Higher National and Graded Unit, National Units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018
Travel and Tourism

Introduction

The units selected for qualification verification in session 2017–18:

National Units

H1SC 12   Heritage Industry in Scotland
F3PA 12   Travel and Tourism Study Visit
F3P9 12   Selling the Travel and Tourism Product
F3PK 11   Tour Guiding: An Introduction
F3PD 11   Airport Ground Operations
H0BD 12   Activity Tourism and Special Interest Pursuits: An Introduction
H0BE 12   Activity Tourism: Developing Skills for Organising Activities
H0BG 12   Activity Tourism: Active Terrestrial
H0E7 11   Participate in Activity Tourism Pursuits

Higher National Units

H1J4 34   Working as Senior Cabin Crew
DK03 34   Providing Information on the Scottish Tourism Product
DJ9T 34   Tour Guiding and Resort Representation
F504 34   Foundations of Activity Tourism
F3F5 34   Scottish Natural Heritage Tourism
DJ9L 35   Visitor Attraction Management
H297 34   Airline and Airport Operations
DK04 35   Marketing Planning in Travel and Tourism
DJ9P 35   Tour Operations
H11R 34   Retail Travel Practice
F6VY 34   Air Travel

Graded Units

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

Eleven centres were selected for qualification verification visits — three for NC units, three for HN units and eight 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 qualification 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 for awards. These are identified during the application/induction process, or during delivery, and relevant plans and/or timetables are implemented. Evidence was available to confirm that candidates can self-refer, or be referred by tutors or assessors, for additional support. Where required, special assessment arrangements are 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 for awards. In addition, candidates can contact staff by e-mail and/or via the VLE. Feedback from assessors on performance ensures that 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 qualification verification applied internal assessment and verification procedures appropriately for the awards. The centres provided documented evidence in master folders and meeting notes.

For the graded unit project, in one centre the internal verifier signed off the candidate marking checklists for each stage, confirming they agreed with the assessor's decisions. However, the assessor's decisions did not meet the minimum evidence requirements and the grade criteria, as stated in the unit specification and SQA assessment exemplar. The centre provided copies of the course team meeting minutes which included pre-delivery internal verification discussions and required actions.

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 make effective selection and use of assessment methods and instruments for the awards delivered. 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, and candidates have access to centre academic malpractice policies. Evidence presented confirmed that the policies and procedures were implemented appropriately. Evidence in master folders included procedures for dealing with academic malpractice, and staff confirmed they are aware of the procedures. Assessment instruments included statements of assessment conditions, which ensured that candidates are aware of the conditions. Candidates sign disclaimers to confirm that the assessments they have submitted are their own work.

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

Most of the centres selected for qualification verification accurately and consistently judged candidate evidence against SQA requirements for the awards. Marking checklists and feedback to candidates confirmed that the judgements were accurate and consistent.

One centre did not mark closed book assessments in line with the SQA exemplar.

One centre did not mark the graded unit projects in line with the minimum evidence requirements and grade criteria, as stated in the unit specification and SQA assessment exemplar.

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 qualification verification purposes.

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

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

One centre did not provide any evidence that feedback from qualification verifiers is disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

♦ Additional support tutorial material for graded units available on VLE (Moodle) in the form of mini lessons.

♦ One centre designed instruments of assessment to ensure candidates can be re-assessed and that assessments reflect industry practice.

♦ Candidate visits to the local council library provided additional resources and input on the use of secondary sources and referencing.

♦ In addition to the marking checklist, one centre used an assessment cover sheet, which records first attempts, remediation, and acts as a visual record of each candidate's achievement.

♦ Integration of assessment across units is good practice, but it needs to be mapped against the evidence requirements.

♦ The internal verifier and assessor's use of the centre's VLE (Moodle) and Turnitin software to check for plagiarism was most effective. Files were very well ordered, and easy to access and understand.

♦ Candidates updating their graded unit online logbooks on a weekly basis.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2017–18:

♦ Assessors should ensure that candidates are providing detailed full responses to assessment instruments. These should be grammatically correct sentences and written in paragraphs.

♦ Internal verifiers must be familiar with the minimum evidence requirements and grade criteria for Graded Unit 1, to be able to give the assessor feedback on the required standards and allocation of marks. The discussions should be recorded, along with any actions required by the assessor to meet the standards stated in the unit specification.

♦ Centres were recommended to submit all internally-devised instruments of assessment to SQA for prior verification.

♦ Centres are advised to clearly outline any changes or amendments made to assessment instruments, indicating the differences from the original SQA assessment exemplar for the unit(s).

♦ Feedback is discussed with the candidates during structured one-to-one meetings with the assessor. Where the feedback is provided verbally, it would benefit the candidate if a copy of the feedback was provided as a paper or electronic copy.

♦ The very broad topics chosen for Graded Unit 2 made it difficult for candidates to make useful recommendations and therefore achieve additional marks and improved grades. It is recommended that the candidates should make their topics more specific to be able to undertake more detailed research and analysis.

♦ Although all requested evidence was available, some of the evidence on VLEs was not easily located, as it was integrated with other units. It is recommended that centres devise a template mapping the evidence requirements to the units, and stating where the evidence is located.

♦ Unit checklists should clearly identify where evidence generated has been obtained by integrated assessment.