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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGs</td>
<td>Assessment Guidelines for the subjects in the NC (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQF</td>
<td>Australian Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHSSETA</td>
<td>Culture, Arts, Tourism Hospitality and Sport Sector Education and Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Quality Council for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Department of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHET</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFAL</td>
<td>English First Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESASS</td>
<td>Either a single, or a set of written papers set externally by the Department of Education, to the requirements of the subject learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDHASA</td>
<td>Federated Hospitality Association of Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FET</td>
<td>Further Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GET</td>
<td>General Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETC</td>
<td>General Education and Training Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTTPSA</td>
<td>Global Travel &amp; Tourism Partnership South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICASS</td>
<td>Internal Continuous Assessment Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAT</td>
<td>Integrated Summative Assessment Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOLT</td>
<td>Language of Learning and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTSM</td>
<td>Learning and Teaching Support Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICE</td>
<td>Meetings, Incentives, Conferencing and Exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC (V)</td>
<td>National Certificate (Vocational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>National Department of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQF</td>
<td>National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Senior Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFO</td>
<td>Organising Framework for Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoA</td>
<td>Portfolio of Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoE</td>
<td>Student Portfolio of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCs</td>
<td>The three Quality Councils responsible for managing the sub-frameworks of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCTO</td>
<td>Quality Council for Trades and Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGs</td>
<td>Subject Guidelines for the subjects in the NC (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>The Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMME</td>
<td>Small-, Medium- and Micro Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBCSA</td>
<td>Tourism Business Council of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umalusi</td>
<td>Quality Council for General and Further Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training – referring to Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACE</td>
<td>Western Australian Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glossary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied Competence</strong></td>
<td>Practical application of an ability or skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Guidelines</strong></td>
<td>Written guidance informing the assessment in a particular subject (See Assessment Guidelines below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Subject</strong></td>
<td>The set of subjects required in a specific programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective Subject</strong></td>
<td>Students may choose from a set of elective subjects, such as Hospitality Services in the Hospitality programme and Tourism Operations in the Tourism programme. Another elective subject chosen in the services curricula is New Venture Creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit Level</strong></td>
<td>The level at which a certificate is awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome</strong></td>
<td>An explanation of what is to be achieved by the student through the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lecturer(s)</strong></td>
<td>In Chapters 1-5 and 7, the word “lecturer(s)” is used to describe educator(s)/facilitator(s) at South African FET colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Senior Certificate</strong></td>
<td>School-leaving NQF Level 4 qualification in the GET sub-framework, written after the completion of 12 years of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NQF Level</strong></td>
<td>The ten levels that comprise the NQF. In this report the levels referred to are L2, L3 and L4 – the three exit levels for the Tourism and Hospitality programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes-Based Education (OBE)</strong></td>
<td>The approach underpinning the NCS which places the emphasis on the students’ successful achievement of identified abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Guidelines</strong></td>
<td>Written guidance about the content of a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher(s)</strong></td>
<td>In Chapter 6, the word “teacher(s)” is used to describe educators/lecturers in the Western Australia case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cognitive categories in Level 4 Sustainable Tourism examination</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of questions in the 2011 Sustainable Tourism examination</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Sustainable Tourism examination paper</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Level of cognitive categories of the Level 4 2011 Science of Tourism examination paper</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Science of Tourism examination</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the Level 4 2011 Science of Tourism examination paper</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cognitive level combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Comparison between weighting of cognitive categories suggested in the Assessment Guidelines and weighting in the 2011 Level 4 examination for Food Preparation</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Comparison between the weighted topic suggestions in the Subject Guidelines and weightings in the final 2011 Level 4 examination for Food Preparation</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Food Preparation examination</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Food Preparation examination</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Food Preparation examination</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Hospitality Generics examination</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Hospitality Generics examination</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Hospitality Generics examination</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cognitive categories in Level 4 2011 Hospitality Services examination</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Hospitality Services examination</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cognitive category combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Hospitality Services examination</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cognitive level combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background

In 2007, a new set of qualifications, the National Certificate (Vocational) (NC (V)) was introduced in South African Further Education and Training (FET) colleges. The qualifications signalled the state’s intent to provide a valuable, vocationally-focused alternative as a school-leaving qualification, one which could ultimately serve the learning needs and aspirations of up to sixty per cent of learners in their last three years of education.

Another of the intentions behind the development and introduction of the NC (V) was to replace the N – courses (National Technical Certificates, NATED 1090/191), which were, at the time, the source of much dissatisfaction in the system. The N-course curricula were often very outdated and had not been revised in decades, a real problem when the subjects are supposed to relate to the demands of a contemporary workplace. The new NC (V) programmes were intended to revitalize the ailing theoretical components of the N-courses; they were also constructed to provide the many students who enrolled for the N-courses with opportunities to acquire practical knowledge, since many of them were not being sent to the colleges by employers, as had been the case in the past.

When Umalusi decided to evaluate some of the NC (V) programmes, there were cogent reasons for addressing the Tourism and Hospitality ones, not least because tourism was identified as a priority economic sector in the government’s Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) in 2009, and as one of the six core pillars of growth in South Africa’s New Growth Plan (October 2010). Similarly, the Industrial Policy Action Plan (IPAP2) identified tourism as one of the growth areas expected to contribute to the development of, among others, economic activity in rural areas and culture (National Tourism Sector Strategy, Feb 2011: 1 - 2).

Since Umalusi had no previous research experience in the fields of tourism and hospitality, a good deal of energy first went into understanding the background to these subjects, their inception, rationale and role of these subjects in the qualifications and South African educational and economic context.

During this fact-finding process, Umalusi’s willingness to listen and engage brought about an organic enlargement of the number of parties interested in the project, and as a result the present research project felicitously includes both Departments of Education, the Independent Examination Board (IEB), Higher Education South Africa (HESA) and through it a number of prominent academics from several universities, the National Department of Tourism (NDT), representatives from industry and private colleges as well as the CATHSSETA. Both CATHSSETA and the NDT have become generous partners in this research process, which all believe will continue to flourish as these findings enrich the teaching and learning environments for these subjects.

While managing the process with representatives from such diverse bodies has not always been simple, it is abundantly clear that the benefits of this research project will extend well beyond this report. Bodies that have grappled with what it means to develop a curriculum will go away with a much richer understanding; Departments which may not have fully understood the needs and dilemmas of the other have come closer; industry has had insight
into educational processes and education has learnt from industry’s requirements. In short, what the project is coming to embody are the benefits that accrue to all when work is undertaken in a truly collaborative spirit.

What Umalusi has learned from undertaking this process provides, we believe, a rich model for future co-operative work in other areas where vocational and basic education flow together.

2. The research report

This research report, the first of four emanating from the research, was generated from the team reports prepared by more than 33 evaluators, all experts in the fields of Hospitality, Tourism and Consumer Sciences. The report, divided into 7 chapters, is summarised below:

2.1 Overview of this evaluation of the National Certificate (Vocational) (NC (V)) Hospitality and Tourism programmes

Chapter 1 details the background to the project (described in 1. Background above) and then provides a detailed description of the structure of the NC (V) in general, and the Tourism and Hospitality programmes in particular. The concept “curriculum” is unpacked, based on the work of SLO in the Netherlands, as a backdrop to this evaluation. The chapter concludes with the purposes of this research which, for Umalusi as a Quality Council, is ensuring a better understanding of the NC (V) for all involved, and for the Department of Higher Education and Training which will use the findings and recommendations for improvement of national policy documents, implementation of the curricula and assessment, and to strengthen teacher education and professional development in the Further Education and Training Colleges.

2.2 The research process and methodology

Chapter 2 spells out the purpose and the research questions which informed this research. It provides an overview of the four phases of the research, and indicates that only Phases 2 and 3 of the research are reported on in this present report, which focuses on the NC (V). Section 2.4 describes in detail the nature of the data that the evaluators sought in order to make informed decisions regarding the nature and general standing of the individual Subject Guidelines (SGs). It explains the features which were sought when the intended curriculum documents were analysed, and how these findings were classified. In section 2.5, the instrument used for analysing the nature of the assessed curriculum is explained. This section also discusses the five-category typology developed for use in analysing the cognitive demands expressed in examination questions, as well as the level of difficulty associated with the question.
Table 1: The NC (V) subjects evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Hospitality</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Food Preparation  
       | • Hospitality Generics  
       | • Hospitality Services * | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Science of Tourism  
       | • Sustainable Tourism in SA  
       | • Tourism Operations* |
| 3     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Food Preparation  
       | • Hospitality Generics  
       | • Hospitality Services *† | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Science of Tourism  
       | • Sustainable Tourism in SA and Regional Travel  
       | • Tourism Operations* |
| 4     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Food Preparation  
       | • Hospitality Generics  
       | • Hospitality Services * | • Client Services and Human Relations  
       | • Science of Tourism  
       | • Sustainable Tourism in SA and International Travel  
       | • Tourism Operations* |

In addition, the subject, Consumer Behaviour, an elective in the NC (V) Marketing programme was evaluated for possible inclusion in the Hospitality and Tourism programmes.

Finally, the National Government of Western Australia’s Vocational Education and Training (VET) Hospitality and Tourism curricula were examined to inform curriculum development in the NC (V) in South Africa.

The research process, which rolled out in four phases and covered a wide range of examining bodies, programmes and curricula, is described:

**Phase 1**

Phase 1 was devoted to understanding the history of the services subjects, not only in the NC (V), but also in the National Senior Certificate (NSC). Stakeholder relationships were established with the Department of Higher Education and Training, the Department of Basic Education, Higher Education South Africa, higher education institutions, the National Department of Tourism, industry through the Federated Hospitality Association of Southern Africa (FEDHASA) and the Culture, Arts, Travel, Hospitality and Sport Sector Education and Training Authority (CATHSSETA).

In addition, Phase 1 included the contextualization and adaptation of the research instruments that would be used in the evaluations.

**Phase 2**

The second phase comprised an in-depth document analysis of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) underpinning the services subjects and the NC (V) Subject Guidelines for the Tourism and Hospitality programmes in order to describe the intended curricula in both qualifications.

The standing and quality of the unit standards underpinning the unit standard-based qualifications, offered by the colleges and the SETAs, were then investigated.

Ms Monica Koen of the Department of Higher Education and Training shared insights

---

† Denotes optional subjects
regarding the structure of the VET system in Victoria State, Australia. A second investigation on the Government of Western Australia’s integrated schooling and the Vocational Education and Training system, with particular reference to Hospitality and Tourism was also shared. The intention of the analysis of the Western Australian Tourism and Hospitality VET programmes and courses was to discern examples of “best practice” which could be applied to the South African NC (V).

Phase 3

In the third phase, the assessed curricula were evaluated through an item-by-item analysis of the NSC Grade 12 and the NC (V) Level 4 examinations in all seven subjects outlined above, as well as Consumer Behaviour. An overview of question papers for NC (V) Levels 2 and 4 answered questions about progression within and between levels.

Phase 4

Phase 1 and 2 of the project served as preparatory work for a comparative evaluation of the current NSC curricula for the services subjects and the amended Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) which was introduced in Grade 10 in 2012.

The present report focuses only on the NC (V) work done in the four phases. A separate report on the NSC and the CAPS study and the findings of the unit-standard investigation will be finalized and presented at a separate seminar.

Evaluation instrument for the intended curriculum

The teams used this instrument to analyze the NC (V) Subject Guidelines and Assessment Guidelines for each subject to support their opinions regarding –

• Broad curriculum design – the central design principle;
• The aims of the subject;
• The ideal student envisaged;
• The weighting of each topic in terms of the percentage of time allocated to each;
• The emphasis placed on content and skills;
• The depth of the subject in terms of the extent to which students could move from a superficial grasp of a topic to a more refined and powerful grasp;
• The degree to which the curriculum of each subject is paced, in terms of the volume to be covered in a specific timeframe;
• The specification of sequencing of topics;
• The progression of topics from Level 2 to 4 in terms of increase in level of complexity and difficulty;
• The coherence of the curriculum for each subject, in terms of connections and coordination between topics through the levels;
• The degree to which lecturers are given explicit guidance regarding pedagogy;
• The degree to which lecturers are provided with guidance regarding assessment;
• Format and user-friendliness of the curriculum documentation.

In drawing up their concluding remarks, the evaluators were asked to comment on:
• The overall guidance offered for the interpretation and implementation of the curriculum;
• The social project of the curricula, i.e. the central values underpinning each curriculum;
• How well each curriculum prepares students for operational skills and/or systemic thinking (managerial skills), and the implications of such preparation for the country, the industry, the lecturers and the students;
• The articulation possibilities at the end of Level 4 into higher education and possible career paths into industry.

The evaluating teams were then required to make recommendations based on their findings.

**Evaluation instrument for the assessed curriculum**

The evaluation teams used this instrument to review the NC (V) Assessment Guidelines and the 2011 examination papers across the three levels. They then did an item-by-item analysis of the 2011 Level 4 examinations in each of the subjects.

The item-by-item analysis of examination paper required evaluators to determine the following for each question:

• Type of cognitive demand;
• Level of difficulty;
• The marks allocated per item;
• A combination of cognitive type and level of difficulty;
• The type of content / skill / topic required;
• The placement of the item in the examination paper; and
• The suitability / appropriateness of the item.

A five-category typology, based on Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (2001), was used to determine the cognitive demand and the level of difficulty of each item.

Based on the data collected above, the teams were asked to report their findings in terms of:

• A general overview of the place and role of each subject in the NC (V);
• The degree of compliance with the Assessment Guidelines evident in the examinations;
• The cognitive demand and the level of difficulty required by the 2011 Level 4 examination papers;
• The format and model of these 2011 papers;
• The general standard and quality of the papers.

The evaluation teams concluded their reports by making recommendations to strengthen assessment in each subject.

**2.3 The findings about the intended curricula in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes**

Chapter 3 presents the findings from the evaluative investigation of the intended curricula in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes. The findings about Subject Guidelines and Assessment Guidelines are presented in two sub-sections, one for the four subjects in the Tourism programme, and the second for the four subjects in the Hospitality programme.
The Tourism team concluded that there is extremely limited internal coherence within the Tourism programme, with little congruence between topics, subject outcomes and learning outcomes. More careful consideration of the level at which topics are pitched would help ensure better progression. The team found that students are not expected to demonstrate much reflexivity, a worrying shortcoming particularly in an industry that requires staff to reflect critically on their own and others’ performance. In addition, it was found that the subjects over the three years are very overloaded. Moreover, while articulation between the FET NC (V) Tourism and Higher Education and Training can be described on paper, it has difficulty being operationalized. No articulation possibilities are formally specified for the NC (V) in relation to Higher Education qualifications in Tourism.

Finally, the NC (V) Tourism programme, as currently presented in FET Colleges, has insufficient contact with the actual tourism industry. The team felt strongly that a simulated environment in a college cannot replace work placement.

The Hospitality team concluded that the written curriculum does not clearly enough specify the general aims, pacing of the subjects and the pedagogic approach in the Subject Guidelines. Furthermore, all three levels of the curriculum lack sufficient breadth and depth, nor are there sufficiently strong links between the levels. In the Assessment Guidelines, insufficient guidance is offered to lecturers by way of examples of suitable assessment tasks for internal continuous assessment.

The evaluation team was of opinion that lecturers are not provided with on-going training and mentoring.

Articulation of the NC (V) Hospitality with higher education qualifications is problematic. No specified and preferred articulation options have been identified in relation to Higher Education qualifications in hospitality management. The programme nonetheless provides a better overall introduction to the hospitality industry than any other FET qualification, despite the fact that the NC (V) Hospitality, as currently presented in FET Colleges, does not have enough contact with the hospitality industry. The team argued that a simulated environment in a college cannot replace work placement.

2.4 The evaluation of the assessed curricula in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes

Chapter 4 reports on the findings about the examined curricula in the two programmes. The teams undertook an item-by-item analysis of the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 examinations in all eight subjects, and then compared their findings with the requirements in the Assessment Guidelines. They also analyzed the progression from the Level 2, to Level 3, to Level 4 examinations.

Concluding remarks and recommendations for each subject were consolidated into a final set of concluding comments for the evaluation of the assessed curricula as a whole.

The Umalusi evaluation teams felt that the intended curriculum for the programmes, as outlined in the Subject and Assessment Guidelines, would certainly equip students with entry-level skills for the tourism and hospitality industries and for higher education. However, the final Level 4 examinations are not yet rigorous enough to allow students to demonstrate mastery of the intended curriculum. The cognitive requirements in the Level 4 papers should urgently be re-visited and aligned with the requirements in the Assessment Guidelines. In addition, the
range of cognitive skills tested, and the difficulty levels at which the Level 4 examinations are set must be significantly extended.

The evaluation teams point out that the style of questioning generally requires recall of conceptual knowledge in the Level 4 examinations. Even good performance in exams such as these will not prepare students to cope with assessment at higher education levels. Even at first-year (NQF 5) level, assessment demands are much higher.

In addition, the lack of questions which require students to identify the component parts of a problem or to solve problems in unfamiliar contexts, based on their knowledge and experience in more familiar contexts, will in all likelihood leave students underprepared in the workplace.

The evaluation teams also called for the examination papers and marking guidelines to be submitted for more stringent language, content and technical editing. Editing would help limit grammatical and punctuation errors, as well as errors of content, the repetition of questions and the incorrect use of action verbs. Careful editing will also help to prevent the answer to a question being provided by a different question. The mark value assigned to a question should be aligned to the content required. The examination papers should also be subjected to readability tests such as the Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid tests in order to ensure that the language is pitched at a level that second- and third-language English speakers at the three NQF levels can comprehend.

Ideally, the examination papers for a programme should be reviewed and moderated collectively and comparatively across all three years of study. This would help ensure a steady progression in cognitive demand and difficulty over the three years of study and develop greater consistency in the format of papers.

The examiners, internal examiners and external examiners should be required to complete an analysis grid to track the difficulty level of each question, compliance with the suggested weighting of the cognitive categories in the Assessment Guidelines, and the match with the weighting of topics in the Subject Guidelines.

It is suggested that a question bank of sound questions should be established across all Tourism and Hospitality subjects to aid examiners and lecturers at colleges. Coupled with this suggestion, the evaluation teams felt that examiners, internal moderators, external moderators and lecturers should have focused and dedicated training in assessment design and the use of the analysis grids. Such professional development should help achieve a clear, shared understanding of the various cognitive categories and how these can be assessed. It would also help with the formulation of different types of questions, in particular the effective use of case studies that require the reflexive thinking skills needed in industry.

Running parallel to this process, it is suggested that the Assessment Guidelines should also be updated to include appropriate and much needed guidelines on the division of topics and questions in the examination papers and the relevant mark allocation for each.

