



Higher National Qualifications including Graded Units
Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019
Events

Verification group: 420

Introduction

The units selected for qualification verification in session 2018–19 were:

National units

HJ2X 46	Corporate Events: An Introduction
F3PN 12	Event Organisation
FP62 11	Contribute to an Event
FP63 12	Events Investigative Project
FP61 11	Events Industry An Overview
F3PN 12	Event organisation

Higher National units

H91J 34	Organising an Event
H91K 34	Events Industry
H91L 34	Event Legislation: Safety and Licensing

Graded units

H919 34	Events: Graded Unit 1
H91R 35	Events: Graded Unit 2

Nine centres were selected for qualification verification visits — three for NC units, one for HN units and five for graded units.

Category 2: Resources

Criterion 2.1: Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.

Not applicable to these qualification types.

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

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

One centre did not provide evidence of dated and signed pre-delivery reviews for one of the units selected. They also did not provide any evidence of standardisation meetings for delivery across courses in the centre.

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 identify candidate prior achievements and development needs against the awards delivered. Prior achievements are identified during the application process and discussed with candidates at the start of the course to ensure they have current knowledge and understanding. Additional support needs are discussed prior to commencing the course to identify resources and additional assessment needs for each unit of study. Individual learning and/or assessment plans are 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. Almost all centres give candidates feedback on the marking checklists to enable candidates to review their progress and prepare for re-assessment and/or remediation. For graded units, assessors did not consistently record the level of support given to candidates. Some centres have assessment schedules for the whole year to avoid assessment overload.

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 almost all centres confirmed that the policies and procedures were applied appropriately 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).

The assessor and internal verifier at one centre did not apply the minimum evidence requirements stated in the graded unit specification and assessment exemplar.

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

Where available, centres are all using SQA exemplars or ASPs for assessment. These are checked pre-delivery to ensure they are valid, fair, reliable and equitable. Centre-devised assessments are internally verified prior to use and some centres use SQA's prior verification service. Assessment instruments clearly state the assessment conditions and give candidates sufficient guidance on the pass requirements for each assessment. Almost all centres have marking checklists and/or solutions in master folders to ensure assessments meet the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units. One centre did not have assessment solutions for their centre-devised assessment instrument.

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 is uploaded via the VLE, and plagiarism software is used. In most centres, candidates sign statements confirming assessments are their own work. Where malpractice is evident, appropriate action is 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.

Almost all centres are using marking checklists and feedback sheets to ensure candidates have achieved the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units. In almost all centres, 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/remediation is required.

One centre for the graded unit had to re-mark candidate evidence in line with the standards and evidence requirements as stated in the unit specification. A few candidates were able to remediate their submissions, however some candidates had to complete a new case study.

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 are received by the SQA co-ordinator (quality department) and disseminated to all relevant staff for discussion and review. All centres discuss good practice and/or recommendations and these are recorded in meeting notes. Where actions are identified they are recorded and implemented, areas for improvement are tracked and signed off when completed.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ The internal verification system ensures that the IV2 document is completed when allocated by the curriculum manager. Candidate results cannot be processed on the system until this is completed.
- ◆ The internal verifier identified 'at risk' two units where the assessor was a new lecturer.
- ◆ In one unit there is a requirement for evidence of promotional materials, as a promotional method candidates recorded a jingle. This was quite different from the evidence normally presented by candidate, for example, posters, tickets or flyers.
- ◆ The pre-delivery checklist included 'unit induction for staff' to ensure that where new assessors are allocated, they have access to teaching, learning and any other materials for unit delivery.
- ◆ Practices and procedures adopted by the assessors and the internal verifier ensured consistency of delivery across two campuses. The comments and actions recorded in the documentation were detailed and rigorous, especially the standardisation meetings.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ Internal verification of the unit should include a documented review and comment on the assessment environment, equipment, learning and assessment materials. This should be more than a pre-delivery checklist to include comment on good practices and areas identified for improvement or alteration. This review should be carried out in accordance with the centre's internal verification procedures.
- ◆ Candidates considering a programme should be encouraged to undertake the centre's application, selection, information, and induction session prior to commencing the course.
- ◆ The type and level of support given to candidates during one-to-one meetings should be documented to ensure that it is clear whether this has affected their grade.
- ◆ Notes prepared by the candidate prior to assessment should be retained by the centre for assessments where notes are permitted.
- ◆ Portfolio templates could be used to ensure all aspects of outcomes are covered.
- ◆ When making assessment decisions, assessors are using a variety of terminology. This could be confusing for candidates and it is suggested that there is a standardisation of terms used for assessment decisions.
- ◆ It is strongly recommended that internal verification and standardisation of assessment decisions takes place prior to final assessment decisions being made.
- ◆ Marking checklists and feedback sheets should clearly indicate whether the candidate meets the minimum evidence requirements.

- ◆ The breakdown of marks within each task should be agreed and adhered to by the assessor and internal verifier. The same marking scheme should be used for future deliveries of the unit.
- ◆ Assessment tasks are recommended to be reviewed and/or revised to ensure evidence requirements are fully covered and not over assessed.
- ◆ Centres should check for any updates or revisions to SQA units prior to delivery to ensure they are using the current unit specification and ASP.
- ◆ Authenticity statements should be added to all assessment submissions. Candidates should sign authenticity statements for all assessment documents indicating it is their own work. This is particularly important where assessments are completed by groups.
- ◆ Centres could consider the use of plagiarism software to assist in the monitoring of authenticity.
- ◆ Where candidates remediate assessments, the original marking checklist and feedback sheet should be retained. A new marking checklist and feedback sheet should be completed and the outcome of the remediation recorded against each question and/or outcome.
- ◆ Although tickets were not actually sold for one or two of the events held, it is strongly recommended that there should be more emphasis on working within clear budget parameters. It should include a costing of resources used and recording donations. A running order is also recommended for the event, and should be included in the candidate folders as evidence.
- ◆ For Graded Unit 1 developing stage, additional marks should only be awarded where the candidate has given more than the evidence requirements. Some assessors are awarding additional marks when the candidate had only just met the minimum evidence requirement.
- ◆ A record sheet should be used to record the level of assistance for each candidate during the graded unit project. The final grade allocated should reflect the level of assistance given in accordance with the grade related criteria.