Higher National and Graded Unit, National Units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019
Travel & Tourism

Verification group 192

Introduction

The units selected for qualification verification in session 2018–19:

National Units

H1SC 12	Heritage Industry in Scotland
F3PK 11	Tour Guiding: an introduction
H90K 45	Tourist Destinations
H90N 45	Travel and Tourism: an introduction
F3P9 12	Selling the Travel and Tourism Product
H90M 46	Travel Products and Services
H90L 46	Leisure and Business Tourist Destinations
H90P 45	Accommodation and Package Holidays
H90R 46	Travel and Tourism in the UK

Higher National Units

DJ9W 34	Structure of the Travel and Tourism Industry
DK07 33	International Tourist Destinations
DJ9P 35	Tour Operations
DK0E 34	Applying Marketing Principles in Travel and Tourism,
DJ9T 34	Tour Guiding and Resort Representation
DK07 33	International Tourist Destinations
DK02 35	Planning and Sustainable Development in Tourism
DK03 34	Providing Information on the Scottish Tourism Product
DK0H 34	Visitor Attraction Operations
H297 34	Airline and Airport Operations

Graded Units

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

Fourteen centres (one international centre) were selected for qualification verification — three for NC units, eight 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.

Almost 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 candidates' prior achievements and development needs. These are identified during the application/induction process and during delivery, and relevant plans/timetables are implemented.

Evidence was available to confirm that candidates can self-refer or be referred by tutors/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. In addition, candidates can contact staff by email and/or via the VLE.

Feedback from assessors on performance ensures that candidates can review their progress and plan for assessment.

Almost all centres had 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.

Most centres selected for qualification verification applied internal assessment and verification procedures appropriately. The centres provided documented evidence in master folders and meeting notes.

In future, for verbal clarification on candidate assessment, the centre-devised Record of Professional Discussion Form must be used. In one centre the assessment and internal verification did not clearly reference/map the candidate evidence. Candidate assessment evidence that has been sampled should be recorded on the internal verification form.

For three centres the assessment decisions did not meet the outcomes/evidence requirements for the units. Internal verification did not identify that the candidate evidence was insufficient. For one centre re-assessment/remediation was not clearly identified by the assessor.

One centre did not record where candidates gave verbal clarification on their assessment the centre were advised to document candidate verbal responses.

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

Almost all centres demonstrated that they have effective selection and use of assessment methods/instruments. Pre-delivery checklists confirmed that assessments are valid, equitable and fair.

For one unit, one centre's assessments did not meet the evidence criteria. The centre was advised to amend its assessment instruments, marking solutions and/or checklists, and that these must be internally verified.

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

Almost 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 are aware of the procedures.

Assessment instruments included statements on the required assessment conditions, and this ensured candidates are aware of the assessment conditions. Candidates sign disclaimers to confirm assessments submitted are their own work.

One centre did not have an assessment procedure and plagiarism procedure/policy in place. The centre was advised that it must have a control mechanism to ensure that candidates submitting electronic evidence is 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's requirements. Marking checklists and feedback to candidates confirmed judgements were accurate and consistent.

One centre did not mark closed-book assessments in line with the SQA exemplar. They allowed candidates to remediate answers, when they should be completing new unseen questions. The internal verifier and assessor must fully understand the instrument of assessment and apply the marking scheme in line with the unit specification and SQA exemplar.

Two centres did not mark the graded unit projects in line with the minimum evidence requirements, remediation and grade criteria as stated in the unit specification and SQA guidance. The grades must reflect the level of support and guidance given.

One centre did not fully complete marking checklists and give candidates detailed feedback on their performance. This resulted in candidate completing new assessments when they could have remediated the first submission.

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.

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.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

♦ Quality policies and procedures, master folders and internal verification are all available electronically. These are securely stored. Only relevant staff have access to these materials.

♦ Centre-devised assessments that have been internal verified and prior verified by SQA.

♦ Devising new assessments that ensure that current industry practices are taken into consideration.

♦ Involvement of industry contacts in judging candidate assessment projects and associated prize-giving to the candidate who has produced the best one. This strengthens links with industry as well as reflecting industry standards in assessments.

♦ Inclusion of a research skills unit in the second-year programme to develop candidates' skills and support them when completing GU2.

♦ One candidate project, which was of an exceptional standard, was submitted to Craftex, an exhibition for student work, where it will have the opportunity to win a prize and gain industry recognition.

♦ The use of a coding system to mark Graded Unit 2 projects is good practice.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2018–19:

♦ Candidates received detailed verbal feedback from the assessor, but this is not documented. There should be a summary of feedback recorded.

♦ Where candidates are assessed using verbal presentations and an observation checklist is completed by the assessor, additional supporting evidence must be retained. This could be presentation notes/research notes or a video/audio recording of the student presentation.

♦ Internal verification reports must be fully completed, accurate and dated.

♦ Standardisation meetings, where the assessors and internal verifiers meet to agree assessment procedures and share good practice, should be documented.

♦ Centres should produce re-assessments for closed-book tests to enable candidates to be re-assessed using new unseen questions.

♦ Where candidates re-submit/remediate a section of their graded unit, the assessor must ensure that the mark reflects the grade criteria and level of guidance and support.

♦ Centres should be consistently using their internal documents to confirm that work is the candidate's own. Assessors should identify where candidates are presenting work copied from the internet and follow their centre's policies for malpractice.

♦ Evaluation stages for graded units, according to the assessment conditions, must be completed in class under exam conditions, where candidates word process their evaluations. They must use exam accounts to ensure the work is the candidate's own.

- For research projects, candidates must include primary data in their appendices and refer to the data in their report. Candidates must include a list of references as well as a bibliography.
- Candidates should be encouraged to provide specific recommendations based on the research undertaken.