**2.5 Consumer Behaviour as a possible optional addition to the Tourism and Hospitality programmes**

Chapter 5 details the investigation of the examined curriculum of Consumer Behaviour through an item-by-item analysis of the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 examination, and then by comparing this with the requirements in the Assessment Guidelines. The analysis included a
consideration of the progression of the examinations from Levels 2 to 4.

The chapter concludes with the findings and recommendations regarding the examined curriculum. Regarding the inclusion of Consumer Behaviour as an option in the Tourism or Hospitality programmes, the Tourism team felt that, during the curriculum rationalization process, Entrepreneurship at Level 3 in Tourism Operations, could be strengthened by including Consumer Behaviour topics such as “Consumer behaviour and decision-making”, “Branding and packaging” and “Identifying customers”. However, it is impossible for Consumer Behaviour to be offered as a complete subject in the Tourism programme, as it could then potentially displace Tourism Operations. Tourism Operations should not be excluded from the Tourism Programme, as the important Entrepreneurship component is included there at Level 3.

The Hospitality team pointed out that the inclusion of Consumer Behaviour as an optional subject might mean dropping Client Care and Human Relations. The team did not feel that this is a viable option.

Moreover, the team pointed out that the focus of Hospitality is on providing services. Consumer Behaviour, on the other hand, focuses largely on providing products. The only two topics in the Consumer Behaviour that link to the Hospitality programme are Topic 6: “Take orders from customers” and Topic 7: “Handle a range of consumer complaints”. These two topics should be referenced for inclusion in a future review of the Hospitality subjects.

2.6 Evaluation of the Western Australian Vocational Education and Training (VET) Curricula

In Chapter 6, the Tourism and Hospitality VET curricula, which lead to the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE), are analyzed, using some 28 documents relating to these subjects. The analysis took into account the following considerations:

- The rationale of the learning;
- The structure and organizing principle;
- The coherence of the documents;
- Content coverage;
- The sequencing and progression evident in the curricula;
- Assessment guidance for students and teachers/lecturers;
- The skills and competencies fostered in the curricula;
- Articulation with industry;
- Additional intentions found in the documents that would help learners to transfer skills between familiar contexts and a variety of unfamiliar contexts;
- Guidance to assist students in completing a course/programme;
- Examples of notable practice which can be considered for implementation in the South African context.

Each of the sub-sections relating to Tourism and Hospitality concludes with examples of outstanding practice that could inform the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes.

The Tourism team found that the Western Australian case is instructive in that it allows movement from one institution to another/one state to another/one employer to another; stresses lifelong learning irrespective of age; closely monitors and keeps records which will help students to recognize when something is achieved; carefully structures the context and
specific resources in the Evidence Guides; has close cooperation between the workplace and training institutions. The layout of the method of assessment is well presented and easily readable. There is in-depth explanation of the range statements. The programme of assessment is comprehensive and well-structured.

The Hospitality team found that the amount of detail in which the requirements are set out, is commendable. Nothing is left to guesswork – everything is spelt out – what the students must do and must not do. Assessment outlines with weightings are provided. A range of assessment methods are used to assess practical skills and knowledge, e.g. direct observation, sampling, written and oral questions. The Curriculum Council’s Workplace Learning document clearly lays out how each unit is organized into three content areas, namely “Workplace foundations, Workplace skills and Workplace reflection”. The Western Australian Council clearly understands that not all students are geared to follow the university route, and the emphasis placed on vocational training and education is commendable.

Employability skills are written into the Western Australian documents: it is clear how units fit into industry occupations, e.g. bar attendant, or kitchen cleaner. Expected performance roles on completion of a qualification are explained, and so are the sectors to which the qualification will apply.

Umalusi’s evaluation team found the qualification to be well structured, borne out by the inclusion of structured and assessed workplace learning.

2.7 Concluding ideas, recommendations and proposed action timeframes

Chapter 7 offers the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the evaluations. The questions posed in Chapter 2 regarding the intended and examined curricula in the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes are answered. The chapter presents recommendations regarding the possible inclusion of the subject, Consumer Studies, in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes, and summarizes the lessons learned from Western Australia.

These are distilled into a set of key interventions to bring about the recommendations, in three time frames:

Short-term interventions

a) In-service training of FET College lecturers in methodology and content

It was recommended that far more on-going in-service support on pedagogy and industry knowledge be offered to lecturers. The Department of Higher Education and Training should take the lead here, together with its partners in the Provincial Education Departments and in industry. Lecturers should be expected to acquire updated industry knowledge and take advantage of specific support on lecturing methodology and interpreting the curriculum documents offered in an annual professional development programme.

b) Training examiners, moderators and external examiners
It is recommended that the examiners, moderators and external examiners for the eight Tourism and Hospitality subjects be trained immediately on compliance with the requirements of the Assessment Guidelines, assessment design, the use of Bloom’s Taxonomy (including an understanding of the meanings of the action verbs used by Bloom and presented to students in the examination papers), levels of difficulty of questions and the use of assessment grids in the development of examinations. Both the Department of Higher Education and Training and Umalusi should be involved in this training.

Similar training should be given to college lecturers in the medium term.

c) Industry experience

The evaluation teams believe that a simulated environment in a college cannot replace work placement. The teams recommend that urgent attention should be given to providing students with meaningful work placements. CATHSSETA should take a lead in this, together with its industry constituents in order to bring about student (and lecturer) contact with the two industries through activities such as job shadowing and observation assignments. This ideal will probably be realized only in the medium term, but should immediately be planned for.

In the immediate short term, it is recommended that the simulated environments in colleges be upgraded to provide meaningful, up-to-date experience, particularly of the tourism industry. Clear directions should be given to colleges to realize this requirement. The Department of Higher Education and Training should provide the directions and ring-fence funding from its latest funding grant to realize this.

d) Articulation with higher education, industry and the National Senior Certificate

The Department of Higher Education and Training should as a matter of urgency engage with CATHSSETA and its industry partners, the Committee for Higher Education, Umalusi and the private training service providers in Tourism and Hospitality to establish clear articulation options from the NC (V) Level 4 Tourism and Hospitality programmes to higher education and to further workplace-based study at Level 5 and above, as well as to the tourism industry in general. This will provide legitimacy for the two programmes which the evaluation teams considered to be credible and worthy.

In addition, the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Higher Education and Training should give urgent attention to articulation between the Hospitality and Tourism subjects in the National Senior Certificate (Grades 10 – 12) and the NC (V) Hospitality and Tourism programmes, Levels 2 – 4.

Medium-term interventions

a) Review of the Hospitality and Tourism curricula

The evaluation teams recommend a review of the Tourism and Hospitality curricula to reduce the breadth of the topics in the subjects within these programmes. This must be done throughout the three years of study in each subject to achieve greater depth, and to allow for the introduction of the latest trends in the industries. Greater coherence in the programmes can be achieved by the spiralling of content, concepts, skills and cognitive
demand as the student progresses through the three years of study. This curriculum review can serve to include relevant content from the subject, Consumer Behaviour.

The Western Australian VET curriculum documents should be consulted as models of sequencing and progression as well as ease of readability.

Such a review should also bring about a rationalization and reduction of the number of assessment tasks by integrating certain assessments across subjects.

b) In-service training of FET College personnel in the examination process

As with the training of examiners, moderators and external examiners for the Tourism and Hospitality subjects, college lecturers should receive ongoing, in-service training on the requirements of the Assessment Guidelines, assessment design, the use of Bloom’s Taxonomy (including an understanding of the meanings of the action verbs identified by Bloom and used in the examination papers), levels of difficulty of questions and the use of assessment grids in the development of examinations. The Department of Higher Education in partnership with its Provincial Department colleagues should be involved in this training, which must take place annually, to assist new lecturers and refresh the skills of experienced staff.

It is recommended that the Department of Higher Education and Training should work in partnership with the institutions of higher learning to devise pre-service courses and in-service courses in methodology and content for lecturers in Tourism and Hospitality in the NC (V). These courses should provide lecturers with a strong pedagogical foundation, including interpretation of the curriculum, planning and preparation, as well as industry knowledge.

**Long-term interventions**

a) One exit-level qualification at NQF Level 4

The rationalization of the curriculum should create a three-year curriculum for a single qualification with an exit level at the end of NQF Level 4.

b) Introduction of a learnership at NQF Level 5

Finally, the evaluation teams recommend the development of an additional year at the end of NQF4 in the form of a learnership in the industry. Funds for this should be sought from CATHSSETA. This would allow for clearer articulation between the NQF Level 4 programme and the needs of industry.
CHAPTER 1

VIEWING THE MENU: AN OVERVIEW OF UMALUSI’S EVALUATION OF THE NC (V) HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM PROGRAMMES

1.1 Background to the present project

In 2007, a new set of qualifications, the National Certificate (Vocational) (NC (V)) was introduced in South African Further Education and Training (FET) colleges. Its introduction marked a bold move on the part of the Department of Education. The qualification signalled the intent of the state to provide a valuable, vocationally-focused alternative as a school-leaving qualification, one which could ultimately serve the learning needs and aspirations of up to sixty per cent of learners in their last three years of education.

The introduction of the NC (V) and that of the National Senior Certificate (NSC) followed hot on the heels of one another. The NSC, a three-year qualification, had enrolled its first cohort of learners in 2006, and so, in 2008, the NSC replaced the well-established Senior Certificate for the first time. That year saw the NC (V) Level 3 introduced, with the first NC (V) Level 4 students enrolled in 2009.

The close timing was no accident: it resulted from a vision of providing more – and diversified – meaningful learning in the last phase of basic education, the FET Phase. The new vocational qualification was also intended to revivify the ailing technical college sector by providing a flagship qualification of high quality, and to that end, a re-capitalization of the colleges took place.

A closer look at the structure of the NSC and the NC (V) reveal their kinship: the foundational requirements for both qualifications are much the same. The spread of possible elective subjects in the NSC is, however, exchanged for programmes in identified vocational fields in the NC (V). So, for example, students enrolling in colleges can choose to do their studies in one of nineteen areas. The number of programmes has increased since 2007.

In 2009, Umalusi undertook research on four of the NC (V) subjects: English First Additional Language (EFAL), Mathematics, Mathematical Literacy and Physical Sciences. The research aimed to examine the comparability of the NSC and the NC (V) in terms of their curricula in the fundamental subjects, and the standards set through the quality of the examinations in the individual subjects. Furthermore, the research was aimed at finding out how progression is managed across NC (V) Levels 2, 3 and 4. The research analysed the sequencing and pacing in the different curricula and also considered, in a limited fashion, the ways in which the NC (V) fundamental subjects are designed to support the vocational demands in the qualification. An overview of the research findings and general trends identified across the fundamental subjects is reported in the May 2010 publication with the title: The “F” in NC (V) – Benchmarking common subjects in the NSC and the NC (V). As a result of the findings, Umalusi proposed that students enrolling for the NC (V) should have their achievements in the NSC fundamental subjects recognised. This transfer of credits was introduced in colleges as of the beginning of 2012.

One of the intentions behind the development and introduction of the NC (V) was to replace the N – courses (National Technical Certificates, NATED 1090/191), which were, at the time,
the source of much dissatisfaction in the system. The N-course curricula were often very outdated and had not been revised in decades, a real problem when the subjects are supposed to relate to the demands of a contemporary workplace. It is worth noting that the N-courses themselves varied enormously in terms of duration, delivery and relationship to the workplace. The new NC (V) programmes were intended to revitalize the ailing N-course theoretical components; they were also constructed to provide the many students that enrolled for the N-courses with opportunities to acquire practical knowledge, since many of them were not being sent to the colleges by employers, as had been the case in the past.

In terms of engaging with the vocational side of the NC (V) which was designed to take the place of the N-programmes, Umalusi embarked on a comparative study in the engineering field. This report (in print) engages with the mathematics, engineering science, engineering drawing and electrical trade theory components of each. It has provided insights into the guidance given in terms of the syllabus/curriculum, assessment guidelines and the quality of the respective assessments associated with each. It also considers the strengths and weaknesses of the delivery models associated with each.

In the present research project, Umalusi’s attention to the services subjects both in the NC (V) and in the NSC, even though the present report focuses exclusively on the findings associated with the NC (V) Hospitality and Tourism programmes. There were cogent reasons for picking up on these areas of learning, not least because Tourism was identified as a priority economic sector in the government’s Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) in 2009, and as one of the six core pillars of growth in South Africa’s New Growth Plan (October 2010). Similarly, the Industrial Policy Action Plan (IPAP2) identified tourism as one of the growth areas expected to contribute to the development of, among others, economic activity in rural area and culture (National Tourism Sector Strategy Feb 2011: 1 -2).

An additional reason for taking on the NC (V) Hospitality and Tourism programmes has been that the research directed Umalusi towards an area which it had long recognised as important, but which it had not engaged with – that is, with subjects that have a strong practical component. This would be a new direction for Umalusi as the earlier Maintaining Standards research has only dealt with the more academic ‘gateway’ subjects.

Umalusi was aware that entering the field of vocational subject evaluation would require an approach that was different. These subjects would presumably challenge our understanding of curriculum in some ways, and would certainly mean working with a more extended range of stakeholders than is the case with the more academic subjects such as mathematics, history and life sciences.

Establishing our bona fides in the field has been a cautious but critical part of the process, and is explained in greater detail later in the report. For this investigation into practical subjects, it was very important for Umalusi’s staff driving the project to become familiar with the origins of the subjects, the role they play not only in education but in industry, and to begin to anticipate how these new subjects could be better integrated into the post-school context. As a result, a good deal of energy went into the first phase of trying to understand the background to the subjects, their inception, rationale and role of these subjects in the qualifications and South African educational and economic context.

During this process, Umalusi’s willingness to listen and engage brought about an increase of the number of parties interested in the project and as a result the present research project felicitously includes both Departments of Education, the Independent Exam Board (IEB), Higher Education South Africa (HESA) and through it a number of prominent academics from several universities, the National Department of Tourism (NDT), representatives from industry and private colleges as well as the CATHSSETA.
While managing the process with representatives from such diverse bodies has not always been simple, it is abundantly clear that the benefits of this research project will extend well beyond the report that Umalusi publishes. Bodies that have grappled with what it means to develop a curriculum will go away with a much richer understanding. Departments which may not have fully understood the needs and dilemmas of the other have come closer; industry has had insight into educational processes and education has learnt from industry’s requirements. In short, what the project is coming to embody are the benefits that accrue to all when work is undertaken in a truly collaborative spirit.

What Umalusi has learned from undertaking this process provides, we believe, a rich model for future co-operative work in other areas where vocational and basic education flow together.

1.2 An overview of the NC (V) qualification

In order to contextualize the analysis of the curricula for the two NC (V) programmes being considered, it is important that the qualification be understood in broad outline.

1.2.1 The National Certificate (Vocational)

1.2.1.1 The structure and purpose of the qualification

The National Certificate (Vocational) is registered on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) at Levels 2, 3 and 4. These separate but related one-year qualifications have, however, effectively been treated by the colleges as a single three-year qualification. The design of the NC (V) with its three exit-levels was intended to align the qualification with the structure proposed for learnerships, but, in reality, the up-take of students graduating from the qualification at Levels 2 and 3, and even at Level 4, has been slow. This reluctance stems from the NC (V) being a largely unknown quantity in the education and training system, due to their newness, and the lack of advocacy around the qualifications.

Registered as 130-credit qualifications, each of the NC (V) qualifications is captured in a policy that explains the qualification design and structure, its rules of combination and its assessment requirements. The fundamental component consists of three compulsory subjects – the language of learning and teaching (generally English, Afrikaans or isiXhosa), mathematics or Mathematical Literacy and Life Orientation. The subjects contribute 50 credits towards the qualification. The vocational component consists of a minimum of four subjects, providing 80 credits towards the qualification. The qualification is described in the Government Gazette number 28677 of March 2006, as amended in Government Gazette number 30266 of September 2007. The admission requirements for the NC (V) to Higher Education are captured in Government Gazette number 32743 of November 2009.

The main purpose of the qualification is to give students the necessary theoretical and practical competence to enter the technical and trade fields of employment. The qualification enables students to acquire the necessary knowledge, practical skills, applied
competence and understanding required for employment in a particular occupation or trade or class of occupations or trades, or entrance into Higher Education. The qualification is offered at public colleges, private colleges and other institutions offering FET vocational programmes.

The Subject Guidelines for the subjects flesh out the nature of the learning for the qualification while Assessment Guidelines (AGs) provide an assessment framework for vocational qualifications, which includes guidance on internal continuous assessment as well as external summative assessment. The AGs also detail the assessment requirements for the individual subjects, including the structure of the integrated summative assessment (ISAT) and the national exam.

1.2.1.2 Awarding the NC (V) and progression

In order to obtain a National Certificate (Vocational), the following minimum promotion requirements must be fulfilled. The candidate must have:

1. offered and written examinations in not fewer than seven subjects;
2. achieved 40% in an official language on either First Additional level or Home Language level, provided that the language chosen is a language of learning and teaching (LOLT) of the institution (as listed in ‘Table B1’ of ‘Annexure B’ of the Policy document for the National Certificate (Vocational));
3. achieved 30% in either Mathematics or Mathematical Literacy (as listed in ‘Table B2’ of ‘Annexure B’ of the Policy document for National Certificate (Vocational));
4. achieved 40% in Life Orientation (as listed in ‘Table B3’ of ‘Annexure B’ of the Policy document for National Certificate (Vocational)); and
5. achieved 50% in four Vocational subjects (sub-fields, as listed in ‘Annexure A’ of the ‘Policy document for National Certificate (Vocational)).

In addition, a record of evidence must be submitted for any subject failed, for certification to be considered.

In terms of qualification policy, a student should complete the one NC (V) qualification before embarking on the next. Colleges have allowed students to carry subjects, say, from Level 3 into Level 4. This practice was carried over from offering the N-courses, but the content of the N-courses is often much more modest, being a trimester’s work, or that of a semester.

1.2.1.3 Assessment

In the NC (V), Internal Continuous Assessment (ICASS) contributes 25% towards the final mark for the fundamental subjects, which is evaluated by means of a student portfolio. The portfolio is a combination of theory and practical work. External assessment of fundamental subjects contributes 75% towards the final mark.

The external assessment mark for the vocational subjects combines theory and practical components. For the vocational subjects, the internal and external assessment each contribute 50% toward the final marks, since the focus in the vocational learning is intended to be on the acquisition of practical skills as well as on the related theory.
A **seven-point rating scale** is used to rate assessment for the **fundamental subjects**, namely mathematics or Mathematical Literacy, English FAL (or alternative language of teaching) and Life Orientation.

Apart from performance in the Home Language or First Additional Language and Life Orientation where a Level 3 (40-49%) is also required, the remaining fundamental subjects (Mathematics / Mathematical Literacy) are passed if the candidate achieves at least a Level 2 (30%).

