

Moderation Feedback - Visiting

Qualification area

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

<p>Sales, Marketing & Procurement Moderation Group 244 Chartered Institute of Marketing Moderation Group 249</p> <p>HN Units and SVQ Levels 2 and 3</p>

Visiting Moderation

General comments on visiting moderation activity

There are two Moderators for both Cognate groups. A total of 20 centres were moderated this year including three private training providers. The geographical locations of centres visited ranged from as far south as Leeds College of Technology through the Borders and Central Scotland and as far north as John O'Groats, (Thurso).

The services of SQA. Travel division were used for several visits and the personnel provided a professional service on each occasion.

In general terms, the centres welcomed the moderation visits, and the Assessors and Internal Verifiers were always happy to discuss particular issues of concern and welcomed the feedback supplied by the Moderators. The moderation visits this year also provide many development opportunities regarding updates on the progress of new frameworks, and the introduction of HN Units under the new guidelines.

Specific issues identified

Both 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 and on a few occasions there was a distinct lack of candidate evidence when the visits actually took place.

The solution to the first issue was to obtain the email address of the personnel responsible for the visit and use this medium to finalise the visit arrangements. Feedback from centres after the visits had taken place, indicated that this method of contact was perfectly acceptable and in many cases preferred to the telephone method.

The second issue was related to the timing of visits and the selection criteria for Units to be moderated. The SQA product list, although issued four weeks prior to a visit seemed to indicate all Units for which candidates had been entered, but gave no indication of start or finish dates. Therefore, when a copy of the product list highlighting the Units to be moderated arrived at the centre, it was found that many of the Units selected had been completed in a previous semester, or had only just started in a new semester.

Some centres notified the Moderators before the visits were undertaken and substitution of other Units were agreed, but in some cases centres allowed the visits to go ahead, but could not provide candidate evidence for the Units selected. This was a particular problem when the visit had to be re-arranged to a later date.

Feedback to centres

The vast majority of centres considered the moderation visits to be vital to their own internal verification procedures and to provide updates on ongoing development issues and were pleased to hear that moderation visits were on the increase once again.

Centres had recognised the importance of maintaining quality standards and this was reflected in the titles of some SQA co-ordinators, ie Directors of Quality or Quality Managers. The Moderators complimented many centres on the structure of their master folders and many issues of good practice were noted. The good practice noted ranged from Learner guides, integration of Outcomes, student feedback forms and relevant up to date case study material relating to specific client groups.

On the downside, there were a few occasions when the Instruments of Assessment were considered to be implicit by nature and in some cases not identified with Outcomes being assessed. In all of these cases the Moderators advised centres possible improvements and these were acceptable to centres involved.

All of the issues requiring attentions have been outline in the specific external moderation visit reports and it is recommended that copies of these reports be issued to Moderators for the 2005/2006 session so that outstanding items can be monitored at the time of the next visit.

In general, the candidate work was of high standard, but in come case, mainly with full time candidates the amount of remediation required was quite high. Assessors had nearly always used marking guidelines and scripts were annotated with helpful comments. The candidate feedback forms are now common practice with many centres and these are used to monitor candidate progress, and advise on the requirements of remediation, if required.