



Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Hospitality Management

Introduction

All centres selected for verification activity during 2016–17 were found to be delivering and assessing individual units and the graded unit within the HN Hospitality awards to the appropriate SQA standards.

Verification activity 2016–17 included visiting verification for the following units:

H198 34	Hospitality Supervision
DL3G 34	Food and Beverage Service
DL3T 34	Financial and Control Systems
DL3D 34	Accommodation Servicing
H1L7 34	Hospitality Industry
DL4H 34	Hospitality: Graded Unit 1
DL4K 35	Hospitality Graded Unit 2

A development visit was carried out with one centre. During this visit, delivery and assessment strategies were discussed including integration opportunities to reduce assessment burden for both learners and academic delivery staff.

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 evidence of pre-delivery checklists being used. These checklists and subsequent discussion relating to resources, delivery and assessment materials was evidenced within course team meetings and/or master folders.

All centres have appropriate environments for the delivery of these awards. A few centres use industry partners as learning and resource centres to give a more realistic environment for candidates to undertake the practical tasks.

Electronic storage of pre-delivery checklists is becoming more common, which facilitates tracking of evidence for this criterion.

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 have policies and procedures relating to student recruitment, selection and admission. These provide the basis for accepting candidates onto the award and units contained within it.

All applicants are assessed by all the centres to establish their suitability for the course. This is commended, as candidates then have personal development or learning plans to facilitate any support needs they may have. This could be through formal additional support teams, or informal workshops that candidates are encouraged to attend to improve skills.

A few centres have electronic programmes to support academic staff to indicate which candidates may require additional support for delivery or assessment tasks.

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

In all centres evidence of scheduled contact for candidates with their assessors was made available. This included: timetables, learning, teaching, and assessment schedules. One centre used log books for the graded unit with records of one-to-one meetings between the candidate and the assessor. Class tutorials and individual face-to-face or e-mail contact was available to candidates within all centres.

All units reviewed by the qualification verifiers contained comprehensive feedback from the assessors to the candidates to support, guide and encourage achievement.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Policies and procedures for all centres relating to assessment and internal verification was available for scrutiny by all qualification verifiers. All centres were found to have appropriate procedures in place and all implemented these effectively to ensure standardisation.

In one centre an online system was used, which generates moderation reports and alerts for the assessors and verifiers of the unit. Any actions create an 'in-house hold' with no results recorded until the issues were resolved. This practice is sector-leading in relation to quality assurance practices. Electronic storage of policies and procedures was available to view in all centres.

One centre has representation on a networked board for all academic partners to ensure consistency is maintained for all Hospitality units delivered and assessed across the partnership.

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

All centres were using SQA devised unit specifications and assessment support material in an effective manner. In each centre, pre-delivery checks were carried out to ensure use of the correct unit specifications and assessment support materials.

All centres scheduled the units appropriately over the full academic year and this allowed candidates to fair access of assessment tasks. In one centre assessors were encouraged to raise issues/concerns/queries relating to SQA awards through their standardisation meetings.

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

All centres have plagiarism and malpractice policies and procedures in place. Most centres had devised declarations/statements for candidates to sign to confirm receipt and understanding of these policies and the penalties that may be applied if contravened. Three centres use Turnitin for submission and checking of candidate evidence.

The qualification verifiers were confident that establishing the veracity of candidates' work is sufficiently robust in all centres.

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

The units selected for verification activity have SQA assessment support material available. It was found during external verification activity that all assessors judged candidate evidence to an appropriate standard.

Graded units

Double marking was used to support marking consistency in the graded units. The levels of support and feedback given to candidates was detailed in candidate log books, and this was used to inform the final grades awarded.

Individual units

In all centres, assessors used SQA devised assessment support material, which ensured consistency in relation to these units. These units were scheduled throughout the academic year, which allowed for internal verification activity to take place timeously and supported assessor decisions.

In all centres for both individual and graded units, detailed feedback was provided to all candidates. This is critical to reassure and encourage achievement of the award.

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

All centres were compliant with SQA requirements for the retention of candidate evidence.

As electronic submission of candidate evidence becomes more common, centres are implementing policies and procedures to ensure secure storage of evidence and candidate information is compliant with data protection requirements.

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

In all centres, there were clear policies and procedures for the internal dissemination of qualification verification reports. Evidence of discussion of these reports was noted in programme team meetings, with any actions and changes for future delivery or assessment strategies recorded.

In one centre members of the internal quality team completed a follow-up check to ensure actions or recommendations were implemented by the team. In another centre, qualification verification reports were included as a standard agenda item for course team meetings.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ Electronic tracking ensured that candidates were supported at all stages. Any problems were identified and actioned.
- ◆ English support was included by a specialist as part of the programme for all HN candidates.
- ◆ Online registers to ensure all tutors were aware of identified candidate needs.
- ◆ Use of bespoke quality and moderation systems to ensure standardisation.
- ◆ Excellent written feedback from the assessor to candidates on their progress, commenting on strengths and recommendations for improvement.
- ◆ Mentoring across campuses and sharing of good practice by more experienced assessors.
- ◆ Clear and constructive tutor feedback on the graded unit, highlighting key areas of how minimum evidence could be achieved.