An illustration of the seven-point rating scale appears below:

**Table 2: Seven-point rating scale for fundamental subjects in the NC (V)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding achievement (80–100%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious achievement (70–79%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial achievement (60–69%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate achievement (50–59%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate achievement (40–49%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary achievement (30–39%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not achieved (0–29%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **vocational subjects** (as in Hospitality and Tourism programmes) a **five-level scale** is used:

**Table 3: Five-point rating scale for vocational subjects in the NC (V)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding (80–100%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly competent (70–79%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent (50–69%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet competent (40–49%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not achieved (0–39%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a vocational subject, satisfactory achievement is pegged at Level 4 (50-59%).

**1.2.1.4 The NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes**

The development of the first eleven NC (V) programmes was based on scarce skills identified as priorities in the country. Tourism and Hospitality were included. Each of the NC (V) programmes includes three ‘core’ subjects, which are compulsory. The fourth subject is an elective and students may choose an additional subject from within the programme or one from another of the NC (V) programmes. So, for example, a student may choose to replace Hospitality Services with, say, New Venture Creation or Entrepreneurship or Project Management over the three years.

In the Hospitality programme, the subject Hospitality Services is indicated as the elective (optional) subject and in the Tourism programme the subject Tourism Operations is indicated as the elective (optional) subject. The table below lists the subjects included in the programmes; as explained above, the subjects marked with an asterisk are electives (optional):
Table 4: Vocational subjects in the NC (V) Hospitality and Tourism programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Hospitality</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Food Preparation  
• Hospitality Generics  
• Hospitality Services* | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Science of Tourism  
• Sustainable Tourism in SA  
• Tourism Operations* |
| 3     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Food Preparation  
• Hospitality Generics  
• Hospitality Services* | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Science of Tourism  
• Sustainable Tourism in SA and Regional Travel  
• Tourism Operations* |
| 4     | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Food Preparation  
• Hospitality Generics  
• Hospitality Services* | • Client Services and Human Relations  
• Science of Tourism  
• Sustainable Tourism in SA and International Travel  
• Tourism Operations* |

It is important to be reminded once again of the newness of this qualification – the Level 4 qualification has not yet been offered for a full five years, so it can hardly be said to have bedded down in the national system, a matter which has not necessarily been helped by a call for its review hardly before it had even begun. This report is, in a sense, the first one which attempts to look holistically at two of the programmes as NC (V) programmes. It is hoped that the findings will help emphasize the value that it can add to our education system.

1.3 Unpacking the concept “curriculum”

Before embarking on this analysis of the curricula for the Tourism and Hospitality Programmes, it may be worth considering briefly the location and the form of representation of the curriculum to be evaluated in this report.

1.3.1 Curriculum – a plan for learning

There are numerous and conflicting definitions for the word ‘curriculum’, but one of the most useful is a direct translation of the Dutch – and Afrikaans word – ‘leerplan’, a plan for learning. Clearly, ‘a plan for learning’ could equally describe the timetable for an individual student and, say, the documents that form the ‘primary sources of support and direction for learning and teaching in (an) educational system’ (DBE, 2009: 11).

The Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, have identified two vectors which serve to relate the many definitions of curriculum to one another, and which have helped to pinpoint the nature of the curricula which are considered in this research. At the same time, these identify the areas which cannot be addressed by research of this kind, but which nevertheless clearly require further attention, a matter which is raised again in the final chapters of this report.

The SLO analysis presented in Curriculum in development (2009) identifies different levels at which curriculum is represented and provides examples of the ‘products’ associated with or applied at each of these levels. The following table summarises the levels and the documents – all of which might reasonably be regarded as curricula – associated with that level.
Table 5: Curriculum levels and associated curriculum documentation (adapted from SLO (2009))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPRA</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>• Common European Framework of Reference for Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACRO</td>
<td>System, national</td>
<td>• Core objectives, attainment levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examinations programmes/assessment guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESO</td>
<td>School, college</td>
<td>• School programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRO</td>
<td>Classroom, teacher</td>
<td>• Teaching plan, instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Module, course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Textbooks, learning and teaching materials (LTSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANO</td>
<td>Learner, student</td>
<td>• Personal plan for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual course of learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second dimension SLO identifies as different forms in which curricula can be represented. It calls these ‘curriculum representations’, and these categories relate to distinctions, which Umalusi currently makes in its thinking about curriculum. Umalusi distinguishes between the intended curriculum (as represented in the national curriculum documents), the enacted curriculum as it is implemented in classrooms, and the assessed curriculum. The SLO, however, makes the following, more finely-nuanced distinctions, as reflected in the table on the next page.

According to SLO, this six-way distinction, based on the work of Goodlad (1979) and Van den Akker (2003), is useful in the analysis of the processes and outcomes of curriculum innovation (SLO, 2009:10).

Table 6: Forms of curriculum (adapted from SLO, 2009)

| INTENDED   | Ideal                      | Vision (rationale or basic philosophy underlying a curriculum)          |
|           | Formal/written             | Intentions as specified in curriculum documents and/or materials        |
| IMPLEMENTED/ ENACTED | Perceived                  | Curriculum interpreted by its users (especially teachers)              |
|           | Operational                | Actual process of teaching and learning (curriculum in action)         |
| ATTAINED/ ASSESSED  | Experiential              | Learning experiences as perceived by learners                         |
|           | Learned/assessed           | Resulting learning outcomes of learners                                 |

Using these two SLO vectors, it is apparent that the present NC (V) analysis deals with curriculum developed at and for the macro level, since it considers versions of the curriculum determined for the national educational system. Secondly, the form of representation of curriculum dealt with, includes sub-categories of the intended curriculum, viz. in terms of their ideals or vision, and in terms of the formal, written representation of those ideals, in this case, the Subject Guidelines.

The analysis of the NC (V) Level 4 examinations means that this report is also able to comment on the last of the categories of representation, that is, the attained curriculum insofar as it is represented by what is assessed and how.
Both the tables presented in this section serve to flag where the attention has been focused in the analysis of the NC (V) curriculum: findings about the individual subject guidelines are intended to help make the necessary adjustments at the macro level in the belief that improvements to the curriculum documents will directly influence the performance in the colleges (meso level/implemented curriculum) and in classrooms and workshops (micro level/operational and experiential aspects representations of the curriculum).

In other words, the focus of the present research is not on the implemented curriculum, though the evaluators have frequently brought to bear their knowledge of college practice to explain why or how something works well – or not.

1.4 The purposes of this research

While the questions that guided the actual research are laid out and discussed in the following chapter, it is perhaps important to understand what the drives are behind this initiative.

In 2008, with the promulgation of the NQF Act, Umalusi became one of the three quality councils (QCs) responsible for managing the sub-frameworks of the NQF. The NC (V) is in the General and Further Education and Training Qualifications Sub-framework, for which Umalusi is responsible. In order to understand the quality and standing of the qualification itself, Umalusi systematically researches various of its component aspects – in this report, specifically the curriculum, as exemplified in the vocational subjects, as well as the quality of the assessment, a kind of mirror which reflects the quality of the teaching and learning related to the programme.

Research such as this not only helps us to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the individual Subject Guidelines and the related Assessment Guidelines, it helps us to build a bigger picture of the nature of the qualification itself – what its strengths might be, what challenges its implementation presents to the institutions and staff offering it. In short, the research is undertaken with a commitment to ensuring a better understanding of the NC (V) for all involved.

First and foremost, the report will be submitted to the Department of Higher Education and Training. The findings and recommendations are formulated as guidelines for improvement, in terms both of the national policy (SGs and AGs) and of implementation and assessment. The findings also point to areas that need strengthening in teacher education and professional development. Umalusi in collaboration with stakeholders such as CATHSSETA and NDT will help to monitor how these recommendations are effected and the impact that they slowly but surely must have on teacher/lecturer and learner/student performance. Umalusi in collaboration with Higher Education Institutions and Higher Education South Africa (HESA) will need to work towards ensuring teacher/lecturer preparation not only as field experts, but also subject methodologists who would be able to reflect on their own teaching practice.

However, when the curriculum unit was incubating this project, the involvement of Ms Lisa Gordon-Davis, as a representative from Global Travel and Tourism Partnership South Africa, and the collaboration with the National Department of Tourism, brought about the need to investigate articulation pathways to Higher Education qualifications in tourism and hospitality management.

CATHSSETA had questions about the quality of the NC (V) curricula and the preparation of students for entering industry. As CATHSSETA had already committed itself to a review process of the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes, the research was an opportunity to
collaborate with curriculum specialists, field experts and colleagues from higher education institutions to engage in an investigation to find ways to strengthen the curricula and their assessment thereof.

Representatives from higher education institutions spoke about global competitiveness, the purpose of the curriculum, and the need to involve people emotionally. So the question about what kind of learner/student is envisaged in the curriculum came to mind. Colleagues from higher education raised questions about the need for a holistic view of the competencies needed in industry. It was clear that a sound operational understanding is important, but managerial skills and systemic thinking abilities are to be developed in training related to the services fields. The research therefore included concluding tasks in this regard. Umalusi also considered the questions about the impact of emotional intelligence (EI) on tourism operations and hospitality management (leadership) in the final research questions.

All the stakeholders needed to gain insight in the development of the NC (V) programmes and the subjects included in the programmes.

In this way, several new purposes for the project have emerged as the work unfolded: it is clear, for example, that the findings are of great interest to teachers as the teams found out when they presented at the National Department of Tourism’s 2012 National Tourism Career Expo (NTCE) in the Eastern Cape in September last year. This has resulted in plans to share the findings more widely and to link that to offering support regarding assessment, an area where there is a thirst for better understanding.

The fact that the project brought people from different sectors together has inspired new measures of co-operation between the industry and schools and colleges, a move which can only serve to benefit the students, the colleges and schools, and ultimately the workplace and institutions of higher education. While this was not conceived as a conscious purpose for the research project, Umalusi has learned that it should be an intention when vocational subjects are addressed. The project has exemplified how possible it is to create a situation where everyone can gain a great deal, and, in doing so, also offer much.

Finally, one of the unexpected benefits has been growing co-operation with the universities which have supported the research. Umalusi staff has been invited to share the findings from this research with departments teaching these subjects and/or training teachers to teach them. A number of papers have been and will be presented at conferences nationally and internationally based on this work – and these papers will be offered by the academics who participated as well as by Umalusi staff members.

1.5 Overview of the report structure

Chapter 1 of this report sketches the background to the present research, locating it within the trajectory of NC (V)-related research already undertaken by Umalusi. Then, in the interest of a better understanding of the subject reports which follow, the structure and design of the NC (V) qualification is described. A brief discussion on curriculum, based on the work of SLO in the Netherlands, helps to locate the level at which the NC (V) curriculum is located – it is national policy which places the analysis at a macro level in the system. The policy documents thus describe the intended curriculum, while recourse to the examinations also allowed the evaluation teams to gauge how the intended curriculum is assessed, and how closely it complied with the requirements of the policy documents. The last sub-section in Chapter 1 speaks to the purposes which drive research of this nature for Umalusi as well as newly identified purposes that result from undertaking the work itself.
Chapter 2 summarizes the research process. It addresses the questions which guided the curriculum evaluations, and outlines the criteria which directed the teams’ attention to critical features in the construction of a curriculum. The third sub-section explains how the teams sought to understand how the curriculum is assessed through formal examinations. The instrument which has been developed to analyze the examinations requires the experienced evaluators to make judgements in respect of the nature of the cognitive demand being tested and the question’s level of difficulty. These insights depend on the professional judgements of the team members, and the decisions ultimately made by the team about a particular question are often hard-fought and hard-won. It will be evident to readers of the chapters that follow that the evaluation teams are expected to support their professional judgement with quantitative data derived from their scrupulous analysis of the Subject Guidelines, the Assessment Guidelines and the actual examinations set. The evaluation of the Integrated Summative Assessment Task (ISAT) did not form part of the assessed curriculum analysis in 2012, but will in future be part of research determining knowledge and applied knowledge.

In Chapter 3 the findings of Umalusi’s two evaluation teams of their investigation of the intended curricula in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes are presented. The teams used the intended curriculum evaluation instrument described in Chapter 2 as an evaluation tool. The findings derived from the analysis are presented in two sub-sections for the four subjects in the Tourism programme and those of the Hospitality programme. The two sub-sections detail the teams’ analyses of the curricula underpinning the subjects in the two programmes. Each sub-section concludes with the team’s recommendations regarding strengthening the curricula analysed.

Chapter 4 reports on the findings of analyses of the examined curricula in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes. This chapter presents the findings of an item-by-item analysis of the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 examinations written in the subjects included in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes, and then compares this with the requirements for the intended examined curricula outlined in the Assessment Guidelines for these subjects. Chapter 4 also reports on findings pertaining to the progression from the Level 2, to Level 3, to Level 4 examinations.

Chapter 5 considers the subject Consumer Behaviour as a possible optional addition to the Hospitality and Tourism programmes, or the possible strengthening the current Tourism and/or Hospitality programme by the inclusion of particular topics (aspects) from the subject Consumer Behaviour. The chapter concludes with the findings and recommendations regarding the assessed curriculum with reference to examples of assessment that begin to assess complex reasoning and reflexive thinking.

In Chapter 6 the Tourism and Hospitality Vocational Education and Training curricula which lead to the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE) are analyzed. The two sub-sections relating to Tourism and Hospitality conclude with examples of “best practice” that can inform the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes.

Chapter 7 concludes the report with recommendations for the intended curricula of both the Tourism and Hospitality programmes and their assessment. The intent of this chapter is to summarize the findings and to provide guidance for strengthening the curricula that underpin the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes. The findings and recommendations are formulated as guidelines for improvement, in terms both of the national policy (SGs and AGs) and of implementation and assessment.
CHAPTER 2

FOLLOWING THE RECIPE: THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses how Umalusi embarked on working in subject domains where no in-depth work had been done previously. It also explains what we asked the teams to look for when they did the curriculum analysis and how they were to undertake the examination analysis. Using the instruments to undertake these investigations required Umalusi staff to engage the evaluators deeply in discussions of concepts such as sequencing, progression and weighting or how to determine the cognitive demand inherent in a question. It is probably safe to say that everyone in the process learned a great deal that was beneficial to them and offered a great deal, which was of value to the report.

In the interest of space, the names and CVs of the evaluators have not been included in the body of this chapter, but, by way of thanks, their names and brief biographical profiles are recorded in Annexure B. Reading that Annexure will indicate how actively industry was involved in helping to evaluate the usefulness of the curriculum from its perspective. University staff brought their needs to the table, while people involved in teaching the NC (V) and administering hospitality and tourism programmes brought their knowledge and experience to bear on the questions being asked.

2.1 Purpose

In Section 1.4 the larger purposes of the research are explained. The immediate purpose of the project that concerned the NC (V) was to acquire an in-depth understanding of the Subject Guidelines, which are the national policy governing what is to be taught and learned, and the Assessment Guidelines, which explain what is to be assessed. The project also included a limited international overview which focused on the Western Australian Tourism and Hospitality programmes, in order to find possible examples of outstanding practice.

2.2 The research questions

In the analysis of the intended curricula of the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes, the project sought to find answers to the following questions:

a. What is the quality and standing of the curricula of the subjects included in the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes on Levels 2, 3 and 4?

b. How do the curricula in question prepare students for operational skills and/or systemic thinking (managerial) skills, and how well do they do so?

c. Except for ‘designation’, what other criteria should serve as articulation indicators?

d. Do the NC (V) Level 4 exam papers comply with the requirements stipulated in Assessment Guidelines?

e. Are the exam papers aligned with the topic weighting and the intended content and skill focus outlined in the Subject Guidelines?

f. Which cognitive categories appear in the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 examination papers for the subjects in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes?
g. What is the cognitive demand and level of difficulty of the assessment items (questions) in the NC (V) Level 4 exam papers in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes?

h. What are the levels of progression between NC (V) Levels 2, 3 and 4?

2.3 Process

Before embarking on a description of the way in which this project unfolded, it is necessary to remind readers that this report deals only with certain portions of the entire findings of the project. The additional findings, especially those relating to the new Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) for the NSC will be reported on separately.

The Service Subjects research rolled out in four phases. The analysis of the NC (V) intended and assessed curricula took place in Phases 2 and 3. It is, however, worth sharing briefly the entire research process, as it indicates just how seriously Umalusi takes the issue of mapping related qualifications to one another in order to understand both the field and how the related qualifications work.

Phase 1 (March – September 2011)
Understanding the history of the services subjects and planning the way ahead

In February 2011, Ms Lisa Gordon-Davis, representing Global Travel & Tourism Partnership South Africa (GTTPSA) and Managing Director of Kundisa Training and Consulting requested a meeting with Umalusi. She explained the concerns about the preparation of learners/students for the hospitality industry and referred to a Concept Document on Revision of Hospitality Studies prepared by stakeholders to strengthen the NSC subject Hospitality Studies. Though the information was applicable to the NSC subject, Hospitality Studies, the principle of learner preparation for industry was equally applicable to students following the NC (V) Tourism programme as well.

Ms Gordon-Davis explained the stakeholders’ position regarding a proposal for the revision of Hospitality Studies by including a framework which reflects the emerging/new educational discipline to which the field of Hospitality Studies belongs. The framework outlines the development of conceptual understanding in this field which includes managerial capacity, sales client service, value chains, the guest cycle and other concepts included in the academic discipline. Umalusi made Ms Gordon Davis aware of the importance of benchmarking in the evaluation of curricula and the need to establish standards, after which she, on behalf of GTTPSA, agreed to do an overview of hospitality programmes in Canada.

Ms Gordon-Davies was willing to introduce Umalusi to Ms Nozuko Ngozi, who was at that stage the Director: Human Capital Development and Governance at the National Department of Tourism, and other stakeholders involved in the tourism and hospitality fields. Umalusi invited the NDT representatives to a meeting in April 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to conceptualize the purpose of the intended research and to establish partnerships between national departments and industry. Umalusi provided background on the research that it had conducted up to that point, but which, prior to 2011, had not included the evaluation of the NSC subjects Tourism, Hospitality and Consumer Studies.

Ms Ngozi led the representation from the National Department of Tourism and the Culture Arts, Tourism, Hospitality and Sport Sector Education and Training Authority (CATHSSETA). Ms Ngozi explained that as of 2008, an investigation had been done on possible articulation pathways from schooling into higher education. It was found that the rate of learners from hospitality accessing higher education was dropping. A few other concerns were also tabled, of which the quality of the curriculum was one.
The outcomes of the meeting resulted in a verbal agreement from NDT and CATHSSETA to become observers in the research process and to assist in referring representatives from industry to be involved as members of the evaluation teams. Umalusi agreed to attend the meetings arranged for the Tourism-Hospitality Talent Attraction and Capacity Strategy Programme Working Group, which included representation from NDT, the International Hotel Schools, Tourism Business Council of South Africa (TBCSA), CATHSSETA, City Lodge Hotels Limited and Federated Hospitality Association of Southern Africa (FEDHASA).

