



**Higher National Qualifications (China)  
Internal Assessment Report 2013  
Catering and Hospitality**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Higher National Qualifications in this subject.

# Higher National Units

HN Units verified:

DL 3M 35 Gastronomy  
DL 3C 35 Accommodation Management  
DL 40 35 Kitchen Planning and Design  
DL 43 35 Management of Food and Beverage Operations  
DL3V 34 Hospitality Industry  
DL3T 34 Financial and Control Systems  
DL3A 34 Managing Financial Resources in Hospitality  
DL4M 34 Managing Hospitality Organisations 2  
DL3P 34 Front Office Procedures 2  
DL3N 34 Front Office Procedures 1

## General comments

All current assessment documentation was in place with clear evidence of quality control and assurance. Excellent record keeping was noted and procedures were well documented and clearly evidenced in both staff and student handbooks.

Centres are encouraged to provide more detailed feedback to students when marking assessments. Correcting use of English should be encouraged to ensure a learning point is made, but feedback must be provided in a positive manner.

There was clear evidence of improved practical activities. One centre has now become involved in the operation of an on-campus hotel/hostel and is using this as a realistic working environment to ensure practical coverage across the Units.

All SQA-generated assessment documentation is current and internal verification processes well recorded and robustly applied.

All assessment decisions were accurate and consistent in line with SQA requirements.

Submission of verification reports for session 2012–13 were of an acceptable standard across Units in Hospitality Management. All Chinese centres were verified under SQA's New Approach to Quality Assurance system.

Candidate support systems were in place with candidate profiles provided as evidence of individual development needs. Additional language support is offered as informal drop-in sessions with progress recorded to track improvement.

## **Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials**

SQA-approved assessment and verification procedures are embedded.

Internal verification documentation was available for the Units that were externally verified, confirming the assessments are approved by the teaching team and Internal Verifier (IV).

Assessment materials in use are current, valid and reliable, with evidence across centres of robust internal verification systems which are well recorded and evidenced. Candidate responses and IV records confirm this.

Evidence was shown in relation to the Quality Manual which clearly indicated when reviews, updates and actions were required for equipment, accommodation, teaching and learning materials.

Course programme reviews were also conducted regularly to assure validity, currency and availability of materials for each of the Units under review.

### **Evidence Requirements**

Staff had a good understanding of the Evidence Requirements and Units in general. It is important that those involved in delivery, assessment and verification continue to keep abreast of any refreshed Unit content.

### **Administration of assessments**

All centres that were externally verified administered the assessment process to an acceptable standard. All highlighted problems were minor.

Not all centres ensured appropriate access to assessment opportunities for candidates. Some centres seem to have clearer strategies than others.

Generally, all centres provide an excellent system which adequately prepares the candidates for assessment. However, not all centres involved students sufficiently in the assessment planning process.

Internal verification activity was acceptable in most cases and supportive of assessors and included effective development feedback to the assessors on their assessment practice. Some centres require to carry out development on internal verification activity to further improve their systems in a robust and professional manner.

Standardisation meetings and resultant decisions are much improved from last session's reports, demonstrating a real effort on the part of those centres concerned.

The centres, in general, demonstrated an appropriate sampling policy when undertaking internal verification.

Centres have taken a real step forward in the battle against plagiarism by careful and detailed marking so any plagiarism is more likely to be detected. A statement regarding plagiarism and 'honesty in study' is included in the student handbook in order to further highlight this problem, but seems to be ineffective in some centres.

### **General feedback**

Candidate support in some centres could be enhanced by more extensive use of homework support. The opportunity to undertake research activities could help develop and reinforce candidate knowledge.

Candidates don't always receive effective supportive and developmental feedback from their assessors. This would allow candidates to be aware of the next steps in terms of progression and attainment.

One centre in particular was commended and had positive comments recorded by External Verifiers in relation to candidate access to resources for training and assessment purposes.

Candidates cannot be interviewed by postal verification, therefore it would help if written feedback could accompany the verification and standardise the approach to all verification reports. This would also highlight if candidates are, in fact, receiving the appropriate guidance and support in their studies during the academic session.

### **Areas of good practice**

One centre produces a candidate handbook which clearly indicates that plagiarism is not acceptable. A disclaimer signed at the beginning of each semester has taken positive steps to eradicate this issue.

One centre initiated a teaching survey where candidates are encouraged to comment on the fairness, treatment, support and guidance offered by staff in assessments.

One centre in particular was commended for correcting the use of English, indicating the level of detail in the report as highly commendable.

The joint assessor and verifier approach where individual support is required is commendable. Support is recorded and signed-off by the candidate.

One centre provides specialised English training to support the award.

One centre was applauded for innovation in the delivery of the Unit Managing Financial Resources in Hospitality because its internal verification process verifies outcome by outcome.

## **Specific areas for improvement**

Records must be maintained to provide evidence that a centre has sufficient competent staff with the necessary qualifications, occupational experience and understanding to support the assessment and internal verification of qualifications being offered in the centre.

There must be evidence of initial and on-going reviews of accommodation, equipment and reference, learning and assessment materials.

In Front Office Procedures Outcome 1 Assessment, it is recommended that, in future, students are allowed more practice before undertaking the assessment. Kitchen Planning and Design would benefit by a more practical approach in the teaching before the assessments.

It is recommended that photographic evidence is used throughout the appropriate Units to provide authenticity.