# Construction and Civil Engineering Operations National Occupational Standards Review 2019 3rd Practitioner Group Meeting England 08 October 2019

### **Notes and Actions**

#### Welcomes and Apologies for Absence

1. Two employers attended this meeting Tim Brownbridge and Steven Burton. In attendance was Andy Moule and David Richardson represented the interests of training organisations and their employer customers. Peter Aird attended this meeting for the Scottish Qualifications Authority Accreditation body as part of the quality monitoring process for the government contract. The meeting was facilitated by George Swann from the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB).

2. Apologies were received from Richard Own, Nicola Bird, (both absent due to illness, all present wished them a speedy recovery), David Hardie, Ed Evans, Jenny Green and Mark Wells. No replies where received from Amy Catlin, Graham Hanna, Jane Sweeney, John Mackin, Mark Till, Amanda Bulingham (via Rose) Steve Bishop and William Coventry.

**Developers Note:** met Nicola and agreed to arrange a meeting at KW Bell, in Cinderford, to which employers representing Wales will be invited. The date is yet to be confirmed.

3. Tim expressed concern regarding the lack of employer involvement. George reassured all present that he was making every effort to consult with employers in each of the home Nations and that he was in the process of arranging meetings in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. He asked Tim if he, as chair, would be happy to attend these meetings, Tim agreed, dependent upon his availability.

4. Tim instigated round table introductions. Everyone introduced themselves.

#### Actions from the Last Meeting.

5. George stated no Job Descriptions for operatives employed in a way that matches the level three qualification descriptor had been received. Tim explained BAM Nuttall did not have people working at level three and therefore no job descriptions are available. Andy emphasised the organisations he had approached did not employ operatives at level three.

6. David pointed out there is an English Apprenticeship for Civil Engineering Technician at level three. Although he felt this apprenticeship had been wrongly levelled and should have been at level four he suggested considering the content of the standard. George presented the standard shown on the IfATE web page (link below).

7. Tim immediately identified the criteria listed in the standard as the requirements for professional membership of the Engineering Council. Andy pointed out the Occupational Profile did not match any of the tasks undertaken by Groundworkers and agreed with David that it had been wrongly levelled. Full details can be viewed on the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education web page at:

<u>https://www.instituteforapprenticeships.org/apprenticeship-standards/civil-engineering-technician/</u>. All present agreed that only the most able Groundworkers would go on to complete this apprenticeship. David stated this would be approximately 20% of Fareham's current cohort. The standard lists the technician's work as:

•**Design** – assisting in the development of technical solutions by producing design models, calculations, reports and drawings, surveying a site, using appropriate analysis and relevant codes.

•Analysis – using appropriate software systems and other data gathering tools and tests to solve technical problems.

•**Project delivery** – contributing to planning, managing work schedules, budgets and deadlines, and ensuring outputs comply with client and industry specifications, standards and guidance.

•Site engineering - operating quality systems and Health, Safety and Risk Management procedures and checking specified technical aspects of site activities.

8. Andy stated the Civil Engineering Technician apprenticeship is not suitable to define a progressive level three outcome for Groundworkers. George added this apprenticeship appeared to provide criteria for university students studying engineering or surveying and completion will support student's studies while ensuring employable on site. All present agreed.

**CCEO 2019** 

9. George reported as part of action point two he had, during his day to day duties, spoken informally to employers. All stated they did not employ Construction and Civil Engineering (CCEO) Operatives at level three and that their pay structures recognised increases in experience or 'breadth' of skills and knowledge. One employer stated the introduction of a level three technical qualification would undermine the achievements of the organisations current Occupational Supervisors. Many reflected a level three qualification may deter the delivery of the current level two qualification and be more costly to employers, with the potential of inexperienced people going straight into a level three qualification and then demanding greater recognition.

10. After further discussion all present agreed a level three technical outcome for this occupation was not required at this time. It was stated the progression route must remain as Occupational Work Supervision at level three, Construction Site Supervision at level four and Construction Site Manager at level six in order to maintain the current 'status quo' for promotion, experience recognition, remuneration and costs incurred by employers for training and qualifications.