At a follow-up meeting in May 2011, the decision was made to include two representatives from industry, one person from higher education, a subject advisor, a person to represent the NC (V) fraternity and a curriculum or methodology expert. A further decision was to keep both the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Higher Education informed about the process.

The National Department of Tourism, in partnership with FEDHASA, had commissioned a study in 2008 to investigate the reasons for the decline of new entrants into Hotel Schools or Hospitality Colleges. Finalized in 2009, the report culminated in a Tourism and Hospitality Talent Attraction and Capacity Development (THTACD) Strategy with an Implementation plan. A National Key Stakeholder Workshop was subsequently convened in December 2009, which adopted the THTACD Strategy and Implementation Plan. The National Key Stakeholder Workshop also endorsed the establishment of a Working Group which was mandated to coordinate the implementation of the strategy through its Implementation Plan.

It was against this background that the National Department of Tourism in partnership with FEDHASA and on behalf of the THTACD Working Group invited Umalusi to attend the feedback National Key Stakeholders Workshop in August 2011. The purpose of the workshop was to:

- review progress and achievement of the THTACD strategy implementation,
- reprioritize implementation programs for the year 2011/12, and
- define roles and responsibilities in the implementation of priorities.

Umalusi had the opportunity to present the process and progress of the Services Subjects investigation, and was able to initiate discussions with higher education representatives from the University of Johannesburg (UJ) around articulation issues and the need for learners to be prepared to think systemically.

Phase 1 of this investigation is considered to be a time of building stakeholder relationships and establishing the involvement of DHET, DBE, HESA and other government departments. The research questions, research methods and the identification of experts were based on background information, resulting from discussions with GTTPSA / Kundisa, the members of the task team, private providers, the National Department of Tourism (NDT), FEDHASA, HESA and representatives from the University of Johannesburg, University of Pretoria, UNISA and North West University.

Phase 1 also included the contextualization and adaptation of the research instrument to suit the analysis of intended curricula of a more practical nature.

It became very clear even in Phase 1 of the investigation that the model for collaboration that involved both evaluators and observers across sectors had multiple benefits and positively influenced thinking processes.
Phase 2 (November 2011 – January 2012)
NSC and NC (V) curriculum analysis; overview of unit-standard based programmes and examples of good practice

The focus in the second phase was an in-depth analysis of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) documents underpinning the NSC services subjects, as well as the Subject Guidelines for the subjects included in the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes. Though the analysis of both curricula included the same dimensions to establish the standing and quality of the curricula in both qualifications, the investigation was not of a directly comparative nature. The teamwork during the two workshops in November 2011 resulted in detailed reporting on the curricula underpinning the subjects in question.

A “layered-model” for the curriculum analysis was implemented during these workshops which resulted in more effective use of team time and allowed for individual input into the process. The teams worked in smaller groups and focused on specific tasks allocated to them. Team coordinators guided the groups, provided direction in completing the tasks, paced the groups and took responsibility for compiling a single team report. This “layered” approach gave each individual in the team the opportunity to add value to the investigation. Some of the industry representatives attested that the model provided the opportunity to grow “from looking at any training material with minimum interest to wanting to examine, study, investigate, scrutinize, evaluate, consider, question, assess, weigh up the content and to assure its validity and overall impact on both learner and teacher!”

As a result of the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between Umalusi and CATHSSETA, eight CATHSSETA representatives attended an orientation day on 21 November 2011 to acquaint themselves with the process and progress to date and with the instrument applied in the earlier workshop, which none of them had attended. They then joined the rest of the evaluators on the following day for the second workshop in Phase 2, which undertook the NC (V) Subject Guideline analysis for the Tourism and Hospitality programmes.

The third workshop in Phase 2 at the end of January 2012 entailed an investigation of the standing and quality of the unit standards underpinning the unit-standard based qualifications offered by colleges and the SETAs. The dimensions in this analysis included the following: rationale, purpose and aim, organising principle, content coverage and assessment guidelines.

Furthermore, as part of the search for examples of best practice, Ms Monica Koen (DHET) shared insights into the structure of the VET system in Victoria State, Australia. A second investigation shared findings on the Western Australian integrated schooling and VET system.

Phase 3 (May 2012)
Evaluating the assessed curricula

Phase 3 of the project had as its focus the nature of the assessed curriculum. The item-by-item analysis of exam papers for NSC Gr 12 and those of NC (V) Level 4 was undertaken at the end of May 2012. An overview of the NC (V) Levels 2 and 3 examinations included answering questions about progression within and between levels.

A five-category typology, with examples specifically linked to the services subjects, guided the analysis used to establish which cognitive categories appeared and weighed more heavily in the assessment items of the exam papers as well as to establish the nature of the cognitive demands assessed and the associated levels of difficulty. The data collection was
made easier by a calculation function in the Excel spread sheet, which enabled an “on the spot” visual presentation of the findings. The teams had to make notes on the format and layout of the paper before the analysis of all items in the papers began.

Phase 4 (July 2012)
The NCS 2003-CAPS comparison

Phase 1 and 2 of the project served as preparatory work for the final, comparative investigation, in which the NSC services-subjects curricula and the amended CAPS curricula were set side by side. The CAPS was introduced in the last three years of schooling in 2012, and the first Grade 12 examinations based on the CAPS will be written in 2014, when the first cohort will have gone through all three years of the FET phase.

Eight of the field experts were also involved in a benchmarking overview to establish the standing of the subjects internationally and to identify learning pathways in a global market.

2.4 The evaluation instrument for the intended curriculum

The instrument used to evaluate the intended curriculum draws conceptually on two sources.

Firstly, the instruments consider the features associated with the intended national curricula from top-performing countries in international standardized tests. These features include curricula which have:

- Clear, succinct, unambiguous, easily understood, measurable statements of learning (Donnelly, 2005)
- A foundation of essential learning as represented by subject disciplines (Donnelly, 2005) and a strong, discipline-based approach to school subjects (Schmidt et al, 2005)
- Curriculum coherence – the overall sequence or order of the curriculum from one grade to the next, and internal disciplinary principles are evident in the sequencing and progression (Schmidt et al, 2005).

These features appear to be hallmarks of good macro-level curricula.

Secondly the instrument is underpinned by Bernstein’s (1990; 1996) conceptual categories that comprehensively describe the structuring of curriculum and pedagogy, including:

- The relationship between different subjects in the curriculum
- The relationship between topics within subjects
- The relationship between subjects and the everyday world or the world of work
- The specification of the sequencing of the curriculum
- The specification of the pacing of the curriculum
- The specification of knowledge or that which is to be learnt in the curriculum

The evaluation teams involved in the process had to consider the following dimensions of the intended curriculum. These dimensions have been developed and refined over a successive series of Umalusi studies (Umalusi 2004, 2006a, 2006b; 2007; 2008; 2010):

1. Curriculum aims
2. Curriculum coverage, breadth and specification
3. Curriculum weighting, emphasis and depth
4. Curriculum pacing
5. Curriculum sequence and progression
6. Curriculum coherence
7. Specification of pedagogic approaches
8. Assessment guidance
9. Curriculum integration
10. Curriculum format and user-friendliness

These dimensions serve to address both the “Ideal” and “Formal/Written Categories” in the SLO Intended Curriculum Levels.

The instrument used for the curriculum evaluation has been refined by Umalusi to allow for both qualitative and quantitative reporting on the similarities and differences between curricula. It was previously adapted to compare curricula for the fundamentals in the NSC and the NC (V), for example, and for subject comparisons between the NSC and selected international qualifications.

However, in the present analysis of the NSC and the NC (V) subjects, the instrument was not used for directly comparative purposes because of the substantial differences in the structure of the subjects and the roles which they play in the respective qualifications. Questions in the instrument speaking directly to the practical character of the subjects, the student envisaged in the aims and the perceived impact of the curricula on the country, lecturers and students were included.

Umalusi required the evaluators to report on the ten curriculum elements mentioned above. These informed the headings in each of the subject reports. (The numbers in brackets below correspond with the numbering for the sections and sub-sections in the evaluation instrument.)

(1) Broad Curriculum Design

In the first section of the report, evaluators wrote a brief descriptive paragraph on the general design of the curricula. The description of the broad curriculum design required them to refer to all the documents which comprise the curriculum, and to explain the function of each document as well as comment on the central design principle.

The teams were asked to identify and to find evidence for the technical aspect(s) which organize(s) the design of the curriculum. The instrument gave as examples, ‘a spiral curriculum’; ‘outcomes-based”; ‘standards-based”; ‘syllabus’, ‘topic- structured”, for the technical design aspect.

(2) Curriculum aims

Evaluators had to indicate the extent to which the aims are:

- general (related to broad, general societal, economic or political goals);
- generic cross-cutting or cross-field (related to generic skills such as critical thinking or problem solving, relevant across a range of subjects, but which are not subject specific);
- subject-specific (related to the specific subject in question).

The general aims stipulated in the curriculum documents are regarded as reflecting the broadest qualification intentions, and include reference to issues such as responsibility towards the environment; health, safety and security; social transformation and
understanding ethics and values. These general aims will be common to all the subject
curriculum statements or guidelines for a particular qualification – and they may be quite
similar across qualifications coming from a single education and training system.

The **generic cross-cutting aims** are adapted generic aims related to critical cross-field
outcomes, but are translated in the curriculum statement in terms of actual subject content.

The **subject specific aims** are solely related to the core intent / objective of the discipline to
be achieved through the teaching and learning of the subject.

(3) **The ideal student in each programme**

The evaluation team had to describe how each curriculum envisaged its ideal student.
The suggestion to the teams was to infer the nature of the student from the kind of citizen /
student envisaged through the aims.

(4) **Content / skills coverage, breadth and specification**

Umalusi’s evaluators were asked to identify the major content / concepts / topics / skill
areas in the respective Subject Guidelines and to report on the number of topics they had
identified.

Then evaluators were asked to indicate how clearly the content / topics is/are specified,
providing an indication of the depth in which the topics were (to be) dealt with. The degree
of depth was to be recorded as high, medium or low.

**High** (degree of) specification refers to content / topics with extremely clear subject-specific
specification and very little chance for educators to attach multiple interpretations to the
topic.

Moderately clear subject-specific specifications, with some generic statements /skills or some
topics underspecified were judged as a **medium** (degree of) specification of topics.

Where the teams found no clear subject-specific specification or where minimal guidance is
provided for users and multiple interpretations are allowed for, **low** specification is indicated.

From these data, Umalusi’s teams drew conclusions on the breadth and depth of content
included and noted any significant omissions or additions in the respective curricula. So,
for example, the breadth of the curriculum is determined by the number of different topics
specified: the greater the number of topics, the broader the curriculum to be covered in the
given time. It should be noted that a broad curriculum is not in and of itself, ‘a good thing’
since other factors also come into play, as is evident from the sub-sections that follow.

(5) **Weighting**

Umalusi evaluators were asked to determine the percentage of time allocated to each topic
in the curriculum documents.

Different teams found different ways of answering this question, depending on the availability
of information. Some teams, for example, determined the weighting of topics by considering
the mark allocation in the assessment guidelines as an indicator of where teachers were
most likely to spend teaching time. Others considered the topics themselves and estimated
how much time would be required to teach the topic adequately. The third option was to
check whether the documentation is specific about how much classroom time ought to be allocated to a topic, even if this was provided as a form of guidance to the lecturer.

(6) Curriculum emphasis

By referring to the weighting determined above, evaluators were asked to describe where the emphasis lay in terms of content / skill in the curriculum.

(7) Depth

By referring to curriculum coverage, weighting and the level of specification of topics above, evaluators then were able to draw conclusions about the depth provided by the Subject Guidelines, referring to considerations such as the extent to which the curricula provide students with the opportunity to move from a superficial or primitive grasp of a topic to a more refined and powerful grasp of it.²

In other words, the depth of a curriculum refers to the extent to which topics are to be explored. When a topic is given a significant amount of time and the expectation is for engagement at a demanding conceptual level, the topic is considered to have been covered in depth.

Breadth and depth are in constant tension, because the greater the depth expected, the fewer the topics which can be covered in the time available. Ideally, a subject curriculum must attempt to find a balance between these diverging curriculum impulses – something which may be achieved by covering certain topics in greater depth while conceding the need to cover a range of other topics more quickly and in a way that demands less intellectual rigour.

(8) Pacing

The evaluators determined the stipulation of pacing in the Subject Guidelines in terms of the relationship between the volume of learning material (topics to be covered) and the particular timeframe given to the subject. A high degree of specificity is rated as high.

Where a team found a moderate degree of specification of pacing, which provides the broad parameters regarding what should be covered and when over the course of the grade, the specification was considered to be moderate.

Low refers to pacing in instances where how to proceed is at the discretion of the educator and where little or no indication is given of the rate at which content should be covered, much beyond a specification of content per level.

It should be noted, however, that low and high are not necessarily value judgements about pacing. High levels of specification may be thought appropriate where many teachers are poorly educated and trained. Alternatively, high levels of specification could be regarded as unnecessarily constraining on experienced and knowledgeable teachers, especially if there is an insistence on treating a national curriculum as the letter of the law.

(9) Sequencing

Evaluators were asked to describe the level of specification of sequencing in the curricula being evaluated, using the following descriptors:

- **high** indicates that the order in which topics are to be taught is clearly specified and prescribed;
- **moderate** specification refers to situations where a general order in which topics are expected to be taught is suggested, but with allowance for some discretion on the part of the lecturer;
- **low** indicates that there is no particular order indicated in which the educator should present or teach the topics, and the sequencing of content is at the discretion of the lecturer.

Sequencing as a curriculum requirement is much more critical in some subjects than in others. In subjects such as Mathematics and Physical Science, the sequencing of topics is important because earlier content must have been acquired in order to learn more advanced concepts and skills. While all subjects will have some sequencing requirements, the sequencing may be less stringent than in subjects which are, in Bernstein’s terms, horizontal in structure. Nevertheless, sequencing of content can be of great assistance to educators (and others such as materials developers).

(10) Progression

Evaluators were asked to describe the changing nature of topics (and the nature of their treatment) over the course of the three NQF Levels, namely Level 2, 3 and 4 in terms of an increase in the level of complexity / difficulty at which a topic is addressed over the three NQF Levels.

The evaluation teams described the progression as **strong** if they could find evidence of clear movement from one type of related content / concept / skill to another, or a clear progression in terms of increasing complexity or difficulty in a topic from one NQF Level to the next.

Progression is described as **moderate** where some indications of a shift to different content / concepts / skills were found, or where some instances pointed to an increase in the complexity or difficulty at which topics are addressed at different Levels.

The teams identified a curriculum as having **weak** progression when very little indication of progression in terms of shift of content / concept / skill from one level to the next could be found, or where little evidence of increasing complexity or difficulty is evident across levels.

**None** was used as indicator where no shift in the content / concept / skill or change in complexity / difficulty from one level to the next was evident.

Analysis of progression across levels often helps to pinpoint potential difficulties, for example, where a topic may have been introduced in one level, neglected in a second, and then suddenly become both conceptually demanding and difficult in the last of the three levels. Looking for progression helps evaluators to check whether the content is logically organized within a level and then across levels.
(11) Curriculum coherence

Having looked at the curriculum aims, the content / concept / skill coverage, the sequence and the progression in the LPG/SG, the evaluators were required to make a judgement on the coherence of the subject curriculum, by considering the following questions:

- Are there sensible connections and points of coordination between topics that students study in each subject within a level and as they advance through the levels?
- Is there a logical, and if appropriate, hierarchical sequence of knowledge over time?\(^3\)
- Alternatively, are there logical and sensible shifts in the content that is specified at different levels? Is a particular form of reasoning or a conceptual logic evident in the ordering of the knowledge?

(12) Specification of pedagogic approaches

Evaluators were asked to describe the extent to which the Subject Guidelines provide explicit guidance regarding the preferred pedagogic approach(es) to be adopted. The following descriptors are used:

- **high** describes a curriculum where detailed guidance is given regarding the preferred general and/or subject-specific pedagogic approach to be taken;
- **moderate** describes a curriculum where some guidance is given regarding the preferred general and/or subject-specific pedagogic approach to be taken;
- **low** describes a curriculum where the preferred general or subject-specific pedagogic approach is mentioned in a few places but no details are provided;
- **none** describes a curriculum that provides no information or guidance regarding the general and/or subject-specific pedagogic approach.

(13) Assessment

Evaluators were asked to give an overview of the nature and extent of the assessment guidance provided in each of the curricula, including any information offered that would contribute towards a general understanding of the approach taken towards assessment. If this information was included, evaluators were asked to indicate whether both internal and external assessment are required, and if so, what proportion of the total assessment is apportioned to each.

More specifically, evaluators had to indicate the number and types of assessment tasks specified in the Subject Guidelines, and the dominant types of assessment specified.

The degree of specificity of assessment guidance had to be analyzed, using the following descriptors:

- **general** means that only generic assessment guidance is given;
- **subject-specific** means that subject-specific assessment guidelines are provided;
- **both** means that both general guidance and subject-specific guidelines are provided;
- **neither** refers to a curriculum where no assessment guidance is provided at all.

The degree of clarity of guidance regarding assessment was indicated by the use of the following descriptors:

\(^3\) Schmidt explains that content standards that are not based on a progressive structure that is reflective of the discipline seem likely “to appear arbitrary and to look like a ‘laundry list’ of topics” (Schmidt, 2005: 528).
• **high** describes assessment guidance that provides detailed, specific, clear, and comprehensive information, and is not likely to result in differing interpretations of the assessment requirements;
• **moderate** describes assessment guidance that provides moderate amounts of information regarding assessment that is generally clear, but which leaves scope for differing interpretations of the assessment requirements;
• **low** describes assessment guidance that provides only broad statements about assessment that lack clarity and which allow for multiple interpretations;
• **none** describes a curriculum where no guidance regarding assessment is provided.

(14) Integration

Evaluators first considered the degree to which different subjects are consciously integrated across the curriculum, or kept separate, using the following descriptors:

• **high** refers to a curriculum where an effort has been made to understand and encourage integration across a number of different subjects;
• **moderate** refers to a curriculum where, in a few places, reference is made to other subjects, or connections to topics in other subjects are referred to;
• **low** refers to a curriculum where the approach keeps subjects very separate from one another and there is very little or no reference to other subjects.

Evaluators then considered the extent to which explicit relationships and connections are made between topics within the subjects, using the following descriptors:

• **high** refers to a curriculum where an effort has been made to understand and encourage the relationships and connections between different topics within the subject;
• **moderate** refers to a curriculum where, in a few places, relationships and connections between different topics, are referred to;
• **low** refers to a curriculum where there is little or no explicit indication of the relationships and connections between different topics within the subject.

