



**Higher National Qualifications including Graded Unit (China)**  
**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019**  
**Hospitality Management**

Verification group: 616

## **Introduction**

Two centres were selected for verification activity during 2018–19. Visiting verification, which included graded unit 1, was undertaken for one centre; remote verification activity was used for the other centre. It was found both centres are delivering and assessing both the individual units and the graded unit within the HN Hospitality Management award to the appropriate SQA standards.

Verification activity 2018–19 covered the following units:

H197 35 Managing Food and Beverage Operations  
DL4M 34 Managing Hospitality Organisations 2  
DL3A 35 Managing Financial Resources in Hospitality  
DL3D 34 Accommodation Servicing  
H317 34 Hospitality Management: Graded Unit 1

All units were selected from the HND Hospitality Management fixed framework, and followed the new approach to verification activity.

## **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.**

Both centres presented CVs for their assessors, which showed all are appropriately qualified for delivery and assessment of the individual units. Almost all hold postgraduate degrees in hospitality or related disciplines.

In both centres the lack of current occupational activity within continuing professional development (CPD) records was a concern. Recommendations were made by the external verifiers for both assessors and internal verifiers to undertake activities to ensure currency with industry standards.

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

One centre was required to provide evidence of current reviews in relation to this criterion. It is essential that centres undertake an annual review to ensure facilities and services meet the requirements of the award. This provides confidence that all candidates undertaking the award have equal and fair opportunity for success.

### **Category 3: Candidate support**

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

Both centres met the requirements for this criterion. However, for future verification activity, centres should review the evidence available. It is worth noting that whilst the selection procedures are set by the centres, this should provide for the identification of development needs for each candidate, and how this can be targeted to enable candidates to achieve the award.

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

One centre presented sufficient evidence for this criterion.

## **Category 4: Internal assessment and verification**

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

Both centres provided evidence of application in relation to internal policy and procedures being followed by the academic teams.

Minutes of meetings provided evidence that pre-delivery and internal verification (IV) activity is scheduled appropriately.

Minutes of team meetings to ensure standardisation of delivery and assessment were available to support this criterion. External verifiers (EVs) reported confidence that both centres support SQA standards for internal assessment and verification purposes.

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

The centres selected for verification activity are using the appropriate assessment instruments for the fixed framework award. In all reports the centres are using SQA-devised materials.

A recommendation was made for one centre to review the delivery and assessment teaching plan to ensure candidates have sufficient time to prepare for the assessment tasks.

#### **Graded units**

In one centre there was discussion about the opportunity to 'redo' one submission. The EV explored this with the assessors and was satisfied with the reasons, and the re-marked submission was appropriate.

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

All reports identified that policies are in place for ensuring candidate work is reliable. Declarations of originality/authenticity in some instances had been included for this verification activity.

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

#### **Hospitality Management units**

The EVs were confident that assessors consistently applied SQA's requirements for each of the units presented for this verification activity. Internal verification was carried out and adheres to SQA guidelines for reassessment purpose.

Both centres used SQA-devised exemplars. This assists with standardisation of assessment approaches.

### **Hospitality Management: Graded Unit 1**

The centres provided clear marking schemes appropriate for the graded unit. The IV evidence provided assurance that assessors had been supported in their decisions and maintained SQA requirements.

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

Both centres retain candidate evidence and assessment records in line with SQA requirements.

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

One centre provided evidence of report dissemination to the academic teams through their standardisation meetings. In all other reports no evidence was made available for the external verifiers to comment on this criterion.

## **Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers**

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ Encouraging levels of support provided by the internal verifier. Some good photographs used and referenced.
- ◆ Assessment summary record — this is good practice as it allows the assessor to reflect on the delivery and assessment of the unit. However, this could be further enhanced by recognition of the IV comments with actions to implement and feedback from candidates in relation to the schedule of the unit assessment tasks.

## **Specific areas for development**

The following areas for development were reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ It is recommended that CPD activity also reflect research activities and industry experience in the hospitality sector, where applicable, in relation to the units being delivered and verified. Typical CPD activity may include reading trade journals, attending workshops, industry experience or visits.
- ◆ Encourage candidates to reference their findings in the body of text to support adherence to copyright. Reference to the sources of information page at the end of the development stage appropriately.