



National Units and Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Events

Introduction

The units selected for external verification in 2016–17 were:

NC

F3PN 12 Event Organisation
F5A3 11 Event Organisation
FP61 11 Events Industry: An Overview
FP62 11 Contribute to an Event

HN

H91J 34 Organising and Event
H91L 34 Event Legislation
H91K 34 Events Industry: An Introduction
H942 34 Conferences: An Introduction

Graded Unit

H91P 34 Events: Graded Unit 1

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.

All centres provided sufficient evidence to confirm that there were effective ongoing reviews of assessment environments, assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials. Evidence presented by centres included pre-delivery checklists, standardisation meeting notes, team meeting notes and internal verification reports.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

All centres matched candidate prior achievements and development needs against the awards delivered. Prior achievements were identified during the application process and discussed with candidates at the start of the course to ensure they have the current knowledge and understanding. Additional support needs were discussed prior to commencing the course to identify resources and additional assessment needs for each unit of study. Individual learning/assessment plans were recorded and available to all members of the teaching team. Candidates can be referred or self-refer for additional support during their course.

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

Candidates at all centres have timetabled classes for each unit. Where candidates are 'remote', they participated in video conferencing. Assessment marking checklists include feedback on

performance to enable candidates to review their progress and prepare for re-assessment and/or re-mediate assessments. Candidates interviewed said they can approach their assessors face-to-face and via e-mail to discuss their progress. Some centres produced assessment calendars for the whole year to ensure that there is no overload. Where candidates were concerned about too many assessments, staff would re-schedule where possible.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres have assessment and verification procedures and policies in place. Evidence available at centres confirmed that these policies and procedures were appropriate for the awards sampled. Evidence included unit pre-delivery checklists, standardisation meeting notes, internal verification sampling documentation and master folders for units (paper and electronic). For graded unit 1, there was evidence of cross-marking to ensure that the final grades were in line with the grade criteria.

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

Where available, all centres used SQA assessment exemplar packs/assessment support packs for assessment. These were checked pre-delivery to ensure they were valid, fair, reliable and equitable. Centre-devised assessments were internally verified prior to use, and most centres used SQA's prior verification service. Assessment instruments clearly state the assessment conditions and give candidates sufficient guidance on the 'pass' requirements for each assessment. Centres have marking checklists and solutions in master folders to ensure assessments meet the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units.

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

All centres have policies and procedures for academic malpractice. Candidates are made aware of these at induction and have access to the policies in course information (booklets and online). In most centres, candidate evidence was uploaded via the virtual learning environment and plagiarism software was applied. Candidates sign statements confirming assessments are their own work. Where malpractice was evident, appropriate action was taken in line with the centre's policies and procedures. Assessment instruments all clearly state the assessment conditions for the assessment.

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

All centres used marking checklists and feedback sheets to ensure candidates have achieved the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units. Standardisation meetings and internal verification sampling documentation confirmed that assessor judgements were accurate and consistent. Marking checklists and feedback sheets provide candidates with detailed feedback

on performance and guidance where re-assessment/re-mediation is required. Cross marking of graded units also ensured that grades met the grade criteria specified in the unit.

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

All centres have policies and procedures for the retention of candidate assessment evidence for internal and external verification. The disposal dates are all in line with SQA requirements.

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

All centres confirmed that qualification verification reports were received by the SQA co-ordinator (Quality Department) and disseminated to all relevant staff for discussion and review. Good practice/recommendations were discussed and recorded in meeting notes. Where actions were identified, they were recorded and implemented. Areas for improvement were tracked and signed off when completed.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ Good use of standardisation meetings to identify and record action points and follow up for next delivery. This included giving comments to SQA on templates provided.
- ◆ Very detailed and constructive internal verification feedback to the assessor on candidate portfolios.
- ◆ Integration of assessment with communications and enterprise activity units to avoid duplication of assessment.
- ◆ Positive reinforcement of candidate performance using 'feedforward'.

Specific areas for development

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

- ◆ The cross-marker could use a separate marking sheet to allow a comparison of marks with the assessor's marks.
- ◆ Where units are being delivered in more than one team in the centre (for example the *Organising An Event* unit), they should work together to standardise the assessment experience for candidates.