Finally, the evaluators were asked to consider the extent to which explicit relationships and connections are made to students’ everyday knowledge and experience, and whether or not this knowledge is seen to form part of the curriculum. The evaluators used the following descriptors:

• **high** indicates that students’ everyday world and knowledge, the world of work and communities are constantly referenced and form part of the contextualizing knowledge specified in the curriculum;
• **moderate** indicates that students’ everyday world and knowledge, the world of work and of students’ communities are referenced in a few places in the curriculum, but not seemingly as a conscious strategy;
• **low** indicates that the curriculum emphasizes only subject-specific knowledge, and that there are few or no references to the everyday knowledge of students, their communities or the world of work.

(15) Format and user-friendliness of the curriculum documentation

Evaluators were asked to describe the overall volume and format of the curriculum documents, by addressing the following questions:
• How many documents are there for the particular level altogether?
• How many pages are there in each document altogether?
• Is it easy to understand the structuring of information and function of different documents? Are they user-friendly?
• How accessible is the language used in the curriculum? Is it relatively obscure, or does it use plain, direct language?
• Is it clear how different documents relate to one another?

(16) Conclusion

In drawing up their concluding remarks, evaluators were asked to comment on the following:

a) **Structuring of curriculum knowledge**, by answering the following questions:
   
   • To what extent do the curricula provide clear, succinct, unambiguous, measurable statements of learning?
   • To what extent are the curricula based on a foundation of essential learning as represented by subject disciplines?
   • To what extent are the curricula based on a strong, discipline-based approach to the subjects within a particular programme?
   • To what extent do the curricula demonstrate curriculum coherence – i.e. the logic of the overall sequence or order of the curriculum from one level to the next? They were required to mention whether internal disciplinary principles are evident in the sequencing and progression.

b) **Overall guidance and use of curriculum**, by commenting on the suggested pedagogies, user-friendliness and guidance for assessment.

c) **The social project of the curricula**, by describing the ideal student or the theory of the student that is projected across the different curricula, and the central values underpinning the different curricula.

d) **Implications for country, industry, lecturers and students**, by determining how well the curricula prepare students for operational skills and/or systemic thinking (managerial) skills.

e) **Articulation possibilities**, by describing the possible articulation routes applicable for students in the NC (V) as a NQF Level 4 qualification.

(17) Recommendations

Based on their analysis, evaluators were asked to make recommendations to strengthen the curricula. This included commenting on the research instrument and recommendations for further development.

The first round of evaluation focused on the national policy through which the Minister sets the minimum norms and standards for the system, analyzed the ideals entrenched in policy and evaluated the written form it takes on. The second evaluation, however, focused on understanding the assessed curriculum, which serves as a mirror of sorts for what has passed in the classrooms where the curriculum is enacted.
2.5 The instrument for the assessed curriculum

The instrument used in the examination paper evaluation has also been refined by Umalusi to allow for both qualitative and quantitative reporting on the assessed curriculum. It was adapted from the instrument used to compare examined curricula for the NSC with those of the NC (V) for four critical subjects: English First Additional Language, Mathematics, Mathematical Literacy and Physical Science in 2010.

The evaluation instrument requires the evaluators to report on a number of significant assessment elements. These elements include the following:

1. Compliance of examinations with the Assessment Guidelines
2. Evidence of progression from the Level 2 and Level 3 papers to the NC (V) 2011 Level 4 papers
3. Cognitive demand and level of difficulty of the examinations
4. Format and model of the 2011 papers
5. General standard and quality of the 2011 papers.

Evaluators were asked to infer from the Assessment Guidelines (AGs):

- the required levels of cognitive demand;
- the prescribed exam paper format (if any);
- the subject outcomes and assessment tasks or activities;

and then to report on their findings and comment on the quality of the assessment guidance provided, especially in respect of the format, structure, layout and general impression of the examination paper.

2.5.1 Item-by-item examination paper analysis

After the general overview of what the paper holds, evaluators were asked to do an item-by-item analysis of the Level 4 examination papers using the table below:

Table 7: Item-by-item examination paper analysis tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eg.NC380</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Max marks</td>
<td>Type of cognitive demand</td>
<td>Level of Difficulty</td>
<td>Combined type &amp; difficulty level</td>
<td>Content/skill/topic</td>
<td>Comment on placement of item</td>
<td>Suitability / Appropriate item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg.1.1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg.1.1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators had to enter –

a) the exam paper code at the top;

b) the question, or the subsection of the question in Column 1 (C1);

c) the maximum mark for that item in Column 2 (C2);
The type of cognitive demand required in each question had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) using one of the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:

- CK: Conceptual knowledge
- C: Comprehension (Understanding)
- A: Application
- AP: Analysis & Problem-solving
- ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence (using the five category typology below; 
The "combined type and difficulty level" in Column 5 (C5);

- the content/skill required by each question in Column 6 (C6);
- a comment and reason for the demand and level placement of the item in Column 7 (C7);
- the suitability of content and form, the use of the item in future NC (V) paper(s) in Column 8 (C8).

The evaluators were trained to make use of a five-category typology to determine cognitive demand and level of difficulty, based on Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (2001), to determine the cognitive demand and level of difficulty associated with the individual questions and the paper as a whole:

Table 8: Five-category typology to determine cognitive demand and level of difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive categories (Type of demand)</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
<th>Explanation and examples of level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual knowledge (CK)</strong></td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Recognizing obvious facts/content in multiple choice questions, very simple recall; identifying specific data; name, tell; recite; list e.g. identify parts of a whole; match known concepts/words with definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall, recite and remember facts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and describe basic facts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, label, select, locate information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation; appropriate rounding of numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying from data sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of formulae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium content, read and locate, briefly define a term, name and match. Identify answers to what, where, when, which (wh-equivalent) questions from a text/case study; explain particular terminology; Know appropriate vocabulary related to a particular field such as a formula, strategic direction, aspects of sustainable tourism, methods to measure consumer satisfaction, particular ventures, accompaniments, for instance Retrieve information, locate and find required data/information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive categories (Type of demand)</td>
<td>Level of Difficulty</td>
<td>Explanation and examples of level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know and explain appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Recall complex content; identify correct explanation of terminology and use of vocabulary e.g. encapsulation, assertive, dietary allowances, aperitif, amuse bouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know and explain formulae</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Understand and be able to react on responses and actions. Simple relationships of e.g. classes and subclasses; simple explanations; 1 step answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of previously acquired information in a familiar context</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2 steps to arrive at answer (procedures), simple applications; find similar or different uses for terminology. Explain e.g. interpretation of realistic visuals, draw inferences from a text or make a prediction; explain e.g. converting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding information gathering: change or match information</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Describe e.g. an approach, choux product etc. Give explanation of the meaning of particular terms: nutritional values, saturated/unsaturated/polyunsaturated, accumulating. Understanding conventions and giving an explanation of the convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding use of knowledge: distinguish between aspects, compare and explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret and apply knowledge;</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Understand and change applications e.g. adapt a quotation. Know and use formulae; indications of dimensions; Perform well-known procedures in familiar contexts. To use procedures required to solve the problem from the way the problem is posed. (All of the information required is immediately available to the candidate.) Simplify procedures. Apply actions such as formulate checklists, show and display as single application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose, collect and do basic classification of information; Modify existing by making use of the existing knowledge; Using well-known procedures (The required procedure is, however, not immediately obvious from the way the problem is posed.) Candidates to decide for instance on the most appropriate procedure to solve the solution to the question and may have to perform one or more preliminary calculations before determining a solution. Select the most appropriate data from options and decide on best way of application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive categories (Type of demand)</td>
<td>Level of Difficulty</td>
<td>Explanation and examples of level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Use information to describe terminology, do comparisons; draw information from a given text; illustrate; align, propose a course of action based on a straightforward case study; use, run or operate applications; Selecting tools; identify and use procedures; Practical application in own life situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Sort information, for instance, in descending order according to a particular description field. Measure dimensions such as length, time and weight using appropriate measuring instruments sensitive to levels of accuracy. Processes in particular sequence. To be able to make conversions in terms of currency, weight, temperature. To be able to extrapolate e.g. to multiply a recipe to cater for a much larger number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving (AP)</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Determine feasibility of e.g. intended business; simple analysis of procedures, identify strengths and weaknesses. Read and interpret, identify the cause (of a problem) and suggest changes / rectifications. To be able to interpret, make adjustments, provide suggestions / recommendations give reasons for opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis & Problem-solving (AP)
- Analysis of information in a new or unfamiliar context;
- Examine and differentiate;
- Distinguish to find the most appropriate;
- Research and investigate information;
- Solving non-routine, unseen problems by demonstrating higher level understanding and cognitive processes;
- Interpreting and extrapolating from solutions obtained by solving problems based in unfamiliar contexts;
- Using higher level cognitive skills and reasoning to solve non-routine problems;
- Being able to break down a problem into its constituent parts – identifying what is required to be solved and then using appropriate methods in solving the problem;
- Non-routine problems based on real contexts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive categories (Type of demand)</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
<th>Explanation and examples of level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Answering “what if” questions; Solving non-routine, unseen problems by demonstrating higher level understanding and cognitive processes; Qualitative proportional reasoning; more complex relationships or explanations; construction or interpretation of schematic diagrams; problems with 2 or more steps; basic logic leaps; proportional reasoning; interpretation of table of data, investigate, classify, categorize, compare, contact, solve, relate, distinguish, deal with more complex case studies and propose course of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Complex abstract representation; combination of concepts across sub-fields; Interpreting and extrapolating from solutions obtained by solving problems based in unfamiliar contexts. Using higher level cognitive skills and reasoning to solve non-routine problems; Being able to break down a problem into its constituent parts – identifying what is required to be solved and then using appropriate methods in solving the problem. Being able to interpret a problem into its constituent parts – pinpoint the core and using appropriate methods in solving the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) (ES)</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Opinion, giving general critique on a fairly straightforward situation / process/ program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgements (evaluate), critique, and recommend by considering all material available; Weigh possibilities and do recommendations Construct new; Synthesise, create or find innovative solution; Formulate new ideas</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Being able to defend an opinion; provide substantiation for an opinion; critique solutions to problems; critique statements about situations made by others; defend a critical argument. Write data-related feedback Design quotation form and work out an event quotation Work out an itinerary according to particular requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Complex reasoning involving for example synthesis, critical argument linked to abstract contexts. Generalize patterns observed in situations, make predictions based on these patterns and/or other evidence and determine conditions that will lead to desired outcomes. Working with complex problems involving insight and logic-leaps; formulating new equations (using all unknowns; creating new solutions to problems; redesign / rewrite and adapt an existing programme, modify particular procedures or methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting on the findings

Umalusi’s evaluation team used the data collected to compile an analysis report under the following headings:

(1) Introduction

A general overview of the place / role of the particular subject in the NC (V) programme.

(2) Compliance with Assessment Guidelines (AGs)

The extent to which the NC (V) 2011 exam papers comply with Assessment Guidelines (AGs) as set in the curriculum.

(3) Views and findings on the cognitive demand and level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 papers

In terms of their knowledge of the subject and experience in the field, the evaluators were asked to comment on the cognitive demand of the papers and level of difficulty in the papers.

Did the evaluators find evidence of progression from the Level 2 and Level 3 papers towards the Level 4 papers in terms of cognitive demand, complexity and content / skill coverage? Were there notable omissions?

By referring to the data collected in Column 3 and 4 on the analysis table, evaluators were asked to mention whether a cognitive demand is most heavily weighted in the 2011 Level 4 paper; whether a paper can be considered to be leaning towards a particular kind of cognitive demand, or level of difficulty; whether patterns were discernible in this regard.

(4) Format of 2011 papers as a model for future papers

Evaluators were asked to determine whether or not the 2011 Level 4 final papers were a good model for future examinations, or whether their format should be critically re-examined immediately.

(5) General standard and quality of papers

Evaluators were asked to comment on the standard and quality of the 2011 final exam papers especially with regard to language level and format of questions.

(6) Concluding remarks and recommendations

Based on their analysis, evaluators were asked to make recommendations which may be considered in the strengthening of the assessment of the subject. They were also required to evaluate to what extent the package of the intended curriculum and assessed curriculum is likely to provide entry into industry and/or higher education.
The team members made inferences from the data collected, interpreted the data collected in the Excel spread sheets and had to narrate their findings. The evaluation teams were expected to support their professional judgement with quantitative data derived from their scrupulous analysis of the Subject Guidelines, the Assessment Guidelines and the actual examinations set. The teams based their insights on their professional judgements, but had to substantiate statements and what they argued for by tangible evidence. The teams were tasked to find which cognitive category appeared most often in the papers. They determined the level of demand the items require and on what difficulty level within a cognitive category the items are, but they also had to suggest how the items could be improved to ensure effective, reliable and valid assessment.

2.6 The analysis instrument for the Western Australian Vocational Education and Training (VET) investigation

In Chapter 1, mention is made that Phase 2 included an ex post facto evaluation of the Western Australian curricula. For this part of the research Umalusi requested involvement of the Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council. Mr Peter Williams (Manager: Assessment) liaised on behalf of Umalusi with colleagues in the tourism and hospitality fields in Western Australia. Mr Williams made the course material, manuals, reference documents and information about websites and links available to Umalusi.

The teams took note that the course syllabus had to be read together with the Western Australian Certificate in Education (WACE) Manual with information on assessment, moderation and other procedures. The teams furthermore took note of the VET industry-specific course which should be read in conjunction with the relevant training packages. The team had to access the National Training Information Service website (www.ntis.gov.au) which provides information on the training packages.

The following dimensions were included in the investigation:

1. Rationale

The teams were tasked to describe the rationale evident in the documents and to identify any additional intent regarding further education and possible transition expressed in the rationale.

2. Structure and organizing principle

The evaluation teams had to refer to the course layout and the training packages in formulating their opinion on the organizing principle for the course. They also had to comment on the structure of and coherence in the documents.

3. Course content coverage

Regarding the content coverage in the courses, the teams were tasked to access http://employabilityskills.training.com.au and to refer to the units of competency mentioned in the "Training package". Furthermore, they had to discuss briefly how the content reflects knowledge- and skills-development and increasing difficulty levels. The teams had to look for evidence of increasing levels of complexity in topics and content covered in the courses and programmes.
4. Assessment guidance

In order to find answers about how detailed the assessment guidance is to teachers/facilitators and whether teachers/facilitators and learners are adequately guided towards the expectations in assessment, the teams used the following as reference material:
- (SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN WACE COURSES)
- Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council (2008) Workplace Learning Sample Unit Package: Unit 1A – Context: Workplace

5. General

The evaluation teams used the following guiding questions to find answers to the kind and level of competencies fostered in the courses and to note what can be learned to strengthen the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes:

a) In your opinion, what skills and competencies are fostered in and through the particular course?
b) Would you say that the vocational and interpersonal competencies expected to be developed in the course serve as a good foundation for further training in the industry? Explain briefly.
c) Identify and briefly explain any additional intentions found in the documents that would help learners to transfer skills between familiar contexts and across to a variety of unfamiliar contexts.
d) What kind of guidance is evident regarding the requirements for the completion of a course/programme?
e) Mention examples of “best practice” (outstanding practice) which can be considered for implementation in the South African context.

The approach the evaluation teams followed in the analysis, the findings and concluding ideas about the rationale of these courses and programmes in Western Australia and the competencies fostered in these courses are detailed in Chapter 7.
Chapter 3

The Itinerary: The Intended Curriculum Analysis

Umalusi’s evaluation teams for Hospitality and Tourism used the curriculum evaluation instrument in slightly different ways, determined by the fit between every feature of the instrument and the nature of the two programmes.

It is worth noting that, though Umalusi’s evaluation teams began with the same instrument, each team had to grapple with the data at its disposal. Each team consequently worked slightly differently to the other, and reported on their findings in ways suited to their programme.

Client Services and Human Relations is common to both the NC (V) Tourism and Hospitality programmes. The research findings pertaining to that of the Tourism field and that of the Hospitality field will be reported on separately.

3.1 General trends in the curricula of the NC (V) Tourism programme

3.1.1 Introduction

This section considers the four 20-credit vocational subjects in the Tourism programme, namely Science of Tourism, Sustainable Tourism, Client Services and Human Relations and Tourism Operations as an optional subject in the Tourism programme. Based on its focus, the subject of Sustainable Tourism is named slightly differently over the three years: at Level 2, it is called Sustainable Tourism in South Africa; at Level 3, Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and Regional Travel; and at Level 4, it is called Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel.

The topics covered by each of the subjects are:

Science of Tourism

**Level 2:** The Tourism Industry; the Nature of Tourists; Tourism Dynamics; Career Opportunities in the Tourism Industry.

**Level 3:** Tourism as a Business; Processes and Procedures required in a Tourism Business Environment; Sourcing Available Career Opportunities in the Tourism Industry.

**Level 4:** Wholesale and Retail Tourism, incorporating Air Travel; Tourism Legislation

Sustainable Tourism

**Level 2:** Tourism in South Africa; Sustainability of Tourism in South Africa; Conservation and Heritage

**Level 3:** South Africa and Regional Tourism; Contribute to Sustainable Tourism;

**Level 4:** South Africa and International Tourism, Evaluate Tourism Events with respect to Sustainability
Client Services and Human Relations

**Level 2**: Function in a Business Environment; Human Relations with respect to Colleagues with Special Needs; Health and Safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act

**Level 3**: Human Relation Requirements according to the Various Acts; Health and Safety Procedures to ensure a Safe and Secure Environment; The Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care

**Level 4**: The Importance of Staff Development to Human Relations; the Effect of Solved Problems on Client Care; Ways to Ensure the Health and Safety of Clients and Colleagues

Tourism Operations (optional)

**Level 2**: Operate and Maintain Office Equipment; Manage and Store Information; Use the Telephone; Apply Product Knowledge and Make Reservations; Process Payments.

**Level 3**: Tourism Marketing; Tourism Entrepreneurship

**Level 4**: Basic Foreign Exchange Transactions and Conversions; the Itinerary; Excursions and Tours

These subjects are usually considered to be necessary to prepare a person for entry into the tourism industry.

The documents referenced in the Tourism sections dealing with the intended and assessed curriculum analyses are:

**Table 9: Documents referenced in the Tourism sections: intended and assessed curriculum analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Numbers</th>
<th>NC (V) Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Tourism Operations NQF Level 2. Pretoria, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Client Services and Human Relations NQF Level 2. Pretoria, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Sustainable Tourism in South Africa NQF Level 2. Pretoria, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and Regional Travel NQF Level 3. Pretoria, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel NQF Level 4. Pretoria, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2 Content and skills

Umalusi’s Tourism team used the evaluation instrument to analyze the intended curricula of the four subjects included in the NC (V) Tourism programme. The evaluation team’s findings are detailed below:

### 3.1.2.1 Breadth of content covered in the Tourism subjects

The team found that the content/concepts and skills coverage is very wide across all three levels and in all the subjects. The concepts and skills are embedded in the Learning Outcomes of the four subjects. Each subject gives a list of subject focus areas which links to the topics in each subject. The skills required from students in the four subjects are very similar, ranging across Bloom’s cognitive categories, e.g. demonstrating knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Over all, the Tourism curriculum was found to be very packed and intense. In many cases, it was found that far too much content is expected from students in a particular year.

