

Moderation Feedback – Visiting - 2005

Management

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

**Sales, Marketing & Procurement
Chartered Institute of Marketing

HN Units and SVQ Levels 2 and 3**

General comments on moderation activity

The level of visiting moderation undertaken by the team was about half of that undertaken in 2004/2004. The reason for this lower level of moderation was that none of 10 or so Centres identified for cognate group 249, had any live candidates. The reason for the lack of candidates in this area was attributed to particular awards being at the end of their validation period and not being submitted for re-validation. According to some Centres it would appear that the general uptake for the particular awards in this Cognate group had not been as per the expectations identified at the initial validation date.

In Cognate group 244, Sales Marketing and Procurement a total of 12 moderation visits were undertaken and covered Centres in Central Scotland and Northern Ireland. Visits to two English based Centres had to be postponed to next year due to the ill health of the Senior Moderator.

The general standard of candidate work ranged from acceptable to very good, with the majority of Centres providing very good candidate submissions. There was a wide range of Assessment Instruments ranging from restricted response questions to mini-projects. Both moderators noted that some Instruments of Assessment had been modified as per recommendations of previous visits and that more attention had been made to the coverage of the PCs and range statements.

The moderators complimented many Centres on the structure of their master folders but two Centres were advised that more organized master folders should be employed so that assessment methods and candidate feedback could be more uniform and less subjective.

Many issues of good practice were noted, ranging from comprehensive Learner guides, integration of Outcomes, student feedback forms and relevant up to date case study material relating to specific client groups.

Candidates seemed to find some assessment methods more difficult than others, as evidenced by the higher level of remediation associated with assessments requiring a high degree of written response.

Centres were advised to look at the possibilities of integration, contextualisation and weighting of IAs to ensure that a variety of suitable assessment methods could be used.

It was good to note that the majority of Centres moderated this year were using candidate feedback forms to monitor candidate progress, and advise on the requirements of remediation, if required. This method of assessment marking requires the assessor to provide clear feedback to the candidates and to allow clear guidelines as to re-mediation requirements.

Specific issues identified

As mentioned in the previous 2003/2004 Senior Moderator report moderators had difficulty in externally moderating Centres on two counts:

1. The telephone numbers provided were generally accurate, but trying to make contact with the SQA Co-ordinator proved difficult in many cases, either because the named person had changed, or they were constantly engaged in other activities and passed the responsibility for the visit onto other personnel, who were equally difficult to contact.
2. Centres had difficulty in agreeing with the SQA product lists on “live” Units.

This year had similar problems but both moderators managed to obtain the email address of the personnel responsible for the visit and use this medium to set up the moderation visit arrangements.

Centres using the email contact method agreed that this was the best way to overcome the telephone problem and suggested that SQA should include an email address for the SQA Co-ordinator.

The second area of difficulty highlighted last year relating to the SQA product list, did not seem to be as much a problem this year and in general the candidate numbers did reflect the actual situation at the time of the visit.

Section 4 - Feedback to centres

Centres should be advised of the assessment requirements for the new design rule HN units in terms of sampling the knowledge and skills, where possible, thus taking a more holistic approach to assessment.

Centres should be encouraged to use a standard format candidate feedback sheet that clearly outlines the candidate's achievement and clearly specifies any re-mediation that applies. This type of feedback is used by some Centres at the moment and they have found it to be very successful in minimising candidate appeals.

Although many Centres do have well defined IV systems on paper, some of the master folders provided at the time of a moderation visit did not comply with the IV procedures, generally in the area of Internal Verification of IAs. It would be useful to remind Centres that this type of system, if utilised properly, should avoid any problems arising during External Moderation.