

Examiners' Report / Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2010

Principal Learning

Hospitality Level 3 Controlled Assessments

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our Diploma Line on 0844 576 0028, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Summer 2010

Publications Code DP024173

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Contents

1	Level 3 Introduction	4
2	Level 3 Unit 2 Report	5
3	Level 3 Unit 3 Report	7
4	Level 3 Unit 4 Report	9
5	Level 3 Unit 6 Report	11
6	Statistics	14

Level 3 - Introduction

This was the first series of the external moderation for Hospitality taken in Phase 2 of the Diploma. As a result there were only a very small number of centres who submitted candidate work for moderation.

The samples of work submitted for moderation were generally well organised and well presented. As a result the evidence from candidates against the targeted Learning Outcomes (LOs) was relatively easy to locate.

Centres are encouraged to note and action the recommendations suggested at the end of each unit.

Level 3 Unit 2 - Law and Procedures in the Hospitality Industry

General Comments

Centres generally followed the Edexcel "Guidance for assessment" provided in the specifications when writing assignments for this unit. The assignment briefs were well-structured with logical progression through the tasks, and effective coverage of the targeted Learning Outcomes (LOs). The scenarios used were appropriate and provided a useful vocational context for the learners. Assessors generally provided useful and supportive written feedback with some assessors also providing supplementary annotation on the learner work.

The quality of learner work was varied. Some learners clearly found this unit useful and interesting, and this was reflected in the standard of work submitted. Other learners were content to achieve at the lower mark band level. There was also evidence that some assessors were cautious to award marks at the higher mark band level. Hopefully as assessors become more familiar and confident in the content and application of this unit there will be a greater spread of marks awarded across the levels.

Learning Outcome 1

Learners generally provided detailed descriptions of the main legislation and procedures included in LO1. Most key areas of legislation were covered with learners including the correct dates of the most up-to-date legislation. It was evident that different techniques were used for assessing this LO. Booklets were produced by some learners, while others made presentations that included Q&A sessions. It was pleasing to note that centres ensured that learners included issues of non-compliance in their work. The types of non-compliance and the penalties incurred were covered by most learners. Learners also applied their knowledge of legislation to the broad range of units that comprise the hospitality industry, without providing a too specific focus on hotels only.

Learning Outcome 2

This was a more problematic LO, but nevertheless LO2 helped to discriminate effectively between the more-able and less-able candidates. Some learners undertook a review of food safety hazards in local hospitality outlets. Learners then observed working practices and the food safety hazards in these outlets. Other learners carried out this task within their own school/college kitchen and restaurant facilities when they were working in a supervisory role. The quality of the reviews varied considerably. Less-able candidates provided a simplistic review with limited explanation as to how these hazards could be reduced or eliminated. However more-able learners provided very detailed reviews, often presented in a professional format. These learners also provided very detailed explanations as to how these hazards could be eliminated effectively. It was evident again that some centres used presentations and discussion groups as an effective assessment mechanism for learners to share their findings with colleagues.

Learning Outcome 3

This LO was well attempted by most learners, - indeed the content of this LO seemed to be very familiar to them. Most centres encouraged learners to carry-out risk assessments within two different areas which often included the F&B facilities within their own school/college. Less-able learners identified minor problems and risks often missing/ignoring bigger, more relevant issues. Nevertheless these learners did recommend suitable actions to deal with the risks that they identified. More-able learners provided very detailed risk assessment reports. These reports were often presented in a highly professional format with clear structure and layout. More-able learners also provided very detailed recommendations and suggested

actions as to how the identified risks could be eliminated. Again some centres benefited their learners by encouraging them to present their risk assessment findings to their colleagues.

Assessors generally provided useful written feedback against this LO, clearly explaining how learners could improve the quality of their risk assessment reports.

Recommendations for centres

- Use as many different hospitality functional areas as possible so that learners understand common legal/health and safety issues across the industry.
- Ensure that candidates are able to understand, and distinguish between, the use of key words in the mark bands i.e. identify, describe, evaluate and analyse.
- Use presentations/discussion groups to enhance the awarding of marks in the higher mark bands
- Use and explain mark schemes to learners so that they can identify where allocations of marks are awarded.
- Ensure that feedback is linked to the awarding of marks within the three mark bands.
- Attend appropriate Edexcel training events that focus on planning and preparation for Diploma assessment.

