and distribution awards standards to meet assessment strategy requirements
♦ Ensure that there is a standardisation meeting for Warehousing and Distribution and that units have been considered during verification