National Units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017
Catering and Hospitality

Introduction

During this session, the verification team reviewed the following units:

F792 11   Food Hygiene for the Hospitality Industry
D04R 11   Service of Food and Drink
DV3A 11   Customer Care for the Hospitality and Tourism Industry
F7DL 11   Local Hospitality Provision
D0TA11   Hospitality: Food and Drink Service
F7E4 11   Alcoholic Beverages: An Introduction
F792 12   Food Hygiene for the Hospitality Industry

All verification reports showed confidence in the standard of teaching, assessment and verification practices and procedures.

Candidates are clearly being supported and encouraged by curriculum staff, and each centre has been able to demonstrate a variety of teaching and learning methods to help motivate the individual learner.

Candidate feedback has once again proved positive. Many candidates commented on how much they had enjoyed the course, and that the learning experience was valuable. Candidates also stated that they were able to recognise the importance of each unit for future progression and employment opportunities. Retention rates for candidates was very good.

It was apparent from the reports that teaching staff are highly motivated, knowledgeable and enjoyed delivering the course. Whilst gaps in evidence recording had occurred, the robust internal verification systems captured and resolved any issues in a timely manner, demonstrating commitment to quality assurance processes.

Many exciting opportunities were available for staff and candidates through funded field trips and work experiences abroad.

Competition entries by NC candidates has increased over the years. Candidates demonstrated a great deal of skill and passion in producing the menu items involved.

Overall, the reports showed enthusiasm and commitment by all involved in the delivery, assessment and verification activity of these SQA awards.

Category 2: Resources

Criterion 2.4: There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.

Effective course delivery policies were in place in all centres. Most of the centres had detailed pre-delivery, mid-delivery and post-delivery checklists. These are updated on a yearly basis to ensure resources are adequate and suitable for the following session.

Planning for the forthcoming session normally takes place around May/June, which allows sufficient time for standardisation activity to take place.

It was encouraging to see staff use this time to update current knowledge and take advantage of continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities to develop skills, identify trends in industry and undertake trips to industry or other centres.

Some centres provided supporting documentation for tutors in the form of statements for delivery and delivery checklists. These all helped support programme/unit delivery and ensured the appropriate resources were in place and being standardised.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

It was positive to see that the majority of centres are retaining robust one-to-one interviews prior to course commencement, as this highlighted that effective screening takes place. It also ensured the candidates enrolled on the correct programme for their desired career path.

One centre has added a practical cookery activity into the interview process to test the practical ability of the candidate and help highlight any possible future development needs. Candidates commented favourably on this practice, as it gave them a better understanding of the course requirements.

Centres highlighted that additional support is available through a variety of mediums. This was commented on positively by candidates.

Criterion 3.3: Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.

There was clear from the evidence provided by centres that candidate reviews take place at appropriate intervals. These were documented in accordance with the centre policies.

Candidates and staff confirmed that scheduled contact was in place during timetabled classes with the unit tutor. It was also highlighted that centre policies included provision for designated time for candidates to see their tutors outwith classroom activity. Candidates who felt they needed additional support in certain areas of their studies welcomed this.

Any attendance issues were highlighted by the course tutor and appropriate support was put in place.

Personal Development Plans (PDP) were observed across several centres. PDPs encourage candidates to record their own progress and identify gaps in learning. Both tutor and candidate record the outcomes of 360-degree progress review sessions, which enables a more open discussion.

Some centres had internal messenger systems built into learning platforms. This allowed staff to post group messages and for individual learners to contact their course tutor for assistance. This proved to be an effective method of support, which allowed candidates to be more open about the assistance they required.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

Criterion 4.2: Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.

Effective course timetabling contributed to standardisation. Centres were able to demonstrate where standardisation meetings take place within the timetable and how these meetings help to support staff with delivery, assessment and verification. There was evidence of sampling being used in centres.

SQA-devised assessment packs were being used across all centres. Course delivery was matched clearly against the qualifications, with verification activity well planned to ensure no end-loading.

Standardisation meetings (course team reviews) ensured that tutors were being supported throughout delivery and assessment. Internal verification activity was also clearly supportive of the tutor, delivery and assessment procedures.

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

Centres were using SQA-devised assessment packs and this greatly assisted the delivery and assessment marking for staff. Some centres had adapted the assessment material into candidate logbooks.

Evidence of assessments was also provided through secure e-learning assessment sites. Some multiple-choice questions were electronically marked and short-answer questions were checked by the course tutor in the same manner as paper-based questions. Both systems proved positive, valid and reliable methods.

Centres used different versions of the SQA assessments where appropriate re-assessment was required.

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

All centres exhibited that robust plagiarism policies were in place. The information on plagiarism was discussed during candidate induction and in most cases the policy was reinforced at the start of each assessment, and also made available on the centre website or intranet facility.

SQA-devised checklists and marking schemes are being used or complied with (if a centre had imported the information onto their own branded documentation). The majority of paper-based assessments had been hand-written by the candidate, signed and dated appropriately. Internal verification had highlighted any areas of concern where assessments had not been signed. There was no evidence of plagiarism having occurred in any of the samples selected for verification or through any discussions with the centres.

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

It was evident that some inconsistencies had arisen during the course of some assessment decisions in one centre, however it was also clear that internal verification activity had highlighted these and appropriate actions had been taken. This resulted in a further standardisation meeting to discuss consistency across tutors who delivered the same unit across different groups and sites.

SQA conditions for assessment were followed by all centres selected for verification.

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

The retention of evidence met SQA requirements in all centres selected. This was reflected in centre policies, and staff showed an awareness of the retention periods.

The majority of centres retain assessment evidence for longer than required by the SQA retention policy.

Criterion 4.9: Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.

The majority of centres retained evidence of their standardisation meetings in master folders on the centre intranet, devised learning space, or within the printed quality assurance folder. These were available for visiting verification activity.

Information from standardisation meetings was disseminated to all team members. Some centres required e-mail confirmation that staff had read and understood the minutes of these meetings and any subsequent actions. This ensured that all staff were actively involved in receiving and acknowledging the information provided.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2016–17:

♦ The availability of some specialist equipment that reflected current industry trends being available to candidates (although not specifically required for the qualification).

♦ 360-degree reviews were seen as positive and allowed candidates to review their own learning and progression and be more actively involved in how their learning is developed.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were identified during session 2016–17:

♦ Ensure the whole team comply with standardisation processes of delivery and assessment, especially where delivery is cross-college and not necessarily from within the same departmental team.

♦ Ensure that there is a standardised practice for following the plagiarism policy. For example, student declaration forms should be completed by all students.