Level 3 Unit 3 - Customer Service Standards in the Hospitality Industry

General Comments

Generally centres chose to use the suggested Edexcel assessment material where candidates were asked to produce three separate pieces of work. The first one involved the presentation or report about the delivery, monitoring and measuring of customer service standards at two different hospitality businesses, following an investigation. The second was the production of a customer care policy which could be implemented during the performance of customer service tasks. The third was an evaluation of their performance delivering customer service where all centres used a restaurant service at their training restaurant as the opportunity for the candidate to evidence their performance.

Learning Outcome 1

Some candidates seemed to struggle to find two hospitality businesses that were willing to share their customer service standards and procedures. It may have been more appropriate for centres to have organised group visits to facilitate this. Some candidates seemed to get 'bogged-down' producing a commentary on being mystery customers and lost the focus of meeting the marking criteria. Most candidates did not provide evidence on how to *improve* customer service provision from customer feedback although most did provide evidence on how feedback was gathered. Also, most candidates only stated what good and poor service was rather than its likely effects, as was required.

Some candidates produced a PowerPoint presentation but it is difficult to ascertain from the PowerPoint's produced by the candidates whether they had actually 'stated', 'outlined' or 'described' how businesses deliver customer service excellence. The tangible evidence was largely a 'state' but the actual presentation could have been a 'describe', therefore observer feedback/a witness testimony would also be required to justify whether this was the case.

Some assessor feedback was irrelevant to the achievement or non-achievement of the learning outcome, e.g. "good/clear information on products and services on offer in each establishment" which did not relate to any possible marks. This appeared to mislead some candidates who had put a lot of effort in to producing evidence on products and services within hospitality businesses when this gained them no marks. With some candidates effort was then lacking regards to what was important for the gaining of marks i.e. describing the customer service provided at those hospitality businesses.

Learning Outcome 2

The presentation of the required Customer Care Policy by some candidates tended to resemble a 'Standards of Performance' document which had too much irrelevant detail. Most candidates did not mention dealing with customer complaints at the time in their policies, only retrospectively; nor did they mention the industry standard of carrying out 'satisfaction' checks during a food service operation.

Learning Outcome 4

Some assessors did not seem familiar enough with the level 3 descriptors within the unit specification to aid the awarding of marks within the appropriate mark band e.g. some candidate work was awarded marks in mark band 3 when it was not a 'thorough' evaluation. Within this evaluation many candidates were very general with their comments and did not relate specifically to standards of customer care, which was what would gain them the marks. Also many candidates made general evaluations about a customer service situation i.e. a restaurant service but failed to focus on their own performance in that situation in any detail. The strengths, weaknesses and suggestions many candidates made were only obvious ones e.g. need to improve my confidence, or they failed to make any suggestions to improve their performance.

Using training restaurants seemed to work well for producing the required evidence, but for some candidates this seemed to have taken place very early on in their course eg the October following commencement of the course in September. If the assessment of performance was left until the end of the academic year it would give candidates time to gain in confidence and experience.

Recommendations for centres

- Ensure that candidates are able to understand, and distinguish between, the use of key words in the mark bands i.e. identify, describe, evaluate and analyse.
- Ensure that candidates are not misled in providing evidence that will not gain them marks
- Use observation reports/witness statements to enhance the awarding of marks in the higher mark bands
- Use mark schemes with candidates to identify where allocation of marks are awarded.
- Ensure that candidates have access to information they need for their assessments e.g. customer service policies
- Ensure that feedback is linked to the awarding of marks within the three mark bands.
- Carry out the practical assessments towards the end of the academic year
- Attend appropriate Edexcel training events that focus on planning and preparation for Diploma assessment.

Level 3 Unit 4 - Building and Developing Effective Hospitality Teams

General Comments

Generally centres chose to use the suggested Edexcel assessment material and all centres used their Realistic Working Environments (RWEs) to create the opportunities candidates needed to produce much of the required evidence. The candidates were asked to perform a team leader role and a team player role in a practical working environment and most of the tasks set were drawn from this practical activity.

The activities the candidates participated in were appropriate other than the timing, which was not really suitable for first year learners, particularly for those learners who undertook the activity as a team leader in the first two terms. Learners need time to develop their confidence and skills through the experience of working in the RWE.

Learning Outcome 1

Some candidates failed to complete the first bullet point from LO1 i.e. state/outline/describe the different roles and responsibilities of a hospitality team as they related their response to purely their working environment when it should have been tackled generically.

Learning Outcome 2

Most descriptions of how a team leader can contribute to the success of a team lacked any detail and few candidates gained marks in the mark bands 2 and 3.

Learning Outcome 3

Most descriptions of conflict and the causes of conflict lacked any detail and some candidates merely reported the handling of an incident rather than generically describing 'conflict' with examples.

Learning Outcome 4

Most standards identified were simple; this could be probably due to the limited experience of the candidates undertaking this task.

