Higher National Qualifications — China

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017
Hospitality and Professional Cookery

Introduction

One verification visit was undertaken to China, and two centres were selected for verification activity. It was found that centres continue to deliver and assess the units within the HN Hospitality award to the appropriate SQA standards.

Verification activity 2016–17 included visiting verification for the following units:

DL3N 34 Hospitality Front Office Procedures 1
DL3P 34 Hospitality Front Office Procedures 2
DL3M 35 Gastronomy
DL40 35 Kitchen Planning and Design

Verification activity 2016–17 included remote verification for the following graded unit:

H318 35 Hospitality Management Graded Unit 2

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.

In both selected centres, all assessors were appropriately qualified to undertake delivery and assessment of the individual units. Almost all assessors have post-graduate degrees within Hospitality or related disciplines. There was evidence of continuing professional development (CPD) for all assessors, including attendance at SQA training events.

Internal verification was carried out effectively. Reports were complete and the feedback provided to assessors in one centre was comprehensive and included a strategy to improve assessment delivery.

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

In all centres, there was evidence of ongoing reviews of learning and assessment materials. These were recorded by the assessors and signed off by senior staff. In one centre, comprehensive lesson plans included required facilities, services and resources available for the delivery of the unit.

For the units *Hospitality Front Office Procedures 1* and *Hospitality Front Office Procedures 2*, one centre was advised that candidates should have additional opportunities to practice with the computerised system to support understanding and better prepare them for the assessment tasks. It was expected this would improve achievement results for both units.

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 required candidates to undertake an English entrance exam prior to commencing the HND in Hospitality Management. Candidates were subsequently put in groups at an appropriate level to continue their studies.

In one centre, candidates have an assigned counsellor throughout their studies to provide academic and career guidance. All centres provided academic and IT support, visa and internship advice, and advice on personal and student cultural life.

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 candidates with multiple opportunities for individual academic tutorial support. These opportunities included: within the classroom environment as a class group, individual meetings which were recorded on personal development records, direct e-mail or messaging services.

Through discussion with candidates, the methods usually selected for individual support were direct e-mail and message service. The candidates said they preferred the anonymity, and indicated response time from the assessor was very good.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres were compliant with SQA policy for internal assessment and verification procedures for all the units during visiting verification. Internal verifiers (IVs) have experience in the task, but the level of feedback provided to the assessors varied considerably.

An assessment summary record was used as an evaluative tool within one centre to review each stage of the graded unit. This helped to identify any areas of concern for future team discussions.

In one centre, feedback was limited and did not offer a detailed review of the activity or analysis of candidate success or re-assessment requirements. The centre was advised to review the success rates and develop strategies to improve candidate success.

One centre was asked to review re-assessment policy for the graded unit to ensure candidates who did not meet minimum standards were given the opportunity to re-submit.

The second centre provided documented evidence including pre-unit delivery forms through to IV sample records. Documented evidence of discussion between assessors and IVs was comprehensive and detailed.

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

All centres are using SQA devised instruments and assessment exemplars for the HN Hospitality award. In one centre the pre-delivery checklist (IV1) confirms the assessment instrument(s) are current and valid for delivery. This formed the basis of IV activity.

Assessment exemplars are confirmed in all centres as controlled documents. These are released to the assessors by SQA co-ordinators within the centres, and are returned along with candidate evidence for secure storage, awaiting external verification activity.

The graded unit specification and exemplar were used appropriately within both centres. It is essential however that SQA co-ordinators ensure the most up to date version is used for each academic year.

Lesson planning in all centres included assessment scheduling which was appropriate in all instances. Methodology relating to the delivery of the assessment task was compliant in all centres and ensured equality for all candidates.

Minutes from meetings relating to the selection, use and verification of the assessment tasks were available during visiting verification.

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

Policy and procedures relating to candidate evidence and plagiarism for all centres was contained within the candidate, tutor and IV handbooks. In all centres the procedures to be followed were clear and the consequences specific. All candidates and assessors were directed to the handbooks at the commencement of the course.

All candidates in both centres were required to sign either a 'declaration form' or 'Statements of Originality' to ensure they understood SQA coursework submission policy for each unit undertaken, and the consequences if malpractice occurs and the actions to be followed.

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

In all centres the assessors' judgements were appropriately applied, consistent and fair for all units.

In one centre the feedback provided to candidates was comprehensive and supportive. It provided clear reasons for the marks awarded or, where necessary, if a re-submission was required, and how the candidate could prepare for re-assessment.

The need for improving feedback at one centre was discussed during visiting verification, as terms such as 'excellent job', provide little indication to the candidate how or why this

submission was judged excellent. Expanded feedback would allow candidates to apply these same learning/ research/ practical techniques to other units.

All assessors were knowledgeable and competent to manage the assessment tasks, to ensure integrity of the SQA standards were not compromised.

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

All centres have detailed policies relating to retention and security of candidate evidence in line with SQA requirements. All candidate evidence whether paper-based or electronic were controlled by SQA co-ordinators and archived appropriately.

During visiting verification, requests for any additional evidence materials were easily met and this provided evidence of centre policy and procedures in action.

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

In all centres, regular team meetings were evidenced, with minutes available for scrutiny during visiting verification. Dissemination of the results was discussed with the teams, including assessors and internal verifiers identifying any further actions relating to the award delivery and assessment being recorded. One centre used the QV report to inform pre-delivery discussions.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2016–17:

♦ CPD records which clearly indicated ongoing professional development in the field of hospitality management.
♦ The structure of the lesson plans detailed environment, equipment and materials required for each lesson. This is good practice as it facilitates successful delivery and assessment of the units.
♦ The tutorial records are praised for the structure and detailed responses which assist candidate success.
♦ The detailed feedback given from IVs to tutors is excellent. It allows for discussion and a commitment to improve and develop delivery methodologies. The tutor response to feedback and action recording was commendable.
♦ A teaching pack that is comprehensive and introduces the candidates to the commercial kitchen environment which is then supported through visits to a commercial business partner.
♦ Excellent PowerPoint slides to support delivery of a complex unit. The materials and suggested sites for additional information and support is praiseworthy.
♦ The assessment summary record provides valuable reflection for current and future assessors.
♦ A clear procedure is in place which ensures all staff involved with the delivery of the award are informed of results of SQA activity.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2016–17:

♦ Expand IV feedback to support detailed review of the activity or analysis of candidate success or re-assessment requirements.

♦ Extend comments/feedback provided to candidates to encourage and support knowledge and skills development.

♦ Maintain professional communication links with SQA, businesses and colleagues in other centres to share good practices and learning and teaching materials.

♦ Review guidance on re-assessment and re-submission for each stage of the graded unit.

♦ Ensure candidates research correct/appropriate sites for information relating to Scottish Legislation.

♦ Review the information within the current documentation (candidate, tutor and IV handbooks), identify by date that this has been carried out to ensure all information is current and appropriate.

♦ All re-assessments should be signed and dated by the assessor.

♦ Inclusion of additional tasks which do not form part of the assessment task must be justified and not provide a barrier to candidate achievement of a unit.