



Higher National and Graded Unit (China)

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018

Hospitality Management

Introduction

Four centres were selected for verification activity during 2017–18. It was found that all centres are delivering and assessing individual units as well as the graded unit within the HN Hospitality award to the appropriate SQA standards.

Verification activity 2017–18 included verification for the following units:

DL3N 34	Front Office Procedures 1
H1L7 34	Hospitality Industry
H197 35	Managing Food and Beverage Operations
DL3A 35	Managing Financial Resources
H1L6 35	Accommodation Management
H317 34	Hospitality Graded Unit 1
H318 35	Hospitality Graded Unit 2

All units were selected from the fixed framework available within the HN Hospitality Management award, and all activity was conducted through remote verification.

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 all centres, assessors are appropriately qualified to undertake delivery and assessment of the individual units, and almost all hold post graduate degrees within Hospitality or related disciplines. There was evidence of some continuing professional development for all assessors, including attendance at SQA training events identified within the reports.

In all reports, the competence of internal verifiers was concluded to be appropriate for the HN Hospitality Management award.

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 evidence of internal policy and procedures being followed by the academic teams. Records of pre-delivery internal verification (IV) activity are followed to assist the academic teams in making consistent assessment decisions.

All centres use team meetings to ensure standardisation of delivery and assessment. Minutes were available to support this criterion. External verifiers (EVs) reported having confidence that all centres support SQA standards for internal assessment and verification purposes. In addition, in one centre, double marking at each stage of graded units is standard practice.

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

All centres selected for verification activity were using the appropriate assessment instruments for the fixed framework award. Course team minutes provided the EVs with evidence of review to ensure that the correct unit specifications and exemplars were used.

In all centres, delivery of the assessment tasks was compliant with SQA conditions.

Graded units

In one centre, the use of half marks for graded units was identified. The report to the centre has identified this as being inappropriate for future marking schemes.

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

All centres had policies in place to confirm candidate work was produced under the conditions set out by SQA. Some centres provided declarations confirming the originality/authenticity of candidates' work.

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

Hospitality Management units

All centres use SQA devised exemplars and this assists with the standardisation of assessment approaches. The EVs were confident that assessors consistently applied SQA requirements for each of the units, and that internal verification was robust and adheres to SQA guidelines for re-assessment purposes.

Hospitality Management graded units

The centres provided clear marking schemes appropriate to the graded unit(s). One centre had applied half marks but was advised that they should discontinue this practice in the future.

Almost all centres take a double marking approach for each stage of the graded unit to maintain consistency and support for both assessors and candidates.

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

All 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.

Only one centre provided evidence of report dissemination to the academic teams. In all other reports, no evidence was made available for the EVs to comment on this criterion.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ The assessment summary record is a valuable document which provides an overall summary of delivery, assessment, and verification.
- ◆ It is encouraging to see that candidates are developing their English and that relevant experience is being gained through classroom delivery and practical insight.
- ◆ It is clear to see that the internal verification report is discussed with the assessor, and they have provided written consent and comments on the feedback received.

Specific areas for development

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

- ◆ Additional support in relation to knowledge and choice of the menu items for the graded unit would encourage an appetising menu and one that fully met the requirements of the brief.
- ◆ Centres are strongly encouraged to enhance the level of feedback provided to learners as effective feedback provides direction and motivation to improve their written submissions for this award.