Learning Outcome 6

Within the evaluation many candidates were very general with their comments and did not relate specifically to reviewing their own performance. Centres did not back up the evidence claimed by the candidates in their reviews with observation report or witness testimonies which would have been very beneficial particularly when awarding marks in the higher mark bands.

Using training restaurants seemed to work well for producing the required evidence, but for some candidates this seemed to have taken place very early on in their course eg in the Autumn term/at Christmas. If the assessment of performance was left until the end of the academic year it would give candidates time to gain in confidence and experience.

Recommendations for centres:

- Ensure that candidates are able to understand, and distinguish between, the use of key words in the mark bands ie briefly, in detail and thoroughly.
- Use observation reports/witness statements to produce additional evidence for the awarding of marks particularly with reference to mark bands 2 and 3.
- Use mark schemes with candidates to identify where allocation of marks are awarded.
- Ensure that feedback is linked to the awarding of marks within the three mark bands.

- Carry out the practical assessments towards the end of the academic year.
- Attend appropriate Edexcel training events that focus on planning and preparation for Diploma assessment.

Level 3 Unit 6 - Finance and Budgetary Control in the Hospitality Industry

General comments

This unit gives learners the opportunity to discover the use of finance and budgetary control within the hospitality industry. Learners are required to understand costing, pricing and the use of break even analysis. Embedded throughout the learner evidence should be an interpretation of financial information to move between the Mark Bands. The learners should be able to know how hospitality businesses use budgets within their day to day operations and understand how controlling and accounting methods for resources are used within hospitality establishments. The learners should also understand how financial information is used to assess and measure business performance within hospitality. The unit requests that the learners should visit one or more employer.

Assessment coursework guidelines state that learners are required to submit a variety of written evidence that supports the unit content and Learning Outcomes. The documents to be submitted for evidence must include costing and pricing information, a break even analysis, financial statements, interpretation of business performance, examples of budgets, controlling and accounting, and business performance measures. In addition to the written evidence centres may also choose to submit verbal evidence where applicable. Unit specifications state that learner evidence must be legible and preferably word processed. Learners should practice using given examples of financial information to support their understanding including information from at least one hospitality business.

There is a Mark Grid B for this unit; however the moderated work did not concentrate on this element of the specification.

The given scenario used for evidence within the centre was a café. This allowed the candidates to carry out simple calculations and meet the lower mark band. There was some confusion created by the content of the task sheets. It did appear that the task sheets mislead the majority of the learners by asking for evidence that was not required or relevant to the unit specification, i.e. a purchasing cycle. Learners merely listed a purchasing cycle with some expanding upon this to provide a descriptive account of resources used within finance and control. The tasks sheets given did not allow the learners to give a full explanation of the sector specific elements of evidence in relation to income fixed, variable costs and VAT.

Edexcel tasks were not submitted for evidence as the centre used their own examples. The examples the centre used allowed the lower level of learners to carry out a simple calculation task in relation to given products from a menu. However, for Mark Band 2 and 3 there was some lack of mapping the performance criteria to the range statements. This did mislead the learner into submitting evidence that in some cases was not required and omitting evidence that in most cases was requested by the unit, i.e. a break even chart. There was no evidence throughout learner files to support a break even analysis in the form of a chart. There is good use of figures and calculations but some descriptive evidence lacking in detail and analysis to support centre marks.

The tasks that were used within the centre did allow for a range of learners to move between the Mark Bands. If learners moved from Mark Band 1 to Mark Band 2 this highlighted throughout the candidate's work and made tracking evidence a straight forward process. Learner files were consistently well structured throughout. Performance descriptors were included in each learner file but not used to full effect to identify where marks had been awarded.

Learners did submit a variety of tasks that allowed them to meet some of the grade boundaries, but there was an inconsistency in mapping to the specifications. The unit specification does ask for evidence to be word processed, however work submitted was incomplete in parts and hand written. Although the written elements of learners work was well presented, some examples were of poor quality and not what would be expected of a level 3 learner. Some of the evidence was unclear where it had met an element of the grade

boundaries and for some of the higher mark banding there lacking of analysis, examination and comparison.

Some learning outcomes were not mapped correctly against the performance criteria, learner evidence and level descriptors. The task sheets distributed to learners do not match the content of the unit in parts. There is a lack of evidence across the majority of candidate work to support the VAT, performance measures and terminology aspects of the unit.

A greater need to map the content of each of the learning outcomes to specific unit tasks would allow the learners to submit the specific evidence required of them. It did appear that some of the marking criteria had been applied correctly and consistently allocating marks where applicable. Where the centre had allocated marks within the grade boundaries there were occasions when more evidence could have been supplied to fully meet the grade boundary being awarded.

