

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

Travel and Tourism

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
Included in this report**

**Selling Overseas Tourist Destinations
Intermediate 2
X03T 11**

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	77
----------------------------------	----

Number of entries in 2004	72
----------------------------------	----

General comments re entry numbers

The number of entries has not changed significantly considering that one college usually with a large number of entries did not submit any at all this year. Another college made up the numbers by submitting over 40 entries. One college with no entries before this year submitted 8. Six colleges submitted entries.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards

Pass mark data

Grade	No. of candidates	Percentage of candidates	Cumulative % of candidates
A	13	18.1	18.1
B	20	27.7	45.8
C	17	23.6	69.4
Total A-C	50	69.4	-
D	12	16.7	86.1
No Award	10	13.9	100.0

Course Award Data

Grade	No. of candidates	Percentage of candidates	Cumulative % of candidates
A	9	12.5	12.5
B	13	18.0	30.5
C	5	7.0	37.5
Total A-C	27	37.5	-
D	1	1.4	38.9
No award	44	61.1	100.0

Explanation of difference between Pass Mark data and Course Award data

To achieve a course award, candidates must pass the course assessment and pass all unit assessments. Any difference in the data between Pass Mark data and Course Award data is influenced mainly by the achievement of unit assessments not being notified to SQA.

The data used at pass mark stage showed that in the external assessment a lower percentage of candidates received A and B award than in 2003. There was a higher level of achievement at C but overall the standard was weaker.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	18.1	18.1	13	140
B	27.7	45.8	20	120
C	23.6	69.4	17	100
D	16.7	86.1	12	80
No award	13.9	100	10	0

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries are unaltered from 2003. The addition of a 'D' award includes those candidates who narrowly failed to achieve the standard necessary to pass the external assessment.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The standard of the case studies this year was lower than last year's.

The main issues of the project were very rarely addressed with no mention being made of the key points of the holiday researched, e.g. couples were sent on Case Study 2 without mention of the wedding or 2-centre holiday, Case Study 1 did not mention family requirements.

For the Research Based Report students from one centre only researched one Long haul destination and one European when it is clearly stated in the Marking Guidelines that at least two destinations from each category should be researched in order to narrow it down to one in each. At this stage some students gave actual destinations instead of countries whereas again it should be countries in general narrowed down to actual destinations in the countries in the Case Study Report.

Centres are reminded that the Marking Guidelines are only for the lecturers to use and should not be given out to students.

The presentation of the projects was of a very high standard showing high levels of IT skills.

The uptake of the new Case Study 4 was lower than expected.

Case Study 1 was used by 30 candidates.

Case Study 2 was used by 24 candidates.

Case Study 3 was used by 12 candidates.

Case Study 4 was used by 6 candidates.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

The plans were much better this year and marks were generally higher. Most candidates appeared to have been given good guidelines for the project.

IT skills were of a very high standard with many students producing a very high quality of presentation.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Some candidates submitted projects with whole sections, e.g. planning, conclusion, recommendation, evaluation, missed out.

Timescales were not given with enough detail in many cases.

As highlighted in the 2003 PA Report most candidates failed to **compare** one holiday with the other for the conclusions. Instead they only outlined the two holidays, repeating what they had already stated. Over half of the candidates scored less than half marks for this part of the developing section

Evaluation once again was also performed very poorly with only about one third of candidates passing this section.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

- ◆ In the Conclusions and Recommendations section of the Case Study, please attach page of **handwritten** notes to this part as evidence and only in exceptional circumstances should students be allowed to word process either this or the Evaluation section. It is clearly stated in the Specification that the Conclusions and Recommendations and Evaluation should be **handwritten**.
- ◆ The specification states that Conclusions must be written. A valid conclusion must include a comparison of the different destinations and not simply a list of what each offers the customer.
- ◆ Make sure the student either attaches a relevant internet printout or brochure page with the project to show where the holiday originated.
- ◆ Do not leave centre marking sheets in the project – these are for your use only.
- ◆ Students must number the pages in the project to relate to the Contents Page.
- ◆ Make sure that students research at least two countries for European and two countries for Popular Long haul for the Research Based Report.