Thus, for example, in **Tourism Operations** Level 2, Topic 5,\(^4\) there are fifteen subject outcomes with one learning outcome aligned to each subject outcome. Fewer subject outcomes would help to narrow the scope and result in more focused learning.

In **Tourism Operations** Level 2, Topic 2: “manage and store information” was found to be too wide; seven subject outcomes were identified, with up to thirteen learning outcomes per outcome.

On the other hand, “Apply product knowledge and make reservations” (Topic 4) was felt to be a most important technical skill requiring bigger scope than it is given.

In the team’s opinion it may be difficult for a student to handle the workload, particularly at Level 3 in **Client Services and Human Relations**: students are required to have knowledge of various acts (12 subject outcomes with up to 9 learning outcomes each); Health and Safety Procedures (9 subject outcomes with 2 to 3 learning outcomes each); Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care (13 subject outcomes with up to 9 learning outcomes each).

\(^4\) Doc T5/2, p.9
3.1.2.2 The depth of content covered in the Tourism subjects

Tourism operations

At Level 3, Entrepreneurship is covered in great depth in twelve Subject Outcomes. It should equip a person to become an entrepreneur. This part of the curriculum provides students with the opportunity to move from an elementary grasp of entrepreneurship to a more refined and powerful understanding, resulting in skill enough to start a small, medium or micro enterprise (SMME). The curriculum starts off with “describe and discuss entrepreneurship”, “assess and improve tourism entrepreneurial characteristics”, “research the potential for a specific SMME” and ends with “compile a business plan based on a budget for an SMME”. This was regarded as an appropriate topic to cover in depth in the programme.

Sustainable Tourism

Sustainable Tourism provides students with the opportunity to move from a local, to a regional, to an international understanding across the three years.

At Level 3, in Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and Regional Travel\(^5\) (NQF 3), regional tourism is covered in great depth across nine Subject Outcomes.

At Level 4\(^6\), the four Subject Outcomes for International Tourism have a large number of Learning Outcomes each, with a comprehensive list of range statements.

Science of Tourism

In the three years, the curriculum provides students with the opportunity to move from a superficial grasp of the tourism industry to a more refined and powerful understanding, ending with wholesale and retail tourism.

Client Services and Human Relations

Health and Safety is enabled by 14 Subject Outcomes across the three years.

At Level 3, the depth of “impact of cultural knowledge on client care” is supported by 13 Subject Outcomes.

Heritage and Cultural Tourism is stressed to the exclusion of other types of tourism, such as Meetings, Incentives, Conferencing and Exhibitions (MICE), adventure, medical, religious and spiritual tourism.

In the Tourism programme, all the subject guideline documents speak of “Job Shadow or Industry Practicum” and “Practical/Application Assessments”. Anecdotal evidence suggests this requirement is not fulfilled in the workplace at Levels 2 and 3, and only rarely at Level 4. At best, a poorly equipped simulated environment in the college must suffice as industry experience/ practical application. This lack of industry experience means that students are not well equipped to exit the programme and enter the workplace seamlessly.

In general, though, the Tourism evaluation team was of the opinion that the depth required in the four subjects is too great for the kind of student in the programme, especially in Levels 2 and 3.

\(^5\) Doc T7/3
\(^6\) Doc T7/4
\(^7\) Docs 4, 5, 6, 7/2-4
Two subjects, in particular, were found to have too great a depth. Examples of this are:

- **Client Services and Human Relations.** Level 2: Topic 4: 10% of the subject deals with health and safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, which seems to be loaded for the level at which it is required.
- **Client Services and Human Relations.** Level 2: Topic 4 Subject Outcome 1 – students have to explain health and safety legislation, which is too advanced for this level.
- **Client Services and Human Relations.** Level 2: Topic 2 Outcome 3: Special needs legislation is also too advanced at this level.
- Briefly explain omnibus allowance available for companies and for frequent overseas business travel.” – even too advanced for Client Services and Human Relations Level 4.
- **Tourism Operations.** Topic 3: “Excursions and tours” – again there is too much depth. It was suggested that some of this could form part of an internal and integrated assessment task.

### 3.1.2.3 Weighting of content/skills

The NC (V) allocates 200 hours of teaching and learning time per subject per level. No indication of the amount of time to be spent per topic is given.

However, topics are allocated “Weighted Values”. A member of the evaluation team, who is also a FET lecturer, reported that the lecturers use the “weighted values” as estimated time to be spent per topic.

The table below indicates the weighting for the four Tourism subjects:

#### Table 10: Weighting of content / concepts / skills in the NC (V) Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (content / concept and skills)</th>
<th>Level 2 (T4/2)</th>
<th>Level 3 (T4/3)</th>
<th>Level 4 (T4/4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science of Tourism</strong>&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The Tourism Industry Weighing: 25% 1. Subject Outcomes (4 LOs each)</td>
<td>Tourism as a Business Weighing: 50% 5 Subject Outcomes (2-5 LOs each)</td>
<td>Wholesale and Retail Tourism, incorporating Air Travel Weighing: 55% 10 Subject Outcomes (1-9 LOs each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Nature of Tourists Weighing: 25% 2. Subject Outcomes (2-4 LOs each)</td>
<td>Processes and Procedures required in a Tourism Business Environment Weighing: 35% 11 Subject Outcomes (1-6 LOs each)</td>
<td>Tourism Legislation Weighing: 45% 3. Subject Outcomes (1-9 LOs each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism Dynamics</strong>&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>tourism dynamics Weighing: 25% 4. Subject Outcomes (2-5 LOs each)</td>
<td>Sourcing Available Career Opportunities in the Tourism Industry Weighing: 15% 3 Subject Outcomes (2-4 LOs each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Opportunities in the Tourism Industry</strong>&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Career Opportunities in the Tourism Industry Weighing: 25% 3 Subject Outcomes (2-4 LOs each)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>5</sup> Doc T5/4  
<sup>6</sup> Doc T4/2/3/4  
<sup>10</sup> Doc T5/4  
<sup>11</sup> On p. 4 of all Subject documents  
<sup>12</sup> Doc T4/2/3/4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (content / concept and skills)</th>
<th>Level 2 (T4/2)</th>
<th>Level 3 (T4/3)</th>
<th>Level 4 (T4/4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tourism Operations**<sup>13</sup> | Operate and Maintain Office Equipment  
*Weighting: 10%*  
4 Subject Outcomes (4-6 LOs each) | Tourism Marketing  
*Weighting: 40%*  
7 Subject Outcomes (3-6 LOs) | Basic Foreign Exchange Transactions and Conversions  
*Weighting: 25%*  
2 Subject Outcomes (5 and 9 LOs each) |
| **Manage and Store Information**  
*Weighting: 30%*  
7 Subject Outcomes (4-13 LOs each) | Tourism Entrepreneurship  
*Weighting: 60%*  
12 Subject Outcomes (3-10 LOs) | The Itinerary  
*Weighting: 25%*  
3 Subject Outcomes (1-11 LOs each) |
| **Use the Telephone**  
*Weighting: 10%*  
1 Subject Outcomes (13 LOs) | *| Excursions and Tours  
*Weighting: 50%*  
10 Subject Outcomes (3-7 LOs each) |
| **Apply Product Knowledge and Make Reservations**  
*Weighting: 30%*  
6 Subject Outcomes (1-9 LOs each) | *| *|
| **Process Payments**  
*Weighting: 20%*  
15 Subject Outcomes (1 LO each) | *| *|
| **Client Services and Human Relations**<sup>14</sup> | Function in a Business Environment  
*Weighting: 40%*  
18 Subject Outcomes (1-9 LOs each) | Human Relation Requirements according to the Various Acts  
*Weighting: 35%*  
12 Subject Outcomes (2-9 LOs each) | The Importance of Staff Development to Human Relations  
*Weighting: 20%*  
11 Subject Outcomes (1-5 LOs each) |
| Human Relations with respect to Colleagues with Special Needs  
*Weighting: 20%*  
5 Subject Outcomes (1-3 LOs each) | Health and Safety Procedures to ensure a Safe and Secure Environment  
*Weighting: 5%*  
9 Subject Outcomes (2-3 LOs each) | The Effect of Solved Problems on Client Care  
*Weighting: 50%*  
19 Subject Outcomes (2-6 LOs each) |
| Client Services in a Cultural Context  
*Weighting: 30%*  
6 Subject Outcomes (2-7 LOs each) | The Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care  
*Weighting: 60%*  
13 Subject Outcomes (1-9 LOs each) | Ways to ensure the Health and Safety of Clients and Colleagues  
*Weighting: 30%*  
3 Subject Outcomes (4-7 LOs each) |
| Health and Safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act  
*Weighting: 10%*  
2 Subject Outcomes (4 and 5 LOs each) | *| *|

<sup>13</sup> Doc T5/2/3/4  
<sup>14</sup> Doc T6/2/3/4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (content / concept and skills)</th>
<th>Level 2 (T4/2)</th>
<th>Level 3 (T4/3)</th>
<th>Level 4 (T4/4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustainable Tourism in South Africa\(^{15}\) | Tourism in South Africa  
Weighting: 50%  
4 Subject Outcomes  
(3-9 LOs) | South Africa and Regional Tourism  
Weighting: 75%  
Subject Outcomes  
(2-4 LOs each) | South Africa and International Tourism  
Weighting: 60%  
5 Subject Outcomes  
(2-15 LOs each) |
| Sustainability of Tourism in South Africa  
Weighting: 25%  
8 Subject Outcomes  
(1-5 LOs each) | Contribute to Sustainable Tourism  
Weighting: 25%  
5 Subject Outcomes  
(2-6 LOs each) | Evaluate Tourism Events with respect to Sustainability  
Weighting: 40%  
9 Subject Outcomes  
(2-6 LOs each) |
| Conservation and Heritage  
Weighting: 25%  
7 Subject Outcomes  
(1-3 LOs each) | | | |

In summary, Health and Safety is stressed throughout the three years in **Client Services and Human Relations**:

- 10% in NQF 2;
- 40% in NQF 3;
- 30% in NQF 4.

Within subjects, the greatest emphasis is placed on:

- “Entrepreneurship” in **Tourism Operations** Level 3 (60% of the year’s weighted value);
- “Impact of cultural knowledge on client care” has a 60% weighting in **Client Services and Human Relations** (NQF 3);
- “South Africa and Regional Tourism” has a weighting of 75% in **Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and Regional Travel**\(^{16}\) (NQF 3);
- “South Africa and International Tourism” has a weighting of 60% in **Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel**\(^{17}\) (NQF 4)

However, in the four subjects the weighted value for the topics does not correspond to the different sizes of the topics (some of which have eight Subject Outcomes, while others have only two Subject Outcomes).

### 3.1.3 Organising principle and coherence

In the NC (V) Tourism, topics are distributed randomly over the three years and across the subjects, with little or no scaffolding evident within subjects, which suggests that no organizing principle serves to structure the Tourism programme or the three qualifications.

Three subjects in the Tourism programme, viz, **Tourism Operations**, **Science of Tourism** and **Client Services and Human Relations** do not have a clear overarching curriculum structure. Topics appear quite randomly at any level. There is little evidence of progression through changes in content / concept / skill, or changes in levels of complexity and/or difficulty.

\(^{15}\) Doc T7/2/3/4  
\(^{16}\) Doc T7/3  
\(^{17}\) Doc T7/4
However, **Sustainable Tourism** does have a clear progression over the three years.

In the Tourism and Hospitality programmes, customer care is central to the service ethic required in these industries. This is evident in Topic 4 throughout the three years of **Client Services and Human Relations**. In Level 2 of this subject, this topic is worked into the other three topics as and when appropriate, making it a recurring theme throughout.

The four Tourism subjects required in each year do, however, cover in broad terms what would be required of a person studying a course on Tourism. The four subjects are broadly complementary.

### 3.1.4 Sequence, progression and pacing

The four Tourism subjects have a low specification of sequencing, which means that topics to be taught are not presented in any particular order, and the teaching sequence is therefore at the discretion of the lecturer.

The team found that topics are presented without scaffolding or logical development. At times, even within the list of Learning Outcomes, a topic unrelated to the other outcomes is introduced in the list. So, for example, in **Client Services and Human Relations Level 4** has two Learning Outcomes regarding relaying vital information on a patient’s condition and documenting emergency situations. This is followed immediately by ‘Identifying a basic First Aid Programme for employees’.

In **Tourism Operations**, the sequence of topics is very disjointed. For example at Level 4, the concept of “forex” is introduced for the first time; travel allowances, bank selling rate and buying rate are also new concepts that are introduced only at this level, but could be more gradually introduced across the three years. At Level 2, Topic 4, Outcome 2 states “Demonstrate ability to make a reservation”, but the first reference to an itinerary is only in Level 4, Topic 2. The evaluation team is of opinion that “the itinerary” should be included as a topic in the Level 2 curriculum.

In general, the topics are haphazardly arranged, with Learning Outcomes quite arbitrarily listed, sometimes with a lot of repetition of Learning Outcomes within a subject within the same year.

The exception, rather than the rule here, is Subject Outcome 3 in the **Science of Tourism**, which has this flowing progression:

- Identifying tourists;
- Identifying the interests of various tourists;
- Identifying the expectations of various tourists;
- Explaining the reasons why different tourists travel.

The rule, rather than the exception above, looks more like this: in **Science of Tourism**, Subject Outcome 7.2.5 refers to cross-border rental car travel and then only later in Subject Outcome 7.2.10 does it speak of making car rental reservations. Throughout the subjects, topics are often repeated at different stages, without considerations of scaffolding or logical sequence, to ensure student progression.

---
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Thus, within **Tourism Operations, Science of Tourism** and **Client Services and Human Relations**, no evidence of progression could be found. Topics are randomly assigned to each of the three years. So, for example, where a topic like “Safety” appears over the three years of **Client Services and Human Relations**, no clear progression of conceptualization or difficulty of subject matter is evident and the Learning Outcomes seem to be randomly distributed across the three years.

However, in **Sustainable Tourism** there is a strong progression over the three years, which is even indicated in the changing subject titles:

- **Sustainable Tourism in South Africa**;\(^{22}\)
- **Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and Regional Travel**;\(^{23}\)
- **Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel**;\(^{24}\)

Topic 1 in all three years progresses from local to regional to international travel. Topic 2 (Sustainability) progresses from a conceptualization of sustainability to personal contribution, to evaluation.

It is worth remembering that each of the three NQF levels was supposedly written as an exit level qualification. However, with the lack of progression within three of the subjects, and the lack of progression across the three years in these subjects, the structure frequently looks more like a three-year course spread over the three levels.

Furthermore, the student exiting at Level 2 is meant to be prepared for “employment at an elementary level”.\(^{25}\) The South African Organizing Framework for Occupations classifies “elementary occupations” applicable to hospitality and tourism as “cleaners, helpers, and food preparation assistants”. In terms of the content and skills, there is clearly not a fit between the purpose of the Level 2 qualification and the Framework for Occupations. The “Organizing Framework for Occupations”\(^{26}\) places “tourist guides and travel consultants, tourist information officers” on Band 4, and “call-centre operators, data capturers, hotel receptionists, and office administrators” on Band 5. It is therefore debatable whether NC (V) candidates NQF 2 and 3 from a Further Education and Training (FET) college can be placed on these occupational bands.

In summary, based on the analysis of the curricula, it is the Umalusi team’s contention that the three levels would be better treated as one qualification with an exit at NQF Level 4.

---
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\(^{25}\) National Certificate: Vocational Level 2 (NLRD 50440), p.1
\(^{26}\) Department of Higher Education: Organising Framework for Occupations, Johannesburg, 2012
3.1.5 Aims, purpose, vision, general outcomes and articulation

3.1.5.1 Central design principle for the Tourism programme

The evaluation team found the curricula underpinning the NC (V) Tourism programme to be outcomes-based. Each subject is described in terms of Topics, which are unpacked as Subject Outcomes, each further described as Learning Outcomes.

The NC (V) Level 4 curricula are set at NQF Level 4, which coincide with the National Curriculum Statement (NSC) at Grade 12 for the National Senior Certificate.

The curriculum aims of the four subjects are:

**Science of Tourism**

Generally, students are:

- encouraged to think logically;
- develop their analytical ability.

More specifically, the subject aims at enabling students to:

- understand the nature and structure of the tourism environment and industry and to select a suitable tourism career path;
- collect, analyze, organize and critically evaluate information that will serve the development of the national tourism industry;
- demonstrate an understanding of the world in general, and tourism in particular, as a set of interrelated systems by recognizing that problem-solving contexts do not exist in isolation;
- categorize tourist types according to their needs;
- explore education and career opportunities by examining all the various sectors of the tourism industry and (through practical work) experiencing some employment possibilities.

**Client Services and Human Relations**

The subject aims at:

- Contributing to the personal development of each student and the social and economic development of society, by making students aware of the importance of self-improvement as key to personal success.

Generally, students are encouraged to:

- communicate effectively with clients, using visual and/or language skills in the modes of oral and and/or written presentation whilst showing awareness of possible communication barriers such as language or cultural chasms;
- develop a sense of urgency because time is money and no client likes to be kept waiting;
- create a safe environment for staff and clients;
- encourage sensitivity to the needs of their fellow human beings.

---
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• reflect on and explore a variety of strategies to learn more effectively those service characteristics and skills that are needed in a service business.

More specifically, the subject aims at:

• instilling a culture of client satisfaction in all employees working in the tourism industry by equipping them with ways of achieving it;
• identifying and solving problems that arise, either in the daily running of a tourism enterprise or when dealing with the general needs of tourists as clients. Students’ responses will indicate that responsible decisions, using critical and creative thinking, have been made;
• working effectively with others in a variety of contexts: as a staff member in the tourism office; as part of a service excellence team; as leader or guide to a tour group; as member of a particular organization or as a member of a tourism project to involve and benefit the local community.

Sustainable Tourism in South Africa

The subject aims at:

• creating a sense of responsibility amongst the tourism workers of tomorrow.

Generally, students are encouraged to:

• conduct themselves as responsible citizens participating in the lives of local, national and global communities by not only serving in a travel industry that makes physical interaction between local, national and global possible but also striving to preserve those very communities through sound sustainable tourism practices;
• establish a culture of sustainability that can be spread into all communities throughout South Africa;
• critically evaluate information to advise clients to satisfy their needs;
• be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of social contexts when interacting with tourists from all walks of life and from all over the world;
• make informed decisions using their extensive knowledge of South Africa.

