

Principal Moderator/Examiner Feedback

Summer 2012

PL Hospitality Level 2

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2012

Publications Code DP032503

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Principal Learning in Hospitality Level 2 (Internally assessed units)

General Comments

In line with previous series, there is a continuing improvement in the structure of the assessments and evidence generated by candidates. Many centres have noted the feedback in previous examiners reports. The main weakness in assessment evidence submitted for moderation is the lack of comprehensive annotation to show where a learning outcome has been evidenced. Detailed annotation supports the candidate, centre and moderators in determining where the evidence satisfies the stated learning outcome.

In most of the evidence submitted for moderation, Candidate Record Sheets (CRS) were included for each candidate, with candidate ID numbers, and both candidate and assessor signatures all completed accurately. Some centres did not however provide full and accurately completed documentation; comprehensive documentation should be provided by all centres to ensure timely and efficient moderation.

Some centres did not include page numbers and the learning outcome evidence was not signposted which it made it difficult to locate. Well-structured and annotated evidence supports both centre marking and moderation and also external moderation.

Some centres are still not internally standardising evidence. This should be the norm for all centres. It has clear benefits in confirming that the marking is accurate and also checking that the assessment and evidence satisfy the requirement of the learning outcome. It is also a final check that the evidence is complete and ready for submitting for external moderation.

Again, in some centres, candidates are not being provided with sufficient opportunity to generate evidence for the higher mark bands. Care needs to be taken to ensure candidates are stretched and challenged to achieve at the higher mark bands and that the assessment activities support and encourage this. In some centres, no candidates achieved above pass criteria, which is of some concern.

The use of work sheets to provide evidence for the assessed outcome is still a concern. In some centres the worksheets and therefore assessment

evidence was identical, leading to some questions about the individuality and therefore authenticity of the evidence.

In some centres for units and individual outcomes, candidate text was almost identical. There are two possibilities for this. (1) Candidates are working in teams or pairs and generating common evidence. Team/paired work is good practice and acceptable providing that each candidate demonstrates that they have achieved the required outcome. (2) Text is being used directly from the web or other published resources; this should be referenced and there should be some commentary by the candidate as to how this meets the learning outcome.

Some centres chose to set integrated assignments. This is a sensible approach when there is an obvious linkage to the learning outcomes being assessed in different units. Teaching and assessing on a thematic basis can often provide candidates with a deeper understanding in the obvious inter-relationships that exist in a number of hospitality functions. Care needs to be taken however to ensure that the evidence explicitly meets the requirements of each learning outcome. The evidence provided needs to also be clearly annotated to show which Learning Outcome the assessment evidence meets.

Level 2 Unit 2: Customer Service in Hospitality

General Comments

Most centres paid particular attention to the administration associated with this unit, some centres failed to complete page referencing on the candidate learning records. In this series a continuing trend with centres failing to provide any evidence of internal moderation.

The majority of centres provided a copy of the assignment brief for all the candidates work and in some cases, good evidence of annotation were found; in some centres that provided no annotation which made moderation more difficult.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

This requires candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of customer service and wide range of marks was found.

Overall the level of work was generally improved on past submissions. Most candidates provided a clear outline or description of how the industry delivers customer service and work was found in the full range of mark bands.

Some candidates work did relate to completing, monitoring and measuring customer service rather than providing evidence that would demonstrate an understanding of how.

Some centres provided excellent opportunities for candidates, using educational visits as a way of providing evidence from findings relating to customer service.

For the most part whole marking by the centres was accurate and agreed by the moderator, although there were instances of generous and harsh marking as well.

Learning Outcome 2 (LO2)

Candidates are required to provide an understanding of customer's legal rights and some centres provided work of a good standard.

Performance for this Learning Outcome varied from centre to centre. Some candidates provided a very brief outline where others provided a

detailed understanding of legal rights. Work was marked and moderated in all three mark bands.

This Learning Outcome well taught and well assessed, with candidates providing either a report or a booklet stating customer legal rights. Where laws have been explained rather than merely stated by candidates this demonstrated improved understanding and better marks were achieved.

Learning Outcome 3 (LO3)

This learning outcome required candidates to plan the performance of customer service tasks to a required standard; as part of this candidates are required to set times for the work tasks.

Most of the work was well documented with some candidates providing timesheets for tasks on a daily/weekly basis; most work was found to be in either mark band two or three, a wide range of evidence provided by candidates also providing a wide range of standards and realistic timescales. Once again in some circumstances a lack of timescales did restrict marks.

