



**National Qualifications**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022–23**

**Skills for Work: Travel and Tourism**

**Verification group number: 600**

## Skills for Work Courses

Both the National 4 and National 5 Skills for Work: Travel and Tourism courses consist of four mandatory units.

### National 4 Skills for Work: Travel and Tourism

Group award code: C776 74 (24 SCQF credit points)

H2Y1 74	Travel and Tourism: Employability
H2Y2 74	Travel and Tourism: Customer Service
H2Y3 74	Travel and Tourism: UK and Worldwide
H2Y4 74	Travel and Tourism: Scotland

### National 5 Skills for Work: Travel and Tourism

Group award code: C776 75 (24 SCQF credit points)

H2Y1 75	Travel and Tourism: Employability
H2Y2 75	Travel and Tourism: Customer Service
H2Y3 75	Travel and Tourism: UK and Worldwide
H2Y4 75	Travel and Tourism: Scotland

## General comments

Over the last two years centres have faced significant challenges in the delivery and assessment of these qualifications. However, centres have diligently safeguarded the learning experience by maintaining a positive and motivated attitude to candidate achievement. The qualification verification (QV) for session 2022–23 was undertaken as visiting verification. The external verification (EV) team reported that visiting verification was welcomed by centres after a period of remote verification due to the pandemic. The opportunity to discuss concerns and challenges was particularly appreciated.

The QV process is supportive in nature; and conducting the practice through on-site visits gives more opportunity to effectively collaborate using face-to-face professional discussion. Furthermore, visiting activity facilitates and provides opportunities to better explore good practice which may be shared across the sector. It was felt that undertaking the QV process remotely did not provide the best opportunity for meaningful collaboration between the external verifier and the centre.

Verifiers reported that centres had a good understanding of the requirements of the qualifications, however some external verifiers did report that not all centres were aware that they were still able to use the alternative assessment guidance in session 2022–23.

## **Candidate evidence presented**

During this visiting QV activity, 64% of the assessment evidence provided was that of National 5 level only, indicating that these centres were only presenting candidates at this level. A mix of both National 4 and National 5 levels accounted for 29% of the evidence, while 7% of centres presented evidence only for the National 4 qualification.

## **Course arrangements, unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials**

The external verifier team reported that on the whole assessors and internal verifiers were confidently able to discuss course arrangements, unit specifications and their use of instruments of assessment. This demonstrates a sound knowledge and understanding of the courses and units being delivered. Nonetheless, the verification team also reported that not all assessors were aware that they could still use the alternative assessment guidance in session 2023–24. This was impacted by the flow of information within centres.

Moving forward, the external verifier team will remain pre-emptive in ensuring that centres are aware that the unit specification sets the national standard for assessment. It was highlighted that a few centres that were visited are still referring to older specifications and assessment materials dating prior to 2017.

All centres are required to revise materials and assessments to ensure that they reflect the current qualification requirements. This activity could be intertwined with the internal verification process prior to course delivery.

## **Evidence requirements**

Evidence requirements were being adhered to by most centres in session 2022–23. External verifiers found evidence of observation, candidate practice, teamworking, peer evaluation, etc. These approaches to assessment are valid and the assessment judgements were found to be reliable, consistent, and in line with the evidence requirements of the units.

Centres acknowledged the need for a greater interaction with industry providers to assist candidates in developing their vocational and employability skills whilst broadening their understanding of the travel and tourism industry. A move towards centres rekindling business relationships after the pandemic was widely seen and discussed.

## **Administration of assessments**

External verifiers constructively reported on assessment practices with centre evidence exemplifying that assessments were appropriate and judgements of

candidate performance were accurate. Additionally, it was noted that candidates had fair access to assessment in all centres.

Centres that combined both level 4 and level 5 award delivery and assessment found this worked well and indicated it did not significantly increase their workload as planning for this integrated approach was well established.

The mirrored approach to assessment within both qualifications gives opportunity to integrate both levels successfully without having to prepare classes separately.

## **Learning and teaching**

Overall, the learning, teaching and assessment process was seen to be engaging and candidate focused. Centres are providing the opportunity for personalisation and choice which supports equality and inclusion. External verifiers identified that centres continue to work hard to provide a high standard of teaching and learning and the best experience possible. Most are providing a broad range of opportunities for their candidates with learning that is not only focused on the unit requirements, but also providing expansive knowledge across the travel and tourism sector.

In a few instances, timetabling and rooming appeared to be a challenge. Due to the practical and research nature of these qualifications, learning and teaching can be demanding in terms of time and technical resource. It was highlighted that for a few centres the challenges of timetable and computing constraints were providing some stress to the teacher and/or assessor.

Centres recognised that more involvement with industry would enhance attainment of the skills, abilities and attributes sought by employers.

## **Overall assessment**

External verifiers reported that centres produced assessment evidence that was of a good standard with most using the revised assessment guidance provided by SQA.

There was evidence of effective/accurate marking and assessment judgements taking place. Most centres were giving constructive and supportive feedback to candidates on their assessments. However, there were a few cases where verifiers had commented that more informative comments could have been made to allow candidates to fully understand the remediation requirements being asked of them.

Additionally, there were a few cases where feedback could not be established either via assessment checklists or on assessment submissions. It is acknowledged that feedback takes many forms and may be completed verbally with a candidate. However, it is recommended that where any feedback and/or remediation takes place, a record is kept for improvement to be tracked.

Overall, verifiers reported that candidates had demonstrated good levels of performance and in some cases, a remarkably high standard of accomplishment was reported.

## **Verification**

Centres provided their internal verification policies and procedure documents. The evidence presented by each centre confirmed these were applied effectively and met the requirements of SQA.