11. David explained Fareham College and the Civil Engineering Training Centre will deliver the Civil Engineering Technician apprenticeship for England to operatives that have completed the Groundworker apprenticeship plus at least a further two years employment in the occupation. He went on to say the lowest age of an apprentice completing this with Fareham College will be 22, if they start the Groundworker apprenticeship aged 16.

12. George stated the results of action point three are included in the agenda. Copies of the suggested standards had been provided.

### **Review of Revised Standards**

13. George introduced COSVR225 Place and compact concrete with the amendments as discussed during the last meeting. All agreed this was now acceptable. George will now approach the occupational representatives for Substructure Work Occupations with the suggested changes. He will add COSVR225 to the Development Pack, list of imported standards and amend the Recommended Qualification Structure (RQS) replacing COSVR371. Action 1 George

14. George presented COSVR45 and confirmed this standard now belonged to CCEO and would be added to the National Occupational Standards suite. The group revised the content of this standard changing the title to Place and finish concrete as nobody could define what 'non-specialist concrete' was. This standard will now be added to the Development Pack showing all suggested changes. Action 2 George

15. George introduced COSVR36 emphasising that any suggested changes will need to be presented to the NWG for Trowel Occupations. He explained this standard is in the option list for Structural Concreting, Non-structural Concreting and Construction Operations. All present agreed its content and its place in the RQS.

16. George asked if there was any further suggests for the standards in the Development Pack. He explained a number of occupations, although reluctant to place a requirement for Building Information Modelling in the knowledge, had suggested 'electronic data' be added as the knowledge requirement in the scope of knowledge for information. All agreed this must be included in all standards for CCEO. Action 3 George

17. Steve asked about revising COSVR367 lay modular paving. George explained this standard belonged to Road Building and Maintenance and that he would be happy to present any suggested changes to that NWG. He added, alternatively if there is evidence that change is required Steve can submit a request via the Standards Enquiries form on the CITB web page at: <a href="https://www.citb.co.uk/standards-and-delivering-training/training-standards/standards-enquiries/">https://www.citb.co.uk/standards-and-delivering-training/training-standards/standards-enquiries/</a>. George stated he was unsure when the next review of Road Building and Maintenance will take place.

18. George introduced the RQS for CCEO at level two and asked if any further changes were required based upon those agreed for the standards. On viewing the RQS and discussing operative tasks and activities it was agreed no changes were required. Those present gave clearance for George to amend the RQS in order to ensure consistency with the content of the standards. **Action 4 George** 

19. Tim asked if there was any way of finding out the take up for each option listed in the RQS. George stated this data is held by the Awarding Organisations, who may, for commercial reasons, be reluctant to release it. However, he offered to contact members of the Built Environment Awarding Body Forum with this request and stated he would report back at the next meeting. **Action 5 George** 

## **Open Discussion.**

20. Andy asked when it is expected the changes to the standards will be made to the qualification units. George explained the units are normally amended once the NOS have been approved, credit and levelled by this NWG and then made available to the Awarding Organisations in May or June. George stated that he was unsure if or how CITB's future operating model may affect these timings.

### Date of Next Meeting.

21. The next meeting will be a National Working Group (NWG) meeting held in Fareham. This will be an opportunity for Fareham College to showcase their facilities at the Civil Engineering Training Centre. The meeting will be held on Tuesday 12 November 2019. George stated he would arrange further Practitioner Group meetings in Wales (initial location Cinderford), Scotland and Northern Ireland (provisional date Wednesday 30 October 2019 in Belfast) prior to this meeting.

### Meeting close.

22. There being no further business the meeting closed at 13:40. George thanked all present for their input.

Action	Allocated Responsibility and Description	To be completed by
1	<b>George</b> – contact the NWG members for Sub-structure Work Occupations	As soon as possible
2	George – add COSVR 45 to development pack	As soon as possible.
3	George – add 'electronic data' to standards	Prior to next meeting 08 October 2019.
4	<b>George</b> – update RQS	Prior to next meeting 08 October 2019.
5	<b>George</b> – request uptake figures for the past five years from the Build Environment Awarding Body Forum	As soon as possible

#### **Summary of Actions**

#### CCEO 2019