



National Units and Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017

Travel and Tourism

Introduction

The units selected for external verification in session 2016–17 were:

NC

F3PH11	Resort Representation: An Introduction
F3PK11	Tour Guiding: An Introduction
F3P812	Airport Ground Operations
F3P712	Working as Air Cabin Crew
F3P9 12	Selling the Travel and Tourism Product
DF6M 12	Air Travel: An Introduction
DM4T 12	Scottish Tourism Product: An Introduction
H90V 46	Sustainable Practices in Travel and Tourism
H93N 46	Preparation for HN
H0BD 12	Activity Tourism and Special Interest Pursuits: An Introduction
H0BG 12	Activity Tourism Pursuits: Active Terrestrial
H0BE 12	Activity Tourism: Developing Skills for Organising Activities
H0E7 11	Participate in Activity Tourism Pursuits

HN

DK03 34	Providing Information on The Scottish Tourism Product
DJ9T 34	Tour Guiding and Resort Representation
DJ9P 34	Tour Operations
DK02 35	Planning and Sustainable Development in Tourism
F3F5 34	Scottish Natural Heritage Tourism
F3F6 34	Countryside Visitor Management
F566 35	Tourism Sustainability and Rural Communities

Graded Units

H1J7 35	Travel and Tourism: Graded Unit 2
H1J6 34	Travel and Tourism: Graded Unit 1

Seven centres were selected for external verification visits — four for NC units, two for HN units, and three for graded units.

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 selected for external verification provided sufficient valid evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials.

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 identified candidate prior achievements and development needs. These were identified during the application/induction process and during delivery and relevant plans/timetables. Evidence was available to confirm that candidates can self-refer or be referred by tutors/assessors for additional support. Where required, special assessment arrangements were communicated to relevant staff.

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

All centres provided timetabled contact with assessors. Additionally, candidates can contact staff by e-mail and/or via a virtual learning environment. Feedback from assessors on performance ensures candidates can review their progress and plan for assessment. Teaching and assessment plans ensure candidates are aware of assessment dates.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Almost all centres selected for external verification applied internal assessment and verification procedures appropriately for the awards. The centres provided documented evidence in master folders and meeting notes.

One centre did not cross-reference candidate evidence to demonstrate that the candidates met the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units involved when integrated assessment had been undertaken. The internal verifier did not identify the gaps in evidence and record their feedback to the assessor on the assessment decisions. The centre's policies and procedures included internal verification sampling guidance and documentation.

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

All centres demonstrated that they have effective selection and use of assessment methods/instruments for the awards offered. Pre-delivery checklists confirmed that assessments are valid, equitable and fair.

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

All centres have policies and procedures in place to ensure candidate's work is their own. Candidates have access to centre academic malpractice policies and evidence presented confirmed that the policies and procedures were implemented appropriately.

Evidence in master folders included procedures for academic malpractice. Staff confirmed they were aware of the procedures. Assessment instruments included assessment conditions statements and this ensured candidates were aware of the assessment conditions. Candidates sign disclaimers to confirm assessments submitted are their own work. Almost all centres use software for electronic submissions to identify plagiarism.

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

Almost all centres selected for external verification accurately and consistently judged candidate evidence against SQA requirements for the awards. Marking checklists and feedback to candidates confirmed judgements were accurate and consistent.

One centre did not cross-reference candidate evidence for integrated assessment to demonstrate that the candidates met the outcomes and evidence requirements for the units. The internal verifier did not identify the gaps in evidence and record their feedback to the assessor on the assessment decisions. The centre's policies and procedures included internal verification sampling guidance and documentation.

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

All centres retained candidate assessment evidence in line with SQA requirements. Centre policies and procedures included retention dates and ensured that candidate evidence was available for internal and external verification purposes.

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

All centres circulated qualification verification reports to relevant staff. Where good practice, recommendations and/or action points were identified, these were discussed at team/centre meetings. Documented meeting notes included any actions taken with dates for completion. Many centres stored qualification verification reports and meeting notes on their intranet sites which allowed all relevant staff to access the reports.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2016–17:

- ◆ Internal verification systems were working well. Where internal verification required actions to be taken, records confirmed these decisions were agreed.
- ◆ The organisation of files, marking and standard of feedback given to candidates.
- ◆ Well-documented verification and assessment folders for the awards delivered.
- ◆ The use of workplace experience in assessment responses.
- ◆ The use of video recording for sales role-play assessments.
- ◆ The excellent quality of the displays produced by some candidates.

- ◆ The use of Mahara to allow the group members to share resources and record activities and, along with assessors, add comments on the resources.
- ◆ Integration of graded unit topics into assessment for other units delivered on the programme.
- ◆ Excellent support programmes in place for candidates.
- ◆ The role of the co-ordinating unit leader to ensure standardisation across the campuses.
- ◆ Regular cross-campus reviews, updating of instruments of assessment and cross-campus team video conferences to discuss qualification verification feedback.
- ◆ The processing of all open test responses using anti-plagiarism software.
- ◆ Electronic files containing unit information and candidate evidence were well organised and easy to access.
- ◆ Development of mock tests to prepare candidates for assessment in DK03 34 and DK02 35.
- ◆ For graded unit 1, the assessor's log recording items and issues discussed in four scheduled review meetings with individual candidates.
- ◆ For graded unit 1, a marking checklist which aids a holistic decision on candidate grades.
- ◆ The use of candidate logbooks for graded unit 1, containing checklists for each stage of the project and feedback from the assessor on performance. This encouraged the candidates to reflect on the feedback given.
- ◆ Candidate support lessons/handouts for each stage of the graded 2 and the 'Introduction to Reflective Writing' was particularly good as an aid for candidates when completing the evaluation stage.
- ◆ Records of standardisation discussions for graded unit 2 were stored on SharePoint.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2016–17:

- ◆ Assessment evidence to be clear for each candidate. Centres should use a marking checklist to provide feedback to candidates.
- ◆ The internal verifier should record feedback to the assessor on their assessment decisions and where necessary identify actions required.
- ◆ Sales role-play assessments could be more reflective of the importance of selling skills and industry standards and should encourage a natural, animated sales interaction.
- ◆ Re-assessment tests could be further developed to include areas of study not included in the SQA assessment exemplar tests (given that the exemplars sample knowledge covered in the unit specification).
- ◆ Case studies for graded unit 1 should be changed from year to year.
- ◆ Marking checklists for graded unit 1 should clearly reflect the minimum evidence requirements for each stage.
- ◆ The planning and development stages for graded unit 2 should be uploaded on an electronic learning platform with an automatic plagiarism check.