More specifically, the subject aims at:

• providing basic skills such as map reading and giving directions;
• providing the tourism student with very basic knowledge about popular international tourist destinations and overseas travel (Level 4);
• giving a solid understanding of concepts like sustainability, heritage and conservation to help imbed successful tourism practices in students.

Tourism Operations

The subject generally aims at encouraging students to:

• organize and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effectively to use sound business and marketing skills and to combine these with the basics of Science of Tourism to successfully work towards a tourism industry where service excellence is the main objective.
More specifically, the subject aims at developing in students:

• the ability to master the practicalities of starting a new tourism business venture and the use of marketing resources;
• the combination of Tourism knowledge with entrepreneurial and marketing skills to plan a career or to create self-employment in the tourism industry;
• the effective and critical use of modern technology towards faster and more accurate tourism administration, always showing responsibility towards the environment and the health of others in the spirit of conservation;
• entrepreneurial opportunities such as starting up tourism SMMEs by examining marketing principles and entrepreneurial skills and by developing business plans;
• the ability to perform accurately forex exchange transactions and conversions;
• the ability to plan an itinerary to meet the needs of specific tourists.

It is clear, when one considers the accumulated aims of the four subjects that the intent is to develop a thinking, empathetic and sensitized person with a good general knowledge of the tourism industry and with a well-developed set of skills suited to work. The package of aims would suggest that the programme, if properly taught, would go a long way to developing a professional identity suited to the industry. This is confirmed by the analysis which emerged from considering the profile of the idea student as represented in the curricula.

3.1.5.2 The profile of the ideal student perceived in each of the subjects in the Tourism programme

Science of Tourism

• The student must be a people-centred person; somebody who is prepared to render excellent customer service at all times.
• He or she must be a person with sound communication skills who is willing to pursue interpersonal skills. The student must be avidly interested in travel and tourism.
• The student must be a person with keen powers of observation regarding the various media types to stay abreast with the latest developments, daily news, happenings in the industry and especially to always broaden his or her general knowledge.

Client Services and Human Relations

• The student must have good communication skills and creative flair.
• The student must be people-centred and a people “pleaser”.
• The student must have problem-solving skills and keen powers of observation.

Sustainable Tourism

• The student must be interested in travel, physical geography, routes and sightseeing.
• Students should have an active interest in the natural environment.
• Students should have a flair for explaining things and clarifying matters.
• They must have problem-solving skills, keen powers of observation and a feeling of responsibility to the environment and community.
• They must have an interest in history, heritage and culture.
Tourism Operations

The student must show a penchant for orderly, systematic work.
• He or she must have problem-solving skills and keen powers of observation.
• Good communication skills are essential.
• The student must have business sense while an interest in modern technology will be an advantage.

3.1.5.3 Articulation options

In the absence of any clearly articulated options, the evaluation team mapped an articulation pathway for students awarded the NC (V) Tourism Certificate. This includes entry to further industry-based study or entry to tertiary study as two possible options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Career Paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NQF Level 5: 1-year Certificate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry College or FET and Private College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Booking Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check in Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NQF Levels 6 – 10: Certificate/Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Tourism Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Operator Marketing and Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Tourism Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Marketing Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Articulation options for NC (V) Tourism students

3.1.6 Teaching approach and subject methodology

The Tourism Subject Guidelines do not offer any pedagogical support to Tourism lecturers in any of the subjects.

There is no clear indication regarding different teaching methodologies used at FET colleges. Colleges liaise with one another concerning the subject but each lecturer does his/her own lesson planning and development. Certain Provincial Departments, such as Gauteng, Western Cape and Northern Cape, play a role in moderation and assisting lecturers where necessary. However, this approach is not necessarily followed in all the provinces.
3.1.7 Assessment guidance

3.1.7.1 Assessment structure for NC (V)

3.1.7.1.1 Internal continuous assessment (ICASS)

Knowledge, skills values, and attitudes (SKVAs) are assessed throughout the year using assessment instruments such as projects, tests, assignments, investigations, role-play and case studies. The ICASS practical component is to be undertaken in a real workplace, a workshop or a “Structured Environment”. This component is moderated internally and externally, and quality assured by Umalusi and the National Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). All ICASS evidence is to be kept in a Portfolio of Evidence (PoE) and must be readily available for monitoring, moderation and verification purposes.

3.1.7.1.2 External summative assessment (ESASS)

The external summative assessment is either a single paper or a set of written papers set to the requirements of the Subject Learning Outcomes. The National Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) and its provincial counterparts now administer the theoretical component and the Integrated Summative Assessment Task (ISAT) according to relevant assessment policies.

A compulsory component of External Summative Assessment (ESASS) is the ISAT. This ISAT draws on the students’ cumulative learning throughout the year. The task requires integrated application of competence and is executed under strict assessment conditions. The task should take place in a workplace, a simulated or “structured environment”. The ISAT is the most significant test of students’ ability to apply their acquired knowledge.

In the Assessment Guidelines for the four subjects, internal assessment links the topics, the learning outcome and a specific assessment standard. Possible forms of assessment are also indicated for the specific topic.

Internal moderation and external moderation are mentioned in the Tourism Assessment Guidelines. Assessment must be moderated according to the internal moderation policy of the FET College. Internal college moderation is supposed to be a continuous process. The moderator’s involvement starts with the planning of assessment methods and instruments and is followed by continuous collaboration with and support for the assessors. Internal moderation creates common understanding of Assessment Standards and maintains these across vocational programmes.

External moderation is now conducted by the National Department of Higher Education and Training Education, Umalusi and, where relevant, an Education and Training Quality Assurance (ETQA) body according to South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and Umalusi standards and requirements.
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28 National Department of Education in the original document
29 National Department of Education in the original document
30 Doc TA8/4, p.10
31 National Department of Education in the original document
32 Doc TA11/4, p. 4
3.1.7.1.3 **Number of Assessment Tasks**

The Assessment Guidelines state the number of assessment tasks to be done. It is clear that there are too many assessments tasks – sixteen in all, across the four Tourism subjects – which effectively need to be completed in three terms. Umalusi’s evaluation team was of opinion that students are over-assessed.

3.1.7.1.4 **Types of Assessment Tasks**

Although types of assessment, e.g. baseline assessment, are indicated in the Assessment Guidelines, these references are generic in nature in all four subjects and levels. Dominant forms of assessment evidence, indicated in the Subject Guidelines for all subjects, include tests, internal examinations, assignments, practical exercises, case studies and practical examinations in simulated business environments. A good balance is required between theoretical and practical assessments.

3.1.7.1.5 **Specificity of assessment guidance**

The assessment guidance is both general and specific; however this is captured in the Assessment Guidelines only and not the Subject Guidelines.

3.1.7.1.6 **Clarity of assessment**

Additional clear guidelines and examples could be provided, for example, regarding specific case studies. Actual exemplars of good quality assessment tasks would help to clarify the expected levels of assessment.

3.1.8 **Availability and user-friendliness of the programme**

3.1.8.1 **Integration between different subjects**

Integration between the different subjects is generally low among the four vocational subjects and the three fundamentals (English First Additional Language, Mathematics/Mathematical Literacy and Life Orientation).

Notable exceptions among the vocational subjects are a high level of integration between:

- Science of Tourism: linking with Sustainable Tourism
- Tourism Operations: linking with Client Services and Human Relations
- Sustainable Tourism: linking with Science of Tourism

3.1.8.2 **Relationship between subjects and everyday knowledge**

There is a moderate degree of integration between these subjects and everyday knowledge:

- Sustainable Tourism: use of a range of maps
- Client Services and Human Relations: communication skills

---
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3.1.8.3 Relationship between subjects and the world of work

The evaluation team found a moderate relationship in this respect in:

- Tourism Operations: Information on career opportunities\(^{38}\)
- Science of Tourism: Self-employment\(^{39}\)
- Sustainable Tourism: Reflect on own contribution to sustainability within the tourism enterprise\(^{40}\)
- On the theoretical level, various aspects are covered related to the world of work; however these are not practically addressed.

3.1.8.4 Subject Guidelines

The Subject Guidelines are to a certain extent user-friendly, although not enough information is always provided. A lack of specific planning guidelines creates challenges, because currently the topics need to be clustered to create a logical sequence. The guidelines provided for the simulation room are very generic and could relate better to the tourism industry. The document states that “it is advised that a practicum room is available on each campus (where applicable) for practical assessment”.

3.1.8.5 Assessment Guidelines

The Assessment Guideline documents are currently both generic and subject specific. It would be better to focus on subject specific guidelines as the documents tend to be long and repetitive across subjects.

3.1.8.6 How do the guideline documents relate to one another?

The Subject and Assessment Guideline documents relate to one another in terms of the subject and learning outcome titles. However in the guideline documents bullets are used, which makes cross-referencing very difficult.

3.1.8.7 Accessibility of the language

The level of language used in the subject and assessment guidelines is clear and easy to follow and understand.

3.1.9 Concluding comments on the subject curricula for the Tourism programme

The first finding is that there is extremely limited internal coherence within the Tourism programme. There is little congruence between Topics, Subject Outcomes and Learning Outcomes. Thus, for example, “tourism legislation” (which refers to international travel arrangements) is placed in Tourism Operations (which is an optional subject) and not linked with international travel in Sustainable Tourism. In addition, the unnecessary repetition of “Health and Safety” over different subjects and over years of study could be consolidated into a coherent, developmental growth in understanding. Moreover in the four subjects the “Weighted Value” for the topics does not correspond to the different sizes of the topics (some of which have eight Subject Outcomes, while others have only two Subject Outcomes).

\(^{38}\) Doc T5/2, p.8
\(^{39}\) Doc T5/3, p.10
\(^{40}\) Doc T6/2, p.9
The second finding is that there needs to be more careful consideration of which topics are pitched at which of the three levels to ensure progression (e.g. in Science of Tourism (NQF2) “marketing segmentation in terms of a business lifecycle” is better placed with the “marketing plan” in Tourism Operations (NQF 3). 

A third and important finding is that students are not required to demonstrate sufficient reflexivity. The tourism industry requires staff to reflect critically on their own and others’ performance.

A fourth finding is that the subjects over the three years are seriously overloaded. It would be more advantageous to students if they had fewer topics, covered in greater depth. Schwartz et al. (2008) report that students who study at least one major topic in depth for a month or longer in high school, earn higher grades in college. Students reporting breadth in coverage in their high school course, covering all major topics, do not appear to have any advantage in chemistry or physics and are at a significant disadvantage in biology in college. In the light of this study, Umalusi’s evaluation team questions the size of the curricula underpinning the Tourism programme which have great breadth treated at a largely superficial level. There can be a judicious pruning and consolidation of the four subjects so that greater depth is achieved.

A fifth finding is that while articulation between the FET NC (V) Tourism and HET can be described on paper, it is not easily operationalized. There is no specified and preferred articulation towards higher education qualifications in Tourism.

A sixth finding is that the NC (V) Tourism as currently presented in FET colleges does not have enough contact with the tourism industry. The evaluation team feels strongly that a college simulated environment cannot replace work placement.

---
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3.2 General trends in the curricula of the NC (V) Hospitality programme

This section considers the four, 20-credit vocational subjects in the Hospitality programme, namely Food Preparation, Hospitality Generics, Client Services and Human Relations and Hospitality Services as an optional subject in the Hospitality programme.

The topics covered by each of the subjects are:

Food Preparation

**Level 2:** Food Production; Introduction to the Cleaning of Different Equipment, Utensils and Materials
**Level 3:** Food Production
**Level 4:** Food Production; Acceptance and Storage of Food Deliveries

Hospitality Generics

**Level 2:** Food Hygiene; Handling and Disposing of Waste
**Level 3:** Nutritional Needs of Healthy Individuals; Planning and Costing of Menus; How to Operate a Pay Point and Process Payments
**Level 4:** Health, Safety and Security; Developing of Menus; Managing One’s Own Development; Sourcing Information about Self-employment Opportunities

Hospitality Services (optional)

**Level 2:** Food and Beverage Services; Accommodation Services
**Level 3:** Food and Beverage Services; Accommodation Services
**Level 4:** Food and Beverage Services; Planning and Conducting Meetings; Maintaining the Receipt, Storage and Issue of Goods

Client Services and Human Relations

**Level 2:** Function in a Business Environment; Human Relations with respect to colleagues with special needs; Health and Safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act
**Level 3:** Human Relations Requirements according to the various acts; Health and Safety Procedures to ensure a Safe and Secure Environment; The Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care
**Level 4:** The Importance of Staff Development to Human Relations; The effect of Solved Problems on Client Care; Ways to Ensure the Health and Safety of Clients and Colleagues

All these subjects are usually considered to be necessary to prepare a person for entry into the hospitality industry.

The documents referenced in the Hospitality sections dealing with the intended and assessed curriculum analysis are:
The Hospitality evaluation team developed a matrix that analyzed the content, concepts and skills covered in the four subjects across Levels 2 - 4. Content, concepts and skills were not treated as separate entities, but were treated as inextricably bound together within the subjects.

Concerns noted by the evaluation team during this analysis were:

- It is unclear when some topics of this curriculum are intended to be a theoretical concept or a practical skill. The risk associated with this is that topics may be interpreted differently by different lecturers. Lecturer training or more comprehensive curriculum guidelines are therefore of the utmost importance.

  However, this non-distinction is not seen as completely problematic. It is accepted that much of the content and concepts should result in applied knowledge.

- The learning outcomes are sometimes unrelated amongst themselves. In some cases, no clear logical evidence is available as to how a learning outcome links to the subject outcome.

3.2.1.1 Breadth of content covered in the Hospitality programme

Generally, the coverage of knowledge/concepts/skills over the four subjects is wide.

Food Preparation

The content and concepts weigh about 30.5% of the total curriculum and 69.5% is allocated to skills as indicated in this table:
Table 12: Weighting of concepts and skills for Food Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29 (35%)</td>
<td>55 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19 (40%)</td>
<td>28 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
<td>33 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breadth of the subject appears to be wide, because the curriculum covers a broad spectrum of relevant topics. According to these data the subject is highly skill-related.

Hospitality Generics

Levels 2 and 3 consist of 7 topics each while Level 4 covers 4 topics, thus a total of 18 topics. The concepts in this subject are typical of the topics related to Hospitality Generics. Emphasis is placed on the concepts, not on skills development. Level 2 consists of 100% concepts, Level 3 of approximately 87% concepts and 13% skills and Level 4 consists of more or less 14% skills and 86% concepts. Students need good comprehension of concepts before they can be practised as skills.

Hospitality Services

The Learning Outcomes in the various topics reflect a combination of knowledge, skills and Critical and Developmental Outcomes that underpin the subject-specific content and skills. The approximate concept vs. skills vs. critical and developmental outcomes for each level of the subject are:

Table 13: Weighting of concepts and skills for Hospitality Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content/concept</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Critical Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportionate reflection of each of these over the progression from Levels 2 to 4 reflects an almost equal emphasis on knowledge and skills in Level 2 compared with the higher levels. The distribution of content vs. skills in Level 4 reflects a much higher emphasis on the development of concepts and knowledge than skills. As this level reflects a more supervisory level (as indicated by the content of the topics in the curriculum), it was considered by the evaluation team to be appropriate in the curriculum. The team felt that this indicated sound curriculum development over the three levels.

An important omission from the curriculum is the topic “table setting. Also, the topic “table drinks service” only makes provision for wine and non-alcoholic drinks, but malt and spirits are omitted.

In many learning outcomes, no clear distinction is made between the acquisition of knowledge and mastery of the skill, which potentially makes this difficult to interpret as much needs to be inferred from the learning outcomes. Actual skills are not always explicitly addressed and the learning outcomes are sometimes difficult to interpret due to the way in which they are expressed. For example, with “Identify procedures for handling, cleaning and storing food service items”, it is unclear if the requirement is knowledge- or skills-based.
The curriculum for Hospitality Services is considered to cover a broad range of topics relevant to developing hospitality service skills in a range of functional areas.

**Client Services and Human Relations**

In the view of the evaluation team, students may find the workload in this subject difficult to handle, particularly at Level 2; they are, for example, required to have knowledge of various acts (12 Subject Outcomes with up to 9 learning outcomes each); Health and Safety Procedures (9 Subject Outcomes with 2 to 3 Learning Outcomes each); Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care (13 Subject Outcomes with up to 9 Learning Outcomes each).

In summary, the NC (V) Hospitality programme covers food and beverage topics as well as topics in the other sectors in the hospitality industry, namely client services and human relations. It also includes the generics in hospitality as a separate subject. The evaluation team concluded that, as a vocational qualification, the programme as a whole reflects significant degree of breadth. As has been indicated above, the range which students are expected to cover may be too ambitious overall, and greater clarity is required as to whether students are requires to demonstrate the skills in the curricula, or whether they simply are expected to have acquired the theoretical background.

**3.2.1.2 The depth of content covered in the Hospitality programme**

**Food Preparation**

Increasing depth of understanding across the three years of study in this subject is low; one topic is repeated on a higher level. “Vegetables” in Level 2, is repeated in Level 4 on a more advanced level. The curriculum does not appear to return to topics to deal with them in greater depth over the course of the three years.

**Hospitality Generics**

The topics and sub-topics in the curriculum over the three-year period provide the student with moderate depth of knowledge in generic hospitality knowledge and skills. Different aspects of health and hygiene are covered in Levels 2 and 3 to provide the student with more extensive knowledge and skills required to operate successfully in the industry. Initially the student is introduced to “personal health and hygiene”, where after hygiene in food preparation is covered. The student acquires progressively more depth on health and menu planning from Level 3 to 4 to ensure sufficient final in-depth understanding of the topic. The evaluation team concluded therefore that the depth across this subject is moderate.

**Hospitality Services**

A range of topics is covered in Hospitality Services, ranging from the food and beverage department, to the accommodation services department. In addition, other complementary topics such as stores management are included, which are applicable to different departments.

Level 2 does not go into much depth, but as the topics progress over the three years, the depth of knowledge becomes greater. For example, beverage/wine service starts off with “preparing for beverage service” in Level 2, develops into “providing service for beverages” in Level 3, and in Level 4 goes into significant depth on wine studies, preparing cocktails and maintaining a drinks service, which is a supervisory skill.
Client Services and Human Relations

Health and Safety across the three years is enabled by fourteen Subject Outcomes indicating that this topic is dealt with in considerable depth.

At Level 3, the depth of “impact of cultural knowledge on client care” is supported by thirteen Subject Outcomes, and is weighted at 60% of the Level 3 curriculum.