Learning Outcome 1

Simple calculations carried out well by the majority of learners using centre tasks to support this element of the unit. The order of evidence within the files did appear slightly disorganized with some lack of comparison in the use of pricing procedures and calculations. The simple calculations were good in the main but did lack a consistency of accuracy amongst learners where appropriate marks had been awarded. There was a lack of conclusions and analysis throughout the break even element of the learning outcome. This was lacking across all candidate files within the moderation sample.

Learning Outcome 2

Most learners were able to meet the requirements for this part of the unit. However there was a lack of evidence to support profit and loss statements. It was evident that the centre had delivered this element but the evidence did not support the creation and interpretation of financial statements that was required.

Learning Outcome 3

The types of budgets within the hospitality industry were covered by the centre, with learners being competent at identifying the types used within hospitality establishments. Some learners did expand on this element more than others with this being reflected in the marks. This also demonstrates a cross section of understanding between learners which should be addressed in the mapping of specifications and performance criteria. Within the evidence that learners submitted some concentrated on budgets and how they are used in context of the hospitality industry, however not in any great detail. Evidence was also lacking in areas of percentage increases and decreases in business activity not allowing the learner to demonstrate a full understanding of the need for control and corrective action.

Learning Outcome 4

Some misinterpretation of what the learning outcomes were expecting in relation to documentation and evidence. The 'how' control and accounting methods assist a hospitality businesses from the performance descriptors lacked explanation. The evidence submitted merely gave a descriptive account of documentation that is used within the industry.

Learning Outcome 5

It was evident that the centre had used financial information to assess and measure business performance concentrating on key indicators from the hospitality industry. Some learners performed well in this section carrying out calculations and analysis to demonstrate evidence of the learning outcome across all of the mark bands.

Suggestions for centres

Some tasks were not suitable for elements of the mapping criteria. Suggest that learners carry out visits to employers and use realistic working examples from the industry to support a greater generation of evidence. Working examples of invoices, purchase orders and other documentation should preferably be included in the evidence to support each of the relevant learning outcomes.

Learner comments with regards to assignment reflection to be completed on the feedback sheet in addition to the assessor feedback to the learner. This will promote self reflection of learning and support the knowledge elements of the unit.

The menus that were given to learners were suitable for the lower level at Mark Band 1. However it may be advisable to give an overall case study of one organisation and ask the learners to meet the criteria of the unit based on the case study throughout each task and learning outcome. A suggestion may be to give the learners an actual working example from the hospitality industry to support evidence criteria. This would allow the more able learners to interpret financial information demonstrating their knowledge and understanding at the higher level mark band.

There appeared to be an emphasis on the calculations part of the unit, however the unit does specifically request that accounting measures and procedures be addressed. Whilst learners carried out calculations well other parts of evidence did not meet the full range of marks available.

Internal standardisation of the unit was carried out and marks agreed between assessor and the internal verifier. This was positive and demonstrated a commitment to quality control of the Diploma and application of standards.

Suggestion to the centre that Unit 6 be taught in the second year of the programme to allow learners to develop costing skills within other units, i.e. Unit 7.

Concern over the use of the active verbs in the specifications and the incorporation of these into the evidence submitted. It is also important that the performance descriptors are used within the teaching elements of the unit to allow the learners to fully understand what evidence is needed to meet the grading criteria.

Recommendations for centres

- Ensure that candidates are able to understand the use of active verbs in the question i.e. interpret, describe, explain and analyse.
- Greater mapping of the specifications into the teaching strategy within centres.
- Ensure that centres cover the whole unit content in delivery sessions and practice assessment of each component where necessary.
- Practitioners to use the unit specifications with candidates to identify where allocation of marks are awarded.
- Mock assessment sessions when necessary to allow candidates to develop confidence and ability in the use of financial documents.
- Practitioners to attend Edexcel training events to support the delivery of units within the Diploma portfolio.

Statistics

Level 3 Unit 2 - Law and Procedures in the Hospitality Industry

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	35	29	24
Points Score	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Level 3 Unit 3 - Customer Service Standards in the Hospitality Industry

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	36	31	26
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 4 - Building and Developing Effective Hospitality Teams

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	52	46	40	34	29	24
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 6 - Finance and Budgetary Control in the Hospitality Industry

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	45	39	34	29	24
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Notes

Maximum Mark (raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme or mark grids.

Raw boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a learner to qualify for a given grade.

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code DP024173 Summer 2010

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

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH