



**Higher National and Graded Unit
National Units**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019
Professional Cookery**

Verification group 615

Introduction

In total nine centres were selected for verification activity during 2018–19. This included eight offering National Units as part of a National Qualification, and one HN centre selected for Graded Unit 2 verification.

In all centres, i SQA standards were being followed for the delivery and assessment of these units.

Verification activity 2018-19 included visiting verification for the following units:

HN Professional Cookery

DL4G 35 Professional Cookery: Graded Unit 2

Individual National Units

F4SS 10 Healthy Cookery
F7DP 11 Food Preparation Techniques
F7DS 11 Cookery Processes
F7E0 11 Cold Preparation
F993 11 Pastry
F7DX 11 Stocks and Sauces
F792 11 Food Hygiene for the Hospitality Industry
FT8C 11 Fish and Shellfish
FT8A 12 Meat and Poultry
FT8H 12 - Organisation of Practical Skills 4

NPA Professional Cookery SCQF 4

D263 10 Food Preparation Techniques
D264 10 Cookery Processes: An Introduction
F4SK 10 Working Safely in the Hospitality Industry
F4ST 10 Craft Baking
F792 10 Food Hygiene in the Hospitality Industry
D9NL 10 Organisation of Practical Skills

During the verification visits there was opportunity to discuss individual development recommendations with the delivery teams. This included integration of units, and standardisation of delivery and assessment approaches. In all centres it was found the delivery team were fully committed to the delivery of the awards and individual units, and they welcomed the opportunity to explore ways to enhance future delivery.

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 reviews in relation to facilities and services required for the delivery and assessment of the units. In all instances this was in the form of signed checklists. In almost all centres there was evidence of the use of electronic programmes to meet this criterion.

All centres use SQA produced assessment support packs and guidance materials for the individual units to ensure standardisation across all groups and candidates

Category 3: Candidate support

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

In all centres there was evidence of support mechanisms provided for candidates. For example: pre-course interviews with guidance teams and academic staff; workshops designed to enhance and support candidate achievement; additional practical remediation classes; and pre-exit discussions. All combine to ensure candidates are given every opportunity to succeed.

All centres provided student advisors/guidance sessions, almost all regularly timetabled with individual and group face-to-face sessions. This service is delivered through both guidance and academic staff working closely with each candidate to support their individual requirements.

All centres have robust policies and procedures in place relating to recruitment, enrolment and academic support throughout the course. The majority of units verified form part of National Awards, so transition/progression to the next level was fully supported in all centres.

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

Evidence of scheduled contact between candidates and their assessors on a weekly basis was provided by all centres. These scheduled slots took a variety of formats appropriate for each centre — some centres used the end of practical sessions to provide feedback to individual candidates; in almost all centres time outwith the practical environments was seen as the most effective way to discuss progress and establish readiness for assessment.

In all centres candidates were able to contact their assessors outwith these scheduled sessions, which enabled further feedback and support to be provided.

For the graded unit, candidates are fully briefed in relation to the requirements of each stage, and are assigned one-to-one feedback after each stage which is supported by group tutorials, email and the use of Moodle.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Internal assessment and verification procedures in all centres were evidenced by signed off records of pre-delivery internal verification (IV). Course team minutes were available in all centres, with internal verification as a standing agenda item in almost all.

Electronic scheduling of internal verification was common to most centres. This co-ordinated the scheduling and delivery of the units, ensuring ongoing IV activity was taking place.

In all centres, both assessors and internal verifiers were experienced deliverers of the units and awards. This has resulted in a consistent standard evident in almost all centres.

The finding of the external verifiers this academic year is that all centres have appropriate procedures in place, and these have been implemented effectively to ensure standardisation of assessment through their internal verification activity.

In almost all centres, candidate evidence and results are now held electronically. This includes archiving materials in line with SQA policy.

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

All centres selected for verification activity used SQA-devised unit specifications and exemplars appropriately.

Scheduling for the graded unit was appropriate, running throughout the academic year. This enabled the candidates sufficient time to develop each stage fully.

In all centres, observation checklists for the practical units were completed fully. Some centres have developed logbooks/worksheets of a high standard, which ensure candidates have multiple opportunities to develop the skills and techniques required prior to assessment taking place.

One centre effectively used a master matrix to schedule multiple opportunities for candidates to build skills and techniques and allowed for integration across multiple units.

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

The 'Turnitin' originality programme is used by one centre for submission of candidates' work for the graded unit. This provides support for both assessor and internal verifier in relation to the veracity of the candidate submission. This in conjunction with centre policy and procedures confirms this criterion.

All other centres had malpractice and plagiarism statements included within student handbooks and electronic induction materials. In all centres, the practical observation checklists marked by the assessor confirm all products produced meet this criterion. Units that require written assessment responses have signed candidate declaration statements.

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

Professional Cookery Units

External verifiers found that, in all centres, candidate work was consistently judged to the appropriate SQA standard for each unit. All units for verification activity have SQA exemplars, and these were applied effectively. Recording of the products produced by candidates took a variety of formats, including logbooks, work-sheets and photographic evidence. In some centres it was suggested recording product images by means of mobile phones with the images then uploaded to candidate portfolios was supported.

Professional Cookery Graded Unit 2

The centre selected for verification activity uses Moodle and Turnitin very effectively for the delivery and assessment of the graded unit. Each stage was assessed appropriately; judgements were clear and concise and supported the individual feedback given to the candidate. Each stage was then subject to internal verification to ensure consistency.

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

In all centres the retention of candidate evidence complied with SQA requirements. In many centres samples of candidate work are retained for longer periods within their archive procedures.

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

All centres selected for verification activity are experienced with SQA procedures. All centres were able to provide minutes of regular team meetings at which internal and external verification reports were discussed.

In one centre, a post-delivery verification meeting is undertaken to ensure all actions are captured, with follow-up activities taking place to implement recommendations prior to future delivery of the units or awards.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

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

Candidate feedback

- ◆ In depth feedback provided by assessor continued to support and motivate the candidates

Candidate support

- ◆ Use of a 'Big White Wall' platform for addressing mental health issues. This is currently licenced for 16 years old and over, however the centre has advised that they are currently looking into using the same system for 16 and under due to their demographic profile. It has been beneficial to both staff and students and it also has improved overall retention.
- ◆ During the interview process a centre identifies whether an applicant requires supported learning. A traffic light coding is applied as good practice: Green — care experienced young people; Amber — English as 2nd language; Red — additional supported needs. This ensures that a duty of care is immediately applied.
- ◆ Students with attendance issues are offered extra tuition in order to catch up effectively. This has had positive outcome in PI's and in respect of retention.

Curriculum delivery

- ◆ A centre undertakes 'Midterm Reviews' to evaluate the course, ensure standardisation in both campuses, retention, performance indicators / achievement and an action plan where required if areas are showing concern.

Learning and teaching

- ◆ Very detailed Learning, Teaching and Assessment plans.
- ◆ The use of practical diaries to record the dishes made gives candidates ownership of their learning. This could be further supported by photographic evidence of the products, which in future could be recorded through the 'Mylearning' student platform.
- ◆ Student learning packs that provide navigation websites to encourage students to further or enhance their studies. When students pass they are signed off as first opportunity/attempt. This supports the process of verification and for candidate information.

Specific areas for development

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

Curriculum delivery

- ◆ It is recommended that candidates have an extended practical session to provide time for the development of skills and techniques required for the practical units. In addition, dedicated 'theory' classes, with access to computers/laptops, would enhance knowledge and understanding of each unit.