



**Higher National Qualifications (China)
Internal Assessment Report 2012**

Supply Chain Management

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

Higher National Units

HNC Supply Chain Management Units verified:

A4W2 34, DL5E 34, DL5G 34,
DL53 34, D4X6 35, DL57 34, DL5M 36, F26Y 35, F27C 35

General comments

In the main, the assessors and Internal Verifiers (IVs) appear to have a good knowledge of the Unit requirements and specifications and are well qualified to deliver the qualifications.

However, in relation to four of the Units, the centres were following specifications for out-of-date Units and had not taken on board the new Unit specifications. The new Unit specifications have been available to centres for at least four years, which means that the 'old' Unit specifications have been phased out completely. All centres must now work to the 'new' Unit specifications and, following from this, must use a relevant assessment instrument. Some centres continue to use the old assessment exemplar with occasionally some minor adjustments. This means that the assessments submitted by the candidates, whilst often of a high quality, cannot be Accepted because they do not fulfil the specification of the new Unit.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

With the exception of the issues highlighted above, the centres had a good understanding of the Unit specifications and the assessment requirements.

The assessments were usually based on case study exemplars, which were wide ranging and gave good opportunities for the candidates to show their knowledge and ability.

It was also apparent that the assessment materials gave equal opportunity to all candidates.

Assessment was well organised and usually carried out to a high standard with good evidence of standardisation.

Feedback to the candidates was not always consistent, some centres giving good, timeous feedback, others less so.

The same applies to the feedback given by Internal Verifiers to assessors and candidates.

Evidence Requirements

With the exception of the issue identified in the General comments section above, it was apparent that the assessors and Internal Verifiers have a good knowledge of the Unit specifications and the standards required.

The evidence was drawn from candidates working on a case study exemplar and drawing from that the knowledge and information required by the Units. In addition, there was sufficient scope for candidates to make judgements and to draw conclusions.

In the main, the work of candidates was of a high quality.

One instance of plagiarism was identified by the assessor and Internal Verifier.

Administration of assessments

Assessment would appear to be well organised and administered. In most cases a checklist approach was used. This applies not just to the candidate assessments and records but also to internal verification sampling.

There was evidence of standardisation.

Feedback to candidates and assessors was patchy, with some examples being very good and others of a lower standard.

General feedback

Postal verification does not give the verifier the opportunity to discuss the course, its systems and delivery with the centre staff. The lack of this face-to-face discussion means that feedback cannot be as comprehensive or productive as it could be.

However, based on the evidence available, and despite the major issue highlighted above, there is:

- ◆ strong evidence of commitment to the qualification
- ◆ some excellent examples of candidate work
- ◆ well structured systems for assessment and internal verification
- ◆ evidence of standardisation
- ◆ good assessment case study exemplars
- ◆ sound knowledge of the Unit specifications and assessment requirements

Areas of good practice

The following areas of good practice were identified in various centres:

- ◆ The paperwork is well organised.
- ◆ The assessor identified that some candidates had 'copied materials from others' and acted accordingly.
- ◆ Internal verifier sampling was consistent, appropriate and thorough.
- ◆ Assessment records were usually easy to interpret and understand, and were comprehensive.
- ◆ The addendum to each candidate's script of a signed declaration.

Specific areas for improvement

The major issue identified in the General comments section of this report needs urgent consideration and action to overcome it.

In addition:

- ◆ Care should be taken to ensure that the dating of candidate scripts is accurate. In some cases the year was incorrect.
- ◆ Centres must ensure that all candidate scripts are signed and dated.
- ◆ At some centres, it would be helpful if a short, Internal Verifier report was incorporated to expand the short approval comment. This could highlight good practice and offer any development points thought appropriate.
- ◆ In the case where an initial 'U' is remediated to an 'S', both sets of work should be retained and made available for Internal Verifier and External Verifier sampling. This will clearly indicate how the work has been developed and enable the move from 'U' to 'S' to be confirmed.
- ◆ In some centres, the assessor should pay attention and work on improving student research skills which would greatly impact their future academic study.
- ◆ The possibility of offering a special course for candidates on how to format a professional report should be considered.
- ◆ The centre name must be incorporated on all paperwork, including the candidates' assessments.

Graded Units (China)

Graded Units verified:

DM1K 34, DM1L 35, DM1M 35

General comments

This report is based on reports relating to one centre and consequently is not a comprehensive view of the qualification and its delivery.

In the main, the assessors and Internal Verifiers appear to have a good knowledge of the Graded Unit requirements and specifications and are well qualified to deliver the qualifications.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The centre had a good understanding of the Unit specifications and the assessment requirements.

Assessments were based on set question and case study exemplars, which were wide ranging and in most cases gave good opportunities for the candidates to show their knowledge and ability.

It was also apparent that the assessment materials gave equal opportunity to all candidates.

Assessment was well organised and carried out to a high standard with good evidence of standardisation.

Feedback to the candidates was consistent, giving good, timeous feedback.

The same applies to the feedback given by Internal Verifiers to assessors and candidates.

Evidence Requirements

It was apparent that the assessors and Internal Verifiers have a good knowledge of the Unit specifications and the standards required.

For two of the Units, the evidence was based on the work of candidates on case study exemplars, and drawing from that the knowledge and information required by the Units. In the case of the third Unit, evidence was drawn from candidates answering set question exemplars.

In the majority of exemplars, there was sufficient scope for candidates to make judgements and draw conclusions.

In the main, the work of candidates was of a high quality.

Administration of assessments

Assessment was well organised and administered. A checklist approach was used. This applied not just to the candidate assessments and records but also to internal verification sampling.

There was evidence of standardisation.

Feedback to candidates and assessors was good, with some examples excellent and others of a lower standard.

It was pleasing to see that for one candidate who had special requirements, an amanuensis had been appointed who enabled the candidate to use a computer to enter their answers.

General feedback

Postal verification does not give the verifier the opportunity to discuss the course, its systems and delivery with the centre staff. However, based on the evidence available, there is:

- ◆ strong evidence of commitment to the qualification
- ◆ some excellent examples of candidate work
- ◆ well structured systems for assessment and internal verification
- ◆ evidence of standardisation
- ◆ good assessment case study exemplars

Areas of good practice

The following areas of good practice were identified in various centres:

- ◆ The paperwork is well organised.
- ◆ Internal verifier sampling was consistent, appropriate and thorough.
- ◆ Assessment records were easy to interpret and understand, and were comprehensive.
- ◆ The arrangement of an amanuensis for one candidate who required this support to enable them to take the assessment.

Specific areas for improvement

There was one significant example of a mismatch of the assessment to the requirements of the Unit specification. However, SQA is at present reviewing this qualification as a whole and it is highly likely that the issues that arose will be answered as a result of this review and consequent rewriting.

It is also recommended that it would be helpful if a short, Internal Verifier report was incorporated to expand the short approval comments. This could highlight good practice and offer any development points thought appropriate.