



**Higher National Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2013
Food Processing**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Higher National Qualifications in this subject.

Higher National Units

Higher National Unit verified:

F4TL 34 Food Hygiene Intermediate

General comments

The centres selected for verification offer Unit F4TL 34 as part of the Hospitality and Professional Cookery Award.

Three centre visits were undertaken; two of these applied SQA's New Approach to Quality Assurance. All candidate portfolios were available for spontaneous sampling.

There were no Holds or sanctions applied for any centre.

The evidence available from verification visits and Assessor/Internal Verifier meeting records indicate that centre staff have a clear and accurate understanding of national standards. This is demonstrated by:

- ◆ the possession of the required qualification(s) in food hygiene and occupational experience in food handling practices
- ◆ the production of adequate and fit-for-purpose learning and teaching materials aligned to the Assessment Standard for Intermediate Food Hygiene
- ◆ the use of standardised instruments of assessment meeting the requirements stated in the Unit specification
- ◆ compliance with SQA's quality assurance requirements

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

There was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that centres have a clear and accurate understanding of the national standards required for this Unit.

From evidence and the quality of the learners' assessments, it was clear that the assessors are familiar with the Unit specification and instruments of assessment for Intermediate Food Hygiene.

Evidence Requirements

There was evidence from the materials presented for verification that assessors had a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements.

The Evidence Requirements were fully met by learners who successfully completed the assessments for the Unit.

Centre staff have a clear understanding of Evidence Requirements for the Unit. This is shown by:

- ◆ accurate, interpretation and assessment of candidate performance, and the assessment evidence in sampled portfolios of work
- ◆ assessors judgements linked to the Evidence Requirements for the Unit
- ◆ no Holds/non-compliance placed on any of the centres
- ◆ assessors and Internal Verifiers preparing and working from a master folder which holds the relevant information and materials for the Unit, in particular: Unit specification, instruments of assessments, and SQA exemplar assessment materials and REHIS materials

Administration of assessments

The administration of assessments was sound and compliant with the centres' and SQA's quality processes. The internal verification systems were effective in all centres.

Assessment instrument were robust and sound.

The assessment process was accurate and fair there were teaching and assessment plans in place. Where necessary, adjustments and support were made to ensure that assessments were accessible for learners who had English as a second language.

Evidence of feedback was structured and adequate. One area for improvement identified is to provide more detailed feedback on assessment decisions to candidates.

Standardisation meetings were held pre-, mid- and post-assessment to ensure the quality of assessment and judgement of learners' performance and achievement are valid and fair. Assessor support meeting notes indicate that matters relating to the national standards and assessment requirements are regularly discussed. Key highlights and action points from these meetings are documented as appropriate.

Assessment processes and outcomes were effectively recorded and stored securely, meeting SQA and centre policies and procedures. Where centres have devised their own instruments of assessment, these have been benchmarked to the exemplar produced by SQA and prior verified.

Assessment was rigorous, and alternative assessment materials were used for re-testing aspects of knowledge or skills when candidates did not successfully achieve these on the first attempt of the assessment.

Records of internal verification reports were up to date and accurate, and reflected the importance centres attach to issues of quality assurance and enhancement of the awards.

The quality and quantity of feedback provided on candidates' performance was good, and supportive. Feedback was timely, constructive, adequate and enabled candidates to achieve the required knowledge and skills.

There was additional support provided for candidates who do not have English as a first language to ensure that they understood the assessment requirements.

General feedback

In general, the quality and standard of work was high. Learners for whom English is a second language found aspects of the Unit challenging. This issue was addressed by the centre staff through additional support, remediation and adequate re-assessment.

The internal verification (IV) systems at centres made the tracking of information and records much easier.

Centres have developed and produced fit-for-purpose instruments of assessment.

Centres have provided individual assessment plans which promote equality and fair access to learning and assessment.

Centres provide adequate support to meet individual candidates' needs.

Centre staff should continually update their knowledge and skills in the areas of food safety and legislation.

Areas of good practice

- ◆ There was evidence of good IV systems, both traditional and electronic. Internal Verifiers provided timely, constructive feedback on the assessor's decisions.
- ◆ The IV systems contribute to the enhancement of the assessment process, and ensure the required standards are met.
- ◆ The IV systems have made the audit trail and the tracking of information and records much easier.
- ◆ Centres have provided individual assessment plans which promote equality and fair access.
- ◆ Centres have provided adequate support to meet individual candidates' needs.
- ◆ Centres provided adequately structured teaching and learning materials and resources. Resources included up to date REHIS publications, journals, PowerPoint presentations and online teaching aids relating to bacteriology and food safety.
- ◆ There was very good integration of theory and practice to help learners make sense of the importance of food hygiene/safety.
- ◆ Centres have systems in place to identify plagiarism by candidates.

Specific areas for improvement

Centre staff should continually update and record their knowledge and skills in the areas of food safety and legislation.

Centre staff should to continue to work with learners to help familiarise them with aspects of bacteriology, food poisoning and food-borne diseases.

Centre staff should continue to improve feedback to candidates on assessment decisions and where remediation and re-assessment is required.