Policies followed a three-stage process, including pre-delivery, interim and post-delivery. Centres provided their internal verification policy and completed verification documentation including sample plan, record of meetings and verification feedback. Most had 'pro forma' verification paperwork that was completed for the units sampled.

## **Areas of good practice reported in 2022–23**

### **Centre policies, procedures and quality assurance**

- Evidence of internal verification being carried out between centres. This mutual agreement supports and strengthens the standardisation process and is a model that is being used more regularly across centres.
- Evidence of centres referring to the previous year's verification summary report and highlighting some key actions for implementation. For example, one centre referred to giving candidates better and more constructive comments/feedback.

### **Learning and teaching**

- Centre-devised prompts and resources to support candidates of differing needs and abilities.
- Using a varied, engaging, and exciting range of learning and teaching approaches which enhance personal choice.
- A centre devised a document to detail reflections based on their own personal experience of teaching. Recommendations were made for changes to delivery for the year ahead.
- Developing strong links with other schools in the local area to share practice.
- Candidate responses to 'trends' has strengthened with these being accurate and up to date. Professional sector reports are being used effectively by centres.
- Helpful links with local tourism providers which combines well with DYW to enhance teaching and learning.
- Creative work-based scenario of a simulated airline safety briefing. This involved the candidates researching briefings from various airlines, writing a script, crafting the equipment, and carrying out the briefing.

## **Assessing and assessment materials**

- Effective use of assessment grids which give a clear and well documented overview of assessment judgements.
- Making use of different educational practices to provide a variety of assessment approaches for differing abilities.
- Effective, supportive, and constructive feedback on candidate assessment records.
- Excellent use of the formal checklists to give detailed evidence for role plays.
- Assessor feedback was tailored to the candidate, for example: 'Has a good product knowledge and demonstrated this by ...'; 'Used their own initiative by ...'; 'Is a good team player because ...'
- Effective use of MS Teams which organised assessment materials month by month for the candidates.
- Voice recordings of role plays demonstrated how candidates improved in confidence as time went on.
- Collaboration with local DYW network and local businesses to arrange and conduct mock interviews with the candidates.

## **Internal verification**

- Detailed notes by the internal verifier clearly demonstrated how assessment judgements had been made.
- Keeping records of regular meetings between assessor and internal verifier.
- Exceptional feedback given to assessors by internal verifiers, including good practice and any suggested actions.
- Formalised reporting completed to a high standard with exceptional detail.

## **Specific areas for improvement reported in 2022–23**

### **Centre policies, procedures and quality assurance**

- Where required, centres should formalise a robust internal verification procedure/policy and evidence implementation. Referring to SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit will assist.
- Expectations of delivering a full National 5 award in three periods per week is unrealistic. Couple this with attendance issues and candidates not meeting deadlines or acting upon feedback, makes it necessary to re-assess the delivery model.

## **Learning and teaching**

- Ensure that all resources, references and workbooks are up to date and cleared of any outdated content.
- Ensure that cut-and-paste is kept to a minimum and only used where details cannot be changed into own words, for example: opening times, addresses. Candidates are required to make the work their own, for example: descriptions of attractions should be in their own words.

## **Assessing and assessment materials**

- Checklists, evidence, and teaching materials should reflect the current performance criteria requirements within the subject specification. There were updates made several years ago that some centres have still to implement. For example, a shift away from numbering (1.1) to lettering (1(a)).
- Where they are not doing so, centres should make use of current assessment materials provided by SQA. If required these can be adapted to suit the needs of learners. However, if there are complete changes to SQA assessment being made, it would be advantageous to have these prior verified by SQA.
- Where centres are sharing assessments that are from other centres, it is advisable to have these prior verified or internally verified before use to ensure that they are fit for purpose. Some centres were seen to be using shared materials and taking it on face value that they were prior verified — which in most instances was not the case.

## **Internal verification**

- Evidence should be available to show documentation of internal verification policies, decisions, meetings, and any comments or actions to assessors.
- The SQA toolkit describes the internal verification activities at each stage in a 3-step process (pre-delivery, delivery and post-delivery). Referring to this would assist in giving a structured approach to the internal verification process where required.

## **Specific areas for improvement (by unit)**

See below some specific examples of advice given to centres on a unit-by-unit basis.

### **Employability**

- Where candidates select their job role of personal interest, they should be reviewing their skills for this post. Some were seen to be reviewing skills for a different post.
- If candidates review their skills as being excellent at everything, it will make creating action points more difficult for them to present.
- Scottish qualifications should be referred to, not GCSEs or A Levels.

- School attendance and participation in class activities should be avoided (where possible) as a basis for assessment decisions.
- Candidates should be mindful of their job choices, making sure that they are linked to the travel and tourism sector — for example ‘diver’ was not linked strongly enough to cover the required criteria.
- Candidates should not provide the same jobs; this indicates that they were directed towards these jobs, and this does not allow for personal choice and reflection.

## **Geography units**

- Itineraries do not have to be as detailed and specific as: ‘get up’ [time], ‘have breakfast’ [time/where] and ‘go to sleep’ [time]. Completing these as am or pm would suffice.
- Limit the use of cut-and-paste by the candidates. Their own words and sentences are preferred to lifting directly from websites.
- Give more detailed and accurate descriptions of chosen destinations.
- Candidates would benefit from a more personal approach towards choosing destinations. This would then reflect on a wider variety of destination choices being seen.
- A broad range of continents and countries should be used/researched to avoid similar choices/answers from all candidates.
- Costings should be accurate and checked. Candidates were seen to be calculating costs for 7 nights where there was a requirement for 14 nights.
- If costs are in the destination currency, these should be converted to GBP using a currency exchange website for example, Xe currency converter. Evidence should be provided to show this has been undertaken (a screenshot or printout).