Evidence for this outcome was variable between centres with some clearly missing large aspects of this learning outcome, particularly the setting of timings linked to the task.

Learning Outcome 5 (LO5)

This learning outcome required the candidates to review their own performance. Most of the work moderated was either in Mark Band 2 or 3 with most candidates providing a good description of performance against standards.

Some candidates provided a detailed evaluation from practical sessions, responses in most cases highlighted obvious strengths and weaknesses; however in some cases evidence of this was found to be weak and marks were limited to Mark Band 1.

Additional evidenced could also be gathered through one to one sessions, witnessed statements or video evidence.

Level 2 Unit 203: Work in a Hospitality Team

General comments

This unit provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate that they understand what knowledge and skills are required to work in a hospitality team.

Through taking part in practical tasks, candidates should be able to demonstrate that they are both an effective participant and team leader. Candidates need to be able to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations as to how to improve their performance.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

For this learning outcome candidates had to explain the main characteristics of effective teams. A wide range of responses were found from Mark Band 1 to Mark Band 3.

In some instances the explaining of *why* teamwork and team interaction is important was not covered sufficiently in the samples provided; candidates should have focused on how teams in the hospitality business work together e.g. housekeeping/accommodation and restaurant/kitchen/room service, etc. to achieve a main goal.

Learning Outcome 2 (LO2)

Candidates are required to provide evidence of planning to enable them to carry out a hospitality task. Most candidates produced a detailed timescales; however some candidates' evidence did not sufficiently include realistic timescales. Some candidates failed to provide clear standards. Where centres provided candidates with a pro-forma, this tended to result in a better presentation of the required standards.

Learning Outcome 4 (LO4)

Candidates were required to review their performance for the hospitality task. Responses for this learning outcome were limited and moderation found very little evidence relating to the handling of conflict/diverse views, suggestions for improvement were also often limited.

Responses for this learning outcome from many candidates was mostly in mark band one or Mark Band 2. Many descriptions of performances were brief.

Level 2 Unit 4: Dealing with Costs and Income in Hospitality

General Comments

The unit is assessed by an assignment based on candidates using financial techniques to work out the break-even point and profitability of a hospitality activity and to analyse the financial position of a hospitality business.

Many centres/candidates again elected to use a practical scenario which costed a hospitality event. This resulted in some good evidence; however this was dependent on the focus of the activity. Some centres tend and candidates have a tendency to become overly focussed on the practical activity as opposed to the learning and evidence of the financial techniques.

Some centres presented evidence that only required candidates to comment on the financial information. Through the teaching of the unit candidates are expected to practice the construction of both a trading and profit and loss account and cash flow statement. Although the assessment evidence only asks for a commentary, in centres where candidates had obviously practiced and completed the completion of the financial documents, this resulted in deeper understanding and a more informed commentary.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

This learning outcome requires candidates to identify different types of cost. Most candidates did this well, listing types of fixed and variable cost. The evidence may be strengthened by a simple definition of fixed and variable cost, and why each cost is fixed or variable rather than just providing a simple list. As in previous series, some candidates confused fixed and variable costs; evidence was sometimes not corrected when it was incorrect. This was especially evident when candidates attempted to classify semi-variable costs as either fixed or variable costs. In some centres, especially those where work sheets were used, candidates answers were identical, leading to the assumption that worksheets were completed in class. This approach does not sufficiently allow candidates to demonstrate and evidence they have understood the learning outcome.

As in previous series, the focus on cost control was the least well answered in LO1. Candidates need to be able to understand how

businesses control cost. A basic understanding of the purchasing cycle is essential for this learning outcome. A simple diagram of the purchasing annotated with cost controls may support evidence for this. When candidates provide information, it needs to be much further developed to access the M and D grades.

Learning Outcome 2 (LO2)

On the whole, the evidence for this learning outcome was good and candidates demonstrated clear understanding of the financial techniques.

The evidence for calculating the selling price was good, although some centres overcomplicated the concept by using too many products and/or services. The emphasis needs to be on understanding the principles and performing accurate calculations.

Learning Outcome 3 (LO3)

The majority of centres provided good evidence for this learning outcome. As in previous series, some centres still need to support candidates to generate a realistic trading and profit and loss statement based on the practical activity undertaken. Again, in centres where candidates actually completed a trading profit and loss account, there appeared to be greater understanding of what the information said about the performance of the business.

Learning Outcome 4 (LO4)

The evidence for this learning outcome was again mixed. Some candidates provided good evidence which demonstrated an understanding of cash flow forecasts and balance sheets. This again tended to depend on whether or not learners had completed numerical activities on the balance sheet and cash flow statement.

