



**Higher National Qualifications (China)  
Internal Assessment Report 2016  
Professional Cookery**

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

# Higher National units

DL40 35 – Kitchen Planning and Design

## General comments

The unit selected for verification during March–April 2016 forms part of the HND Hospitality Management award. The centres have experience in the delivery and assessment of the award requirements.

There was clear evidence that the centre assessors had read and understood the assessment requirements of the unit and had made arrangements for candidates to access commercial kitchen environments to develop and broaden their knowledge and understanding of the unit requirements.

## Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The assessors and internal verifiers in the centres have been assessing and delivering this unit for a number of years and have a clear understanding of the unit requirements for both delivery and assessment purposes.

The use of SQA unit specifications, assessment materials and exemplars has been embedded effectively in centres. All materials were current and used appropriately — this included the security of the assessment process and the exemplar materials.

In all centres the academic staff are highly qualified and motivated in their delivery of the HND Hospitality award. Individual qualifications are relevant to their subjects they deliver. Internal verifiers have both academic qualifications and experience in SQA procedures to undertake verification activity.

Centres recognise the importance of encouraging both assessors and internal verifiers' attendance at SQA conferences to maintain CPD currency. Both assessors and internal verifiers were aware of the SQA China website and the supporting materials available through the site.

## Evidence requirements

The evidence requirements for the unit were met by centres.

Candidates are encouraged to reflect on the kitchen facilities of their placement providers. However, for outcome 1 it would benefit and broaden knowledge if additional kitchen facilities either on or off campus could be used as examples for planning and design purposes.

## **Administration of assessments**

The assessment process has been carried out effectively and consistently across the centres selected for verification. Internal verification was robust and evidence of discussion taking place between the assessor and verifier was exemplary.

It was recommended that centres review the assessment sequencing for DL40 35 — Kitchen Planning and Design Outcome 1 and set the assessment deadline towards the end of the unit delivery, which would allow candidates the opportunity to broaden and deepen their understanding of the factors which influence kitchen design.

Centres are reminded that outcomes 2 and 3 can be integrated to avoid over-assessment. It would be beneficial to use a computer program for the kitchen design plan for outcome 3, however this does not have to be to scale so the use of a computer aided design (CAD) programme is not required and may disadvantage candidate achievement.

## **General feedback**

Feedback to candidates for outcomes 2 and 3 was comprehensive and supportive. It is recommended that the feedback for outcome 1 be expanded; this will enhance candidate confidence in their analytical skills which they can apply across all level 8 units.

The candidates interviewed were positive in the feedback relating to the support they receive from all centre staff and specifically their assessors. They were happy with the scheduling of the unit within the course.

## **Areas of good practice**

In one centre during the internal verification process there was evidence that the assessor provided a summary regarding the assessment task and its implementation. This feedback is good practice as it could influence future teaching and learning approaches and support candidate achievement.

Candidates in one centre have the opportunity to write down (during and after class) questions/issues they have relating to the unit — this allows the assessor to review and respond to these during the next scheduled class. This practice is proactive as it can capture specific issues the candidates are facing without identifying the author. It also provides feedback to the assessor who may adjust learning materials or approaches for future delivery of the unit.

## **Specific areas for improvement**

There are no specific areas for improvement of the delivery of this unit by centres.