



National, Higher National and Graded Units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018
Marketing, Sales and Advertising

Introduction

This report for 2017–18 covers visiting verifications to eight centres within the UK, in which NQ, HN and Graded Units were being delivered.

The following units were verified:

D0XS 12	Marketing Research Practice
FN3F 34	Marketing: Graded Unit 1
FN3H 34	Advertising and Public Relations: Graded Unit 1
F7BX 34	Marketing: An Introduction
DG6W 34	Principles and Practices of Selling
DG6V 34	Marketing Practice: an Introduction
HH9T 34	Marketing Research Theory
HC4A 35	Marketing: Brand Management
HC2M 34	Advertising: Media Sales

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 satisfactory records of pre-delivery assessment checks, standardisation and post-delivery meetings, which included reviews of equipment, classrooms, assessment instruments and teaching materials.

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 reported that the candidates' development needs and prior achievements were identified and suitably matched against the requirements of the award. Most centres provided evidence of effective personal learning plans, training-needs analysis, weekly guidance classes and an ongoing approach to the candidates' development requirements. All centres confirmed that candidates' development needs were discussed and noted as part of the induction process.

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

All centres reported and demonstrated effective procedures to ensure that candidates have scheduled contact (for example, a weekly, one-hour tutorial period) with their assessors to review progress, and to revise and update assessment plans as required. Contact with candidates was also maintained through electronic means, such as messaging, discussion forums and by e-mail.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

All centres provided satisfactory evidence that their assessment and internal verification procedures were being implemented. Pre-delivery checklists, records of internal verification both during and post delivery were provided, demonstrating a consistent approach to the standardisation of assessment. Copies of the current unit specifications and assessment exemplar were also made available to the assessors and verifiers, generally online.

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

All centres carried out pre-delivery checklists to confirm that the correct instruments of assessment were being used/due to be used, and were discussed both at standardisation meetings and between assessors and internal verifiers.

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

All centres provided evidence of the candidate induction process covering and explaining the policy on plagiarism, malpractice etc. Most centres ensured that candidates sign a learning agreement to confirm their awareness of policies on plagiarism, with many centres utilising anti-plagiarism software, such as Turnitin.

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

All centres provided evidence to show that candidates' evidence was being accurately and consistently judged by the assessors against SQA requirements with specific evidence demonstrating the use of sample solutions, detailed marking schemes and discussions of assessment standards. Moreover, there was good, clear evidence of the assessors having marked and provided each candidate with written comments on their assessment and good remediation guidance prior to re-assessments.

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

All of the centres reported retention of candidates evidence ranging from 1–5 years and all complied with SQA requirements.

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

All centres had satisfactory procedures for effective and timely dissemination of feedback to staff following verification visits, with reports being copied to staff and made available on the intranet. Moreover, staff meetings were held shortly after the verification visits to discuss the outcomes and specific responsibilities to staff where required.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following examples of good practice were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ Assessors maintained their CPD by undertaking professional qualifications such as the Chartered Institute of Marketing's Diploma in Digital Marketing; attending conferences; and taking part in in-house training courses on subjects such as internal verification and equality diversity and inclusiveness.
- ◆ Continual CPD recorded with assessors, creating industry links to ensure up-to-date teaching practice
- ◆ Use of external educational resources, such as industry speakers and parliament visits to support learning and the ability for the candidates to give well-rounded assessment responses. Many lecturers were proactive in bringing industry speakers to the college to give talks to the candidates that not only furthered the candidates' development but also their own development.
- ◆ Lecturers offered training on mental health to ensure they were in the good position to assist the candidates.
- ◆ Good use of Personal Learning Plans to engage candidate in their own learning.
- ◆ Good use of the VLE through messaging and discussion forums to ensure constant communication between the assessors and the candidates. Moreover, one-to-one feedback and the use of digital platforms helped to promote contact with all candidates.
- ◆ Extension studies with candidates participating in the college marketing project 'Bringing the Brand Alive'

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ Class result sheets should be designed to show full candidate results in terms of first attempts, remediation, fails and re-assessments. This is useful information to assist sampling by internal and external verifiers.
- ◆ Candidates should be taught to use the correct terminology concerning referencing/bibliographies. By second year of the HND year candidates should be encouraged to use a recognised referencing system such as Harvard. Referencing and bibliographies are also useful to help identify plagiarism when software is not being used.
- ◆ Assessors should ensure that they are following the evidence requirements set out in the descriptor; some candidate responses seemed to place more emphasis on the case study than on the theoretical responses, as set out in the descriptor.