The balance sheet needs to be simple with obvious issues relating to assets and liabilities that allow the candidates to assess the financial performance of a hospitality business. It is the concept that the candidate needs to understand, rather than complex business situations.

Other Points

It is worthy of note that many centres noted comments relating to the delivery and assessment of this unit from the June 2011 and January 2012 series. These centres focused on simplicity with a few activities or calculations to ensure candidates understood the concept being learnt. This meant that assessment evidence better met the requirements of the assessment evidence grid.

Level 2 Unit 5: Providing Hospitality Services

General Comments

The majority of assessments for this unit were well structured and provided a good opportunity for candidates to present evidence of their learning. Some centres are still overly using worksheets, a significant number of these appear to be completed in taught sessions, which are then submitted as summative evidence. This does not sufficiently demonstrate evidence of candidate learning and understanding and often prevents more able candidates from achieving the higher mark bands.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

This learning outcome required candidates to identify the different service methods offered by UK hospitality businesses. The majority of candidates provided a good description of food service methods with relevant examples. Some centres/candidates made good references to local outlets; this provided much better context to the evidence and good knowledge of the local hospitality industry. Some candidates provided very limited service methods which does not sufficiently represent the diversity of the UK hospitality industry.

The description of sensible drinking as in previous series was not well detailed by a number of candidates. There is a specific evidence requirement that requires candidates to know and explain safe drinking levels and responsible retailing. Where sensible drinking was covered, in many situations the explanation of responsible retailing was poorly covered.

For some centres, the evidence could have been improved by the use of references for the information sources used, and perhaps the use of some published material.

Learning Outcome 2 (LO2)

All candidates provided information relating to the purpose of accommodation services. Some provided more detailed descriptions which moved their work into the higher mark bands. For some centres and candidates, the evidence was far too brief and did not sufficiently represent professional accommodation services.

The better candidates provided simple organisation charts for accommodation services in different types of outlets with well detailed job roles. A number of candidates failed to provide any information on the purpose of accommodation services.

Learning Outcome 3 (LO3)

On the whole, most candidates detailed a satisfactory list of tasks. However, In line with previous series many candidates did not set realistic timescales for completing tasks which did not allow candidates to achieve higher mark band scores.

Learning Outcome 6 (LO6)

The majority of candidates provided some good descriptions on performance including suggestions for improvement. Some provided a brief description on performance limiting them to Mark Band 1. In the majority of cases, identification of strengths and weaknesses could have been much more evaluative as opposed to descriptive.

Level 2 Unit 6: Menu Planning and Design

General Comments

This unit requires candidates to plan and design a healthy menu to meet specified customer requirements, which include special diets and cultural trends. Most centres designed engaging and appropriate assessments which met the requirements of the specification; however some candidates only worked to fulfil the requirements of the marking grid.

The unit was generally well answered with candidates achieving good marks.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

Some candidates provided very good evidence and in depth information covering all characteristics of styles or food across the different cultures clearly showing what is available in their local area.

Some candidates did not include beverages served by UK hospitality businesses; some candidates listed different cultures (e.g. Greek, Indian, and Chinese) but did not include characteristics of the style of food.

A number of candidates submitted many pages of evidence that clearly showed that a lot research had taken place.

Learning Outcome 2 (LO2)

There were some examples of good evidence clearly linked to practical work carried out by candidates, or references made to industry kitchens that had been visited; comparisons were also made to kitchens that candidates were familiar with.

There were limited examples of staffing with a few candidates using a staffing structure from a book, the internet or worksheet without explanation. Some candidates used an example from a kitchen they had visited or were familiar with which showed understanding, with good detail around staffing roles.

The information on kitchen equipment was often lacking in detail and understanding with only pictures from the internet being submitted.

Learning Outcome 3 (LO3)

Most candidates answered this learning outcome well with good examples being provided.

LO 3.1

This was generally well answered, with good evidence of cost calculations, Some candidates only totalled all the food costs required for their chosen menu and did not show how much each dish would cost. A few candidate examples did not relate to the dishes on their chosen planned menu but they showed understanding of the process. Some centres had used standard pre-printed costing sheets that helped candidates submit their evidence.

LO 3.2

A wide range of marks awarded across all three Mark Bands. Some candidates did not show an understanding of complex dishes and more exotic ingredients, with dishes being very average. There was little evidence of portion size and local produce, whilst many did not consider different dietary requirements or meal occasions.

