



Scottish Vocational Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022

Hospitality and Professional Cookery

Verification group number: 617

Introduction

The following awards were verified in 2021-22:

GM2M 21	SVQ in Hospitality Services SCQF Level 4
GM2H 21	SVQ in Professional Cookery SCQF Level 4
GM2D 22	SVQ in Beverage Service SCQF Level 5
GM2F 22	SVQ in Food Production SCQF Level 5
GM2E 22	SVQ in Food and Beverage Service SCQF Level 5
GM2N 22	SVQ in Hospitality Services SCQF Level 5
GM2G 22	SVQ in Kitchen Services SCQF Level 5
GT1R 22	SVQ Production Chef at SCQF Level 5
GM2K 22	SVQ in Professional Cookery SCQF Level 5
GM2J 23	SVQ in Professional Cookery SCQF Level 6
GM2C 23	SVQ in Hospitality Supervision and Leadership SCQF Level 7
GM2L 23	SVQ in Professional Cookery (Patisserie and Confectionery) SCQF Level 7
GR3N 24	SVQ in Hospitality Management Skills SCQF at level 8

- ◆ 42 verification activities were allocated to qualification verifiers
- ◆ 34 verification activities were successfully completed demonstrating high confidence
- ◆ 4 centres either postponed verification or the visit did not run due to insufficient evidence
- ◆ 4 centres received actions due to not meeting assessment strategy requirements

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.

Almost all centres demonstrated a clear understanding of the assessment strategy requirements by ensuring assessors and internal verifiers were suitably qualified and subject-specific professionals.

A small number of centres were found to be non-compliant, and the qualification verifier provided guidance on how to meet requirements for resubmission.

CPD was appropriate and met assessment strategy requirements across most centres. Those that did not initially meet requirements on paper resubmitted evidence to demonstrate compliance.

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

It was evident that almost all centres completed regular reviews of the assessment environments and many used site selection checklists and risk assessments as part of Modern Apprenticeship sign-up paperwork for this purpose.

Some centres clearly demonstrated pre-verification checks being made on an annual basis or as part of internal standardisation procedures.

It was evident this year that many centres had adopted an e-portfolio approach for recording assessment evidence and assessment decisions. It was highlighted by qualification verifiers that centres are responsible for ensuring that any e-portfolio is checked and standardised against unit performance criteria, scope/range and knowledge and understanding (including evidence requirements) to ensure that all team members' assessment and verification is performed consistently.

As part of the move to e-portfolios, some centres had redeveloped learning resources to support candidates on relevant programmes.

Category 3: Candidate support

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

Almost all centres demonstrated a comprehensive enrolment and induction process and ensured that candidate needs were taken into consideration when matching them to the most appropriate qualification. Confirmation was made through discussion with candidates by telephone or video call.

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

In almost all centres, qualification verifiers were able to speak with candidates prior to or during the virtual visit with the centre so they were able to verbally confirm their progress.

In some centres candidates clearly demonstrated an understanding of their progress and particular activities they were working on, showing enthusiasm for their achievements and ongoing activities.

It was also clear to qualification verifiers that assessors maintained scheduled contact with candidates and their progress was documented in line with the qualification requirements in almost all centres. Individual unit assessment plans were not evident in most centres as they used either e-portfolio planning and/or progress review sheets instead.

It was evident that team meetings within the centre highlighted any concerns over candidate progress and assessors provided actions to bring candidates up to date where possible.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

In almost all reports, qualification verifiers confirmed that centres were actively supporting the assessment and verification procedures set by the centre in accordance with assessment strategy requirements and SQA verification criteria.

In a small number of reports, inappropriate assessment methods or insufficiency of evidence was identified. Assessor observation and questioning was missing from SCQF levels 5 and 6 units, or range items had not been sufficiently covered with gaps showing in some internally verified portfolios. Where internal verification had taken place, it demonstrated a failure of meeting internal quality procedures and, subsequently, sanctions were set and re-assessment was required.

Some centre meeting records were team meetings rather than specified standardisation meetings. These would include a contribution and discussion toward a particular award, unit, assessment method to ensure the team maintained a standard approach in delivery, assessment and verification.

There was a distinct rise in the use of online and e-portfolio systems this session. It is important to highlight once again that the centres must take responsibility to ensure the performance criteria, range/scope and knowledge are accurate and in line with the NOS and evidence requirements. Evidence requirements were not always clearly represented in e-portfolio systems and the assessment method, number of observations and range/scope were not always captured. Pre-verification activity must clearly demonstrate that these checks have been made to ensure standardisation of assessment.

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

Almost all centres used the correct assessment method for the unit/award requirements. A small number of centres failed to use assessor observation as a required method of assessment and had relied on candidates writing their own assessment diaries. This did not comply with the assessment strategy.

Qualification verifiers raised awareness of photographic evidence being used as a source of assessment and fed back to centres that these should be supplementary to a source of primary evidence, such as observation. Photographs on their own do not demonstrate competence or knowledge and should only be used if relevant to the assessment task to ensure clarity and purpose.

As stated in the assessment strategy, assessments should be holistic and not undertaken unit by unit. This supports a more accurate and cost-effective approach to assessment. A few verifiers referred to the completion of knowledge statements and ensuring they were signed and dated by both candidate and assessor to help validate authenticity and reliability of evidence.

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

Qualification verifiers confirmed that almost all centres had robust plagiarism policies in place and whilst there were no apparent incidents of plagiarism or malpractice, staff and candidates were aware of the correct procedures to follow.

The majority of evidence reviewed by qualification verifiers had been signed and dated by candidates and/or assessors along with the SQA disclaimer and unit record following completion of a unit. Centres operating e-portfolios demonstrated how candidates confirm authenticity using secure log-in and paper-based signed progress reviews. Some centres used audio files with candidates clearly stating their name, location of work, date and time of assessment and answers to questions.

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

Qualification verifiers reported a small number of inconsistencies in centres where it was identified that there were inaccuracies and inconsistencies in assessor judgements. Some were identified through internal verification practices and some were not.

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

Qualification verifiers were complimentary to centres for the retention of candidate evidence and making available any additional evidence missing from the requested information on the visit plan in a timely manner.

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

All centres had processes in place to disseminate feedback within the centre following qualification verification. This was usually through standardisation meetings, CPD entries and the use of shared drives and intranet systems.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ Investment in staff training to develop more assessors or internal verifiers
- ◆ Flexible approaches to assessment and development of innovative methods to record assessments
- ◆ Close working relationships within the team and use of Microsoft Teams chat for continuous chat
- ◆ Improved standardisation processes and clear distinction between team meetings and standardisation of unit/awards

- ◆ Clear support for candidates
- ◆ Centres being reactive to change

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2021–22:

- ◆ Feedback by assessors to candidates following assessment decision was limited and should be more personalised and constructive rather than just stating 'well done'
- ◆ Internal verification could be more constructive and follow SQA internal verification guidance to ensure sufficiency of verification
- ◆ Assessments require proof of authentication, validity and currency through dates, signature and ensuring scope and range have also been covered (this is currently not detailed on some e-portfolios)
- ◆ Internal verifiers to encourage holistic assessment and clearer mapping
- ◆ Question banks must show evidence of being assessed and any incorrect answers re-assessed