



Higher National Qualifications (China)

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018

Marketing, Sales and Advertising

Introduction

A total of 14 China qualification verification reports were completed for the session 2017–18: 12 were visiting verifications and 2 were remote verifications.

The following units were verified:

F7BX 34	Marketing: An Introduction
F7R3 35	International Marketing: The Mix
H8PD 34	International Marketing: An Introduction

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.

All centres provided satisfactory evidence of the staff qualifications held and CPD undertaken by staff that equipped them to assess and verify the units delivered.

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

All centres provided satisfactory records of pre-delivery, standardisation and post-delivery meetings, which included reviews of equipment, classrooms, assessment instruments and teaching materials.

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 reported that candidates' development needs and prior achievements were identified and suitably matched against the requirements of the award. Most centres provided evidence of effective personal learning plans, training needs analysis and an ongoing approach to the candidates' development requirements, ie not being static. Depending on the qualification, most candidates' development needs were discussed as part of the induction process.

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 satisfactory evidence of scheduled contact with candidates' assessors to review their progress, by means of the scheduled tutor timetable and tutorial record form. Generally, tutors are allocated contact hours for candidate support on their timetable with additional tutor/candidate contact also available through QQ, e-mail and WeChat.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Almost all centres provided evidence of pre-delivery checklists being provided to the assessors and internal verifiers to ensure consistency of approach to the standardisation of assessment. This was backed up with assessor team meetings to discuss delivery etc. Copies of the current unit specifications and assessment exemplars were also made available to the assessors and verifiers, generally online.

In some centres, verifiers recommended that internal verification take place within a short time period of the unit completion, to help ensure effective standardisation of assessment.

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

It was identified that centres carried out 'pre-delivery' checklists to confirm that the correct instruments of assessment were being used/will be used, and that these were discussed at standardisation meetings and between assessors and internal verifiers. However, there were instances where the wrong conditions of assessment were being used, demonstrating an inadequate approach to the pre-delivery checking process.

Centres were asked to ensure that all relevant verification documentation be in English.

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

All centres provided evidence that the candidate-induction process covered and explained the centre's policy on plagiarism, malpractice etc. Most centres ensured that candidates sign a learning agreement to confirm their awareness of policies on plagiarism. Some of the centres also used software to identify plagiarism. A further effective control in this area was the use of witness testimonies.

External verification highlighted that some centres were not providing accurate guidance to candidates on when (and how) to paraphrase information from textbooks, when to cite directly, and how to reference publications consulted.

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

Most of the centres verified provided evidence to show that candidates' evidence was being accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA requirements. However, one area of concern related to the conditions of assessment. Some centres were using closed-book assessment, when the unit specification recommended open-book assessment, a situation which verifiers concluded unfairly penalised candidates. Also, in some circumstances, candidates were being unfairly restricted to one page of notes during open-book assessments, which was not a requirement in the unit specification.

In many cases, recommendations from external verification centred on providing more detailed feedback to candidates. It was suggested that the candidate record sheet be re-designed to provide more space for written feedback to the candidates, particularly for those requiring redoes. Verifiers also recommended that redoes be scheduled far quicker than is the case in some centres.

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

All centres verified reported that candidates' evidence was retained for anything from one year to five years, and that all centres' retention practices complied with SQA requirements.

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

All centres had satisfactory procedures for effective and timely dissemination of feedback to staff following verification visits, with reports being copied to staff and made available on the intranet. Moreover, evidence was provided of staff meetings being held shortly after the verification visits to discuss the outcomes and allocate staff to specific responsibilities where required.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following examples of good practice were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ Use of anti-plagiarism software
- ◆ Well-prepared centre documentation presented for verification
- ◆ Excellent team working between assessor and internal verifier through regular meetings
- ◆ Tutor's use of individual, unit-specific Personal Learning Plans and reviews
- ◆ Use of Student Personal Development Plans
- ◆ Good use of formative assessment and feedback to prepare candidates for summative assessment
- ◆ Excellent candidate support
- ◆ Candidates effective use of and knowledge of referencing

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ Candidates should be guided in their use of quotations and referencing
- ◆ All relevant external verification documentation should be in English
- ◆ Internal verification should take place within a short time of the unit completion, to ensure effective standardisation of assessment