Some candidates did provide information and names of local suppliers for specified produced that showed a good understanding. There was some good practice shown by centres and candidates by producing a menu for three course and with three choices of dishes (unit specifies two courses and three dishes for each course) but it make for a more realistic menu and shows evidence of the candidate being stretched. Most menus were set out in a professional style as would be expected in a restaurant. However some candidates only submitted ingredients for dishes.

LO 3.3

A wide range of marks allocated across all three Mark Bands, as some evidence showed a lack of understanding with some candidates failing to recommend soft drinks whilst other evidence omitted alcoholic beverages. Best practice was where candidates had produced a drinks menu showing all types of beverages with clear explanations and price, as if being presented to a customer. This clearly showed understanding.

Learning Outcome 4 (LO4)

Most candidates achieved good marks, and there was some very detailed evidence, with most focusing their comparisons on dietary requirements, however there was little or no reference to occasion or the meal. Some candidates had reviewed their own menu and one from another classmate. This limited their comments as these only included 2 courses. Best practice was where candidates reviewed different menus from local restaurants, and did not just use menus that other candidates had produced, as these were very limited.

Other Points

Some centres have effectively used the evidence from Unit 6 and integrated it into Unit 7, this has allowed the candidates to take their menus and produce the dishes in a practical session, and this shows if their planning in Unit 6 is achievable and realistic.

If using information from the internet or books the candidates should reference the source, the use of referencing Wikipedia or Google should be discouraged.

As in the previous moderation series, a few centres submitted work sheets, word searches and tutor hand-outs as evidence, these should be used to support class teaching and not used as original candidate evidence as marks could not be allocated.

Level 2 Unit 7: Food preparation and Cooking

General Comments

Candidates are required to prepare and cook a two course composite and healthy meal to meet customer requirements of four people, taking into consideration dietary requirements or meal occasion. A review of the candidate performance was also required, either written or verbal and for candidates to be able to make recommendations for future performance improvement.

Assignment briefs were generally clear and written in language appropriate to candidates. Many assignments followed on from Unit 6 and this clearly showed understanding of the whole process from planning to preparation and evaluation or own performance.

There was good photographic evidence from many candidates, this helped to show how the criteria had been met, however some work was not clearly laid out and was difficult to follow, with page numbers not shown on the candidate record sheet or the candidate evidence. Some centres did not annotate the candidate work to indicate where the learning outcomes had been met. Some centres used witness testimonies and this provided very good feedback to the candidates and also supported the evidence submitted.

Learning Outcome 1 (LO1)

Many candidates did not mention legislation around the food safety hazards. Some centres had used work sheets as evidence and this meant that the evidence provided was limited and repetitive. Some candidates submitted very detailed evidence by way of Power Point presentations with many candidates achieving marks in Mark Band 3.

Learning Outcome 4 (LO4)

LO 4.1

A wide range of marks were given for this learning outcome. Some candidates did not submit menus or recipes or photographic evidence of prepared food. This made it difficult to award marks as the evidence wasn't there. Much of the work lacked detail regarding skills and equipment used to prepare their chosen dishes. Some candidates provided good evidence of meeting safety and hygiene requirements but not all.

Some candidates had used a template to help with providing evidence for meeting safety and hygiene requirements and this worked well. Many candidates found it difficult to provide evidence based on feedback given and how improvements could be made.

LO 4.2

This learning outcome lacked detail and standard grids provided limited the amount of feedback candidates could provide as evidence. There were some detailed suggestions as to how performance could be improved, however this evidence also lacked detail and understanding when describing the quality of the dishes produced. Some candidates appeared to struggle with trying to review their performance based on feedback given; witness statements when provided supported marking decisions.

Learning Outcome 3 (LO3)

There was good evidence of candidates showing a range of appropriate preparation and cooking methods, and the use of healthy and nutritious ingredients. Some evidence lacked detail of decoration and/or garnishes and very few candidates mentioned portion sizes or made any reference to profit. Photographic evidence, when provided, supported the marks awarded.

Other Points

Marking was varied and in some cases rather generous. Where internal moderation had taken place the marking was a better fit to the Mark Band.

It may also be helpful for tutors to look again at the Level 2 descriptors and how these apply to the Mark Bands.

Further guidance and support

Centres are reminded that a range of tutor materials, including example schemes of work and assignment briefs, are available to support this qualification. A range of training opportunities are also available to support centre assessors. Further details can be found at Edexcel Online: www.edexcel.com/resources/training

Edexcel provide an 'Ask the Expert' service to provide timely responses to centre queries regarding the delivery and assessment of this qualification. The service can be accessed via Edexcel Online: www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/ask-expert

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code DP032503

Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

