HN (China)

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017
Supply Chain Management (China)

Units:

H2X3 35   International Purchasing and Supply
H31C 35   Using Sources of Export Assistance
H31G 36   Supply Chain Tactics and Techniques
HE0A 35   Supply Chain Management: Total Quality Management
H2X3 35   International Purchasing and Supply
H31K 34   Supply Chain Business Analysis: An Introduction to Techniques
H31H 34   Supply Chain Capacity Planning and Product Operations
H35K 35   Supply Chain Management: Graded Unit 2

Introduction

At all centres, the evidence examined was well organised and this aided the verification process. There appeared to be good relationships between the assessors and internal verifiers and this also appeared to extend to the candidates. These good relationships resulted in frequent and professional communication between assessors and internal verifiers and their candidates, resulting in content, happy, committed, and motivated candidates. The standard of assessment and verification at almost all centres was very high, with well documented policies and procedures and evidence that they had been implemented effectively. In one centre, there was some inconsistency in judging scripts, but this was resolved after issues were highlighted to the centre.

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.

The evidence presented showed that the assessors and internal verifiers at all centres have an excellent blend of relevant work experience and high academic achievement, together with high levels of teaching ability. The assessors and IVs are all well qualified. Comprehensive CVs and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) records proved this.

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

Evidence provided within the centre's quality manuals showed regular reviews of all relevant assessment environments and materials, including equipment. These were taking place annually and were supported by relevant minutes of meetings and extensive maintenance records of learning and assessment resources. Minutes of various meetings examined also demonstrated effective action was taken if and when required.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

At all centres, the candidates' development needs and their prior achievements are discussed at the induction stage and in ongoing candidate /assessor discussions and communications. All the candidates interviewed had individual development plans that incorporate areas where the

assessor or candidate has identified areas of weakness. Good communication was also observed between the assessors and candidates regarding development needs, etc. One centre used an application called 'QQ/WeeChat' which appeared to be very productive and was popular with both assessors and candidates.

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

At all centres — which are mostly residential — candidate contact to review progress and to communicate on all aspects of their progress and development is available 24/7. More formal scheduled contact on a face-to-face level is also provided regularly. In addition, regular progress reviews are scheduled. Candidat have an individual development plan that is updated at appropriate times.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres provided the external verifier with numerous documents that relate to assessment procedures. These were generally included within the IV's handbook and assessor's delivery plans as well as in the centre's assessment and teaching plans.

Good communication was also observed at meetings and in informal discussions. This supported effective standardisation. Evidence at one centre demonstrated that the SQA Assessment Support Pack is regularly referred to and followed along with associated documents such as delivery plans, IV plans, etc. One centre provided a comprehensive internal verification checklist, an internal verification report, including feedback to assessors, and a record of team meetings

All centres provided a number of documents that show that internal assessment and verification procedures are being implemented. This included a very comprehensive handbook that recorded the work done by the internal verifier in relation to Graded Unit 2.

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

The evidence demonstrated that, at all centres, assessment methods and associated assessment instruments were being implemented in a professional, consistent, and reliable way.

On reviewing a number of the candidates' papers, the external verifier found valid and fair judgments from both assessors and internal verifiers based on the centre's assessment policies.

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

The candidate handbook at all centres provides suitable detail on malpractice and plagiarism and its consequences. Candidates at all centres also sign a declaration that the work is their own. The external verifier also examined a proportion of the candidates' papers and saw no evidence of any form of plagiarism.

Each of the candidates from one centre has included a signed declaration confirming that the assessment is their own work and also an understanding that if this is found to not be the case they will be subject to disciplinary action. At another centre, there is a Declaration of Integrity form in place that each candidate has to sign and date. The external verifier examined a sample of completed forms.

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

The external verifier sampled a large proportion of the candidates' work from all centres. Apart from one centre, the external verifier found the assessors' judgments and subsequent comments and guidance to be of a high standard and to be consistent. The work also demonstrated consistency of marking with fair and appropriate comments provided where necessary.

The scripts examined also contained good annotation by the assessor, indicating which parts were well explained or where they could be better. The projects themselves were very good and balanced in terms of the sections required in the report. As indicated in the general section above, there was one particular issue that applied to some of the candidates in one centre. This included marks allocated by the assessor being altered by the internal verifier with no accompanying explanation.

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

With the exception of one centre , the data management policies at centres defined the candidate evidence ret storage policies. These complied with SQA requirements and exceeded them at one of the centres.

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

At all centres, records of team meetings demonstrate effective dissemination to staff with detailed action points, responsibilities, and timings allocated. The visiting external verifier was able to confirm that there was very good evidence of the required remedial actions being taken in relation to the remote verification of Graded Unit 2 (Supply Chain Management). These were actioned in a timely manner, were well organised, and were effectively monitored and recorded.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The Placement Unit developed at one centre helped candidates to find a work placement. This demonstrates how the delivery of the qualification has developed and moved forward.

Specific areas for development

Criteria 4.6:

Centres must check that candidate scripts addressed the evidence requirements, and where not, candidates must be given the opportunity to address the script and resubmit their project for final assessment and internal verification. Centres should also ensure that sample lists are accurate in terms of grades and students' names.

Criteria 4.7:

Centres must provide evidence that students' evidence is retained in line with SQA requirements.