



## External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	<b>Selling Overseas Tourist Destinations</b>
Level	<b>Intermediate 2</b>

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

# Comments on candidate performance

## General comments

The response overall this year was generally good, with a wide spread of marks being allocated.

This year the ski holiday was unpopular, but this is unusual. All candidates chose Case Study 4, ignoring the 'twin centre' option.

There were instances of students having missing parts of the project, resulting in a loss of marks. Some had notes in the work from a staff member saying that the work had gone missing.

Some students produced factsheets that did not include the correct information required and therefore lost marks.

One centre had red, green and turquoise pen ticks and pencilled comments on scripts. The pencilled comments had been rubbed out but could still be read by the Markers. Centres must be aware that, although an estimate has to be given, it is not permissible to mark the candidates' work on the script. The Centre should use the marking sheets available from SQA to do this and allocate the marks that way.

In the last two parts — invigilated conditions — centres must make sure that the candidates only bring in one sheet of A4 with 200 words for each part. This must be handed in to the member of staff and included with the project.

Conclusions and evaluation can be written up in invigilated conditions and then word processed to be included when collating the project. It is suggested that the candidate is given a copy of their written work; they can then word process it without changing anything.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

The research reports were completed well, with most students presenting suitable destinations for the case study customers.

Presentation of the projects was good, with colour printing where the students were able to achieve this.

Some of the hand-drawn maps and climate charts were of a very high standard.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

In some cases the planning section was not completed well, with candidates not providing enough detail, and quite a few did not actually follow their plan.

Wedding regulations were ignored for the countries chosen in Case Study 2.

In the research-based report, some candidates launched into the actual destination — eg Paris, France, instead of the actual countries as a whole. Climate charts were included, either from the internet or hand-drawn, but some candidates did not extract the actual temperature and rainfall for the time of year that the clients would be visiting the destination.

In the Case Study report, some candidates thought that 'resort' meant the actual hotel — it means the town — and gave all the details for the hotel complex but ignored the town it was in.

The conclusions and evaluation section in some cases are still not completed well. Candidates do not seem to read the headings given for the evaluation and miss out some of the parts, resulting in the loss of marks.

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

- ◆ Centres should go online to get the latest edition of the Unit specification at the end of this year (2010) as there are minor changes planned.
- ◆ Centres should make sure that they have a current marking scheme for the Unit.
- ◆ Centres should make sure that the plan is workable before the student advances on to the rest of the project.
- ◆ Centres should make sure that candidates include evidence of where the actual holidays were found, ie brochure page, printout from web page, etc.
- ◆ Ensure that the candidates hand in A4 200-word notes for each of the last sections to be included with the project.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2009	88
Number of resulted entries in 2010	71

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark — 200				
A	19.7%	19.7%	14	140
B	15.5%	35.2%	11	120
C	28.2%	63.4%	20	100
D	2.8%	66.2%	2	90
No award	33.8%	100.0%	24	—

### General commentary on grade boundaries

While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Head of Service and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.

SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as Arrangements evolve and change.