In the Hospitality Programme, all the subject guideline documents speak of “Job Shadow or Industry Practicum” and “Practical/Application Assessments”. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that practicals are not done in the workplace at Levels 2 and 3, and only rarely at Level 4. At best, a poorly equipped simulated environment in the college must suffice as ‘industry experience/practical application’. This lack of industry experience means that students are not well equipped to exit the programme and enter the workplace seamlessly.

In general, though, the consensus was that the depth required in the four subjects is likely to be too great for the level of the students, especially in Levels 2 and 3. In the following instances the subject deals with too great a depth:

- Level 2 Topic 4: 10% of the subject deals with health and safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, which seems to be loaded for the level at which it is required.
- Level 2: Topic 4 Subject Outcome 1 – students have to explain health and safety legislation, which is too advanced for this level.
- Level 2: Topic 2 Outcome 3: Special needs legislation is also too advanced at this level.
- “Briefly explain omnibus allowance available for companies and for frequent overseas business travel.” This is even too advanced for Client Services and Human Relations Level 4.

3.2.1.3 Weighting of content/skills

The NC (V) allocates 200 hours of teaching and learning time per subject per level, but there is no indication of the amount of time to be spent per topic.

Umalusi’s Hospitality team drew up the table below, containing what it considered to be the key food preparation and service topics relevant to the hospitality industry. They then indicated the weighting for the four Hospitality subjects:

### Table 14: Weighting of content/concepts/skills by percentage of time allocated in the NC (V) Hospitality programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Time Allocated in each Subject</th>
<th>CS &amp; HR</th>
<th>Hospitality Generics</th>
<th>Food Services</th>
<th>Food Prep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts, growth &amp; impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectors and functional areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic recipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and commodities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify nutritional needs of healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals, plan and cost menu accordingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central topics</td>
<td>CS &amp; HR</td>
<td>Hospitality Generics</td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>Food Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, hygiene, safety and security</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout and design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary and cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and legislation (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in a business environment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations - colleagues with special needs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Services in a cultural context</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relation requirements according to Acts</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of cultural knowledge on client care</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of staff development to human relations</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effect of solved problems on client care</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, maintain and store equipment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning equipment and materials</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain hygiene in food preparation and storage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate a payment point and process payments</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle and record refunds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a booking system</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain effective working relationships with all members of staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for a job or work experience placement</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage one’s own development</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source information about self-employment opportunities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean food production areas, equipment and utensils</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knives and cutting equipment</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle and store food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage of Time Allocated in each Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central topics</th>
<th>CS &amp; HR</th>
<th>Hospitality Generics</th>
<th>Food Services</th>
<th>Food Prep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assemble food for quick service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept and store food deliveries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassware</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crockery and cutlery</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks machines and equipment</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function rooms</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter service</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeaway service</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks service</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds, bed linen and coverings</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room service</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet and bathroom areas</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest bedrooms</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floors and floor coverings</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public areas</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen for external laundry</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming and outgoing telephone calls</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain cellars and beverage storage rooms</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a table drinks service</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a table service</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a counter service</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a takeaway service</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain housekeeping supplies</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide housekeeping services within designated area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a clean linen supply</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve bottled wine</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and serve cocktails</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a silver service</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the drinks service</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the cleaning programme in own area of responsibility</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and conduct meetings</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the receipt, storage and issue of goods</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time allocated to the four NC (V) subjects in the Hospitality programme is equal, namely 200 teaching and learning hours per subject. The weighting for the different topics for the four vocational subjects differs from topic to topic as indicated below:
Food Preparation

**Level 2**: The emphasis is on Food Production (75%) with an introduction to the cleaning of different kinds of equipment, utensils and materials (10%).

**Level 3**: The emphasis is on food production (100%) which requires more advanced skills.

**Level 4**: The emphasis is on food production (85%) with a small weighting allocated to the acceptance and storage of food deliveries (15%).

In summary, it can be inferred that Food Preparation concentrates on food production and the development of culinary skills, which is in keeping with the name of the subject.

Hospitality Generics

**Level 2** focuses on food hygiene, handling and disposing of waste (20%).

**Level 3** emphasizes nutritional needs of healthy individuals, planning and costing of menus (20%) and how to operate a payment point and process payments (20%).

**Level 4** focuses on health, safety and security (25%), developing menus (25%), managing one’s own development (25%) and sourcing information about self-employment opportunities (25%).

The major emphasis over the three years is placed on “food hygiene, health and safety” as well as “menu planning and costing”.

Hospitality Services

**Level 2**: The emphasis is on food and beverage service (75%) with accommodation services covered to a lesser extent (25%).

**Level 3**: Here the emphasis is on food and beverage services (60%) and on accommodation services (40%).

**Level 4**: The emphasis is on food and beverage services (60%) with a minor link to planning and conducting meetings (15%) and maintaining the receipt, storage and issue of goods (15%).

The conclusion is that the emphasis in Level 4 is on “food and beverage services” only with minor links to the topics, “Plan and conduct meetings” and “Maintain the receipt, storage and issue of goods”.

Client Services and Human Relations

The table below indicates the weighting for the three years of study:
### Table 15: Weighting for three years of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function in a Business Environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 40%&lt;br&gt;18 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(1-9 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>Human Relations Requirements according to the Various Acts</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 35%&lt;br&gt;12 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(2-9 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>The Importance of Staff Development to Human Relations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 20%&lt;br&gt;11 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(1-5 LOs each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations with respect to Colleagues with Special Needs</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 20%&lt;br&gt;5 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(1-3 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>Health and Safety Procedures to ensure a Safe and Secure Environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 5%&lt;br&gt;9 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(2-3 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>The Effect of Solved Problems on Client Care</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 50%&lt;br&gt;19 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(2-6 LOs each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Services in a Cultural Context</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 30%&lt;br&gt;6 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(2-7 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>The Impact of Cultural Knowledge on Client Care</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 60%&lt;br&gt;13 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(1-9 LOs each)</td>
<td><strong>Ways to ensure the Health and Safety of Clients and Colleagues</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 30%&lt;br&gt;3 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(4-7 LOs each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Safety according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weighting: 10%&lt;br&gt;2 Subject Outcomes&lt;br&gt;(4 and 5 LOs each)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, “Health and Safety” is stressed throughout the three years in Client Services and Human Relations in the following proportions: 10% in NQF 2; 40% in NQF 3 and 30% in NQF 4.

Within the subject, the greatest emphasis is placed on the “Impact of cultural knowledge on client care”, which has a 60% weighting in Level 3.

### 3.2.2 Organizing principle and coherence

In the NC (V) Hospitality, topics are distributed randomly over the three years of the four subjects, with little or no scaffolding evident within subjects. Few or no discernible connections are formally indicated among the topics, or within and across the three Levels.

Nevertheless, the four Hospitality subjects required in each year cover, in broad terms, what would be required of a person studying a course on Hospitality.

### 3.2.3 Sequence, progression and pacing

The evaluation team found that the four subjects in the Hospitality curriculum have a low degree of specification of sequencing. No instructions or guidance is provided for the lecturer with regard to the sequence in which to teach the topics in the curriculum. It is thus left to the lecturer to decide in which order to instruct the topics. It is assumed that the lecturer would start at Subject Outcome 1 of Topic 1 and end at the last subject outcome of the last topic.

The analysis reveals a moderate progression in the topics in the curriculum, but a weak progression in terms of the complexity of the learning content within the levels, with the exception of one subject, namely *Hospitality Generics*, which shows a strong progression in terms of related topics, but also weak progression in the level of complexity. Food hygiene
in the curriculum shows no progression in the topics with just two topics showing moderate progression in the level of complexity.

**Hospitality Services** is the only subject in the Hospitality curriculum to show moderate to high degree of progression across the levels. With regard to pacing, the Subject Guidelines for all four Hospitality subjects do not specify how much time should be spent per topic. The weighting, however, gives the percentage of the weight allocated for each topic, but is not necessarily an indication of time to be spent on each topic. The team nonetheless concluded that the weighted percentage values of each topic should be multiplied by two to calculate the teaching time.

The time allocation for both the practical as well as the theoretical work was felt to be inadequate if the volume of work that needs to be covered is taken into consideration. Attention should therefore be given to actual time spent in the class room as well as in the kitchen.

**Client Services and Human Relations** has topics seemingly randomly assigned to each of the three years. Thus, for example, “Safety” appears as a topic over the three years, but there is no clear progression in terms of subject matter difficulty or of greater conceptualization of the content.

The randomness of content placement is apparent when one considers that learning outcomes regarding relaying vital information on a patient’s condition and documenting emergency situations are linked directly to identifying a basic First Aid programme for employees.

In short, it seems apparent that curricula for the subjects in the Hospitality programme could be considerably strengthened in respect of the ordering of the learning content and skills, their pacing and the logical progression of knowledge.

### 3.2.4 Aims, purpose, vision, general outcomes and articulation

#### 3.2.4.1 Central design principle

The NC (V) curriculum appears to be a **topic-structured, outcome-based curriculum** as each topic is structured around a Subject Outcome and specific Learning Outcomes.

The NC (V) Level 4 curricula are set at NQF Level 4, which coincide with the National Curriculum Statement (NSC) at Grade 12 for the National Senior Certificate.

The overall **curriculum aims** of the four subjects in the curriculum are:

**Food Preparation**

Generally, the subject aims at:

- improving the students’ knowledge, skills and values.
More specifically, the subject aims at:

• providing students with practical, marketable skills to enter the hospitality industry as an employee or entrepreneur;
• enhancing students’ creativity and flair;
• instilling principles such as planning, organising, productivity, discipline, neatness and hygiene.

**Hospitality Generics**

Generally, students are required to:

• identify and solve problems in which responses display responsible decisions, using critical and creative thinking;
• organise and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effectively;
• collect, analyse, organise and critically evaluate information;
• become empowered to develop themselves in job roles and explore self-employment opportunities.

More specifically, the subject aims at enabling students to:

• explore their related work opportunities;
• obtain broad knowledge, skills and values required to operate hygienically and safely in the hospitality environment;
• understand the dynamics of team and work effectively as a team member;
• understand the sectors of the tourism and hospitality industries;
• demonstrate knowledge and understanding of hygiene and safety in the hospitality industry;
• plan and cost menus, operate payment points and computers and maintain booking systems;
• use, prepare and present a variety of food commodities;
• develop practical food preparation skills that can be applied in a wide range of hospitality contexts.

**Hospitality Services**

Generally, the subject specifically aims at enabling students to:

• develop communication and problem solving skills in relation to food and beverage operations;
• apply the important principles of teamwork by developing interdependence and self-discipline.

More specifically, it aims at:

• empowering students with the broad knowledge, skills and values required in the food service and accommodation fields;
• enabling students to provide counter and take-way services, table and drink services and silver service as well as prepare and serve cocktails.
Client Services and Human Relations

The subject aims at:

- Contributing to the personal development of each student and the social and economic development of society, by making students aware of the importance of self-improvement as key to personal success.

Generally, students are encouraged to:

- communicate effectively with clients, using visual and/or language skills in the modes of oral and and/or written presentation whilst showing awareness of possible communication barriers such as language or cultural chasms;
- develop a sense of urgency because time is money and no client likes to be kept waiting;
- create a safe environment for staff and clients;
- encourage sensitivity to the needs of their fellow human beings;
- reflect on and explore a variety of strategies to learn more effectively those service characteristics and skills that are needed in a service business.

More specifically, the subject aims at:

- instilling a culture of client satisfaction in all employees working in the tourism industry by equipping them with ways of achieving it;
- identifying and solving problems that arise, either in the daily running of a tourism enterprise or when dealing with the general needs of tourists as clients. Students’ responses will display that responsible decisions, using critical and creative thinking, have been made;
- working effectively with others in a variety of contexts: as a staff member in the tourism office; as part of a service excellence team; as leader or guide to a tour group; as member of a particular organisation or as a member of a tourism project to involve and benefit the local community.

It is clear, when one considers the accumulated aims of the four subjects that the intent is to develop a well-rounded person with a good general knowledge of the hospitality industry and with an appropriate set of service-oriented skills suited to work. The package of aims would suggest that the programme, if properly taught, would go a long way to developing a professional identity suited to the industry. This is confirmed by the analysis which emerged from considering the profile of the ideal student as represented in the curricula.

3.2.4.2 The profile of the ideal student perceived in each of the subjects in the Hospitality programme

Food Preparation

Food Preparation enhances a student’s creativity and flair, and instills planning, organization skills, productivity, discipline and neatness principles.

Hospitality Generics

The ideal student will have knowledge and understanding of hygiene and safety, a thorough understanding of team dynamics and an instilled sense of responsibility for satisfying customer needs.
Hospitality Services

In Hospitality Services, the ideal student is described as: “one who can work individually and in teams in an organized, disciplined manner”\(^{45}\). The student must be able to follow instructions and take responsibility for their actions. In addition, students will have to understand why safety, hygiene and teamwork are so important to all areas of the industry. Students will also have to open themselves up to acquire knowledge and be able to apply the principles successfully.

Client Services and Human Relations

In Client Services and Human Relations, the ideal student must have good communication skills, creative flair, be people-centred and a “people-pleaser”.

In addition, the student must have problem-solving skills and keen powers of observation.

In summary, the NC (V) Hospitality mentions the importance of hygiene and safety, team dynamics, skills, service, teamwork and customer satisfaction but the critical characteristics necessary for success in the industry still seem elusive.

3.2.4.3 Articulation options

As the curricula underpinning the NC (V) Hospitality programme stand, no specified and preferred articulation in to Higher Education qualifications in hospitality management exist. However, the NC (V) Hospitality provides a better overall background to the hospitality industry than any other further education qualification.

While the table opposite presents the positioning of each of the entry points to hospitality education and training (general, vocational and managerial), no articulation between these has ever been expressed:

\(^{45}\) Doc H/9
\(^{46}\) Docs H/6, 7, 8, 9
### Table 16: The General and Further Education and Training Sector and Higher Education Sector of the National Qualifications Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education: Levels 5 upward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality Qualifications: Managerial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post school qualifications for the hospitality industry focus on the development of deeper skills for entry into junior management positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions:</strong> Offered at public or private academic universities or universities of technology or other higher education institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> The courses cover all levels and topics of hospitality management. This is where industry sources its future leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FET: Levels 2 – 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **NCS Hospitality: “Nursery”**
  - **Industry aim:** Provide students with general overview of the hospitality industry with the aim of enabling them to make informed career choices and to attract talented youth into the industry as future leaders.
  - **Focus:** Skills and subject focus is mainly on the food and beverage industry.
  - **Institution:** High schools

- **NC (V) Hospitality: Supervisory**
  - **Industry aim:** Development of skills to equip graduates with entry level basic skills and supervisory skills to go into the industry.
  - **Focus:** Course focus is on food and beverage preparation and service, as well as accommodation services.
  - **Institutions:** FET Colleges

There is also no articulation between the services subjects in the National Senior Certificate (schooling) and the programmes related to the tourism and hospitality fields in the NC (V).

#### 3.2.5 Teaching approach and subject methodology

Although the Subject and Learning Outcomes in the Hospitality curricula are written to give the impression that they are student-centred, it was noted that the overall pedagogic approach is a content-driven approach.

The Subject Guidelines do not explain a preferred teaching approach. However, the presence of subject and learning outcomes suggests an Outcomes-based Education (OBE) approach. This assumption is strengthened by the required resources listed at the end of each document in Levels 2 - 4. The assessment requirements on page 4 of the Subject Guidelines also support the notion of an outcomes-based methodology, although this is not specifically indicated as such.
3.2.6 Assessment guidance

In the NC (V) Subject Guidelines\(^47\), there are general guidelines for the lecturer on how to conduct the assessment. The internal assessment comprises 50% and external assessment 50%. The guidelines list a range of various assessment methods that can be used.

The Assessment Guidelines\(^48\) have a far greater amount of detail regarding assessment. Pages 2 – 8 of the four documents give a full overview of the various assessment processes, e.g. purpose of the Assessment Guidelines, assessment principles, frameworks, moderation, assessor requirements, planning assessment, methods of assessment, methods for collecting evidence and so forth.

In these same documents, there are very detailed guidelines for the lecturers on how to assess the subject. This provides good guidelines for the assessment task or activity that to be presented to students.

However, lecturers still have to develop their own assessment tools and instruments, as standard instruments are not provided. The evaluation team pointed out that this sometimes leads to the misinterpretation of the outcomes, and could have an impact on standards, as assessment tools may not be developed to the correct requirements.

3.2.6.1 Internal continuous assessment (ICAS)

Knowledge, skills, values and attitudes are assessed throughout the year using assessment instruments such as projects, tests, assignments, investigations, role-play and case studies.

The ICAS practical component is to undertaken in a real workplace, workshop or “structured environment”. It is moderated internally, and is externally quality assured.

3.2.6.2 External summative assessment (ESASS)

It is either a single or a set of written papers to the requirements of the subject learning outcomes.

3.2.6.3 Integrated summative assessment task (ISAT)

This assessment task assesses the students’ cumulative learning throughout the year.

The practical component is internally assessed through practical performance tests and the integrated summative assessment task (ISAT) in a real or simulated work environment. The practical component forms 60% of the internal assessment mark in all the levels of the four subjects.

3.2.6.4 Number and types of assessment tasks and specificity of guidance provided

The table provides this information from the Assessment Guidelines:\(^49\)

\(^{47}\) Docs H/6 to H/9, pp. 3 and 4
\(^{48}\) Docs H/10, H/11, H/12, H/13
\(^{49}\) Docs H/10, H/11, H/12, H/13
Table 17: The number and types of assessment tasks in the NC (V) Hospitality guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Client Services &amp; Human Relations(^{50})</th>
<th>Hospitality Generics(^{51})</th>
<th>Hospitality Services(^{52})</th>
<th>Food Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of assessment tasks specified</td>
<td>Level 2: 4 closed-book class tests, 4 open-book tests, 1 internal written exam, 6 practical assessments</td>
<td>Levels 2 - 4: Theoretical Component: 4 Written tasks</td>
<td>Level 2: 4 written tests, 2 assignments, 2 case studies or reports, 1 project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3: 3 closed-book class tests, 4 open-book tests, 1 internal written exam, 6 practical assessments</td>
<td>Practical component: 3 Practical performance tests, 1 Integrated summative assessment</td>
<td>Level 3: 4 written tests, 2 assignments, 2 case studies or reports, 1 project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4: 6 closed-book class tests, 4 open-book tests, 1 internal written exam, 6 practical assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4: 4 written tests, 3 assignments, 2 case studies or reports, 1 project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of assessment specified</td>
<td>Each level uses the following assessment types: Baseline assessment, Diagnostic assessment, Formative assessment and Summative assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels 2 - 4: Observation, class questions, group work, individual discussions, class tests, internal exams, assignments, case studies, practical exercises, research as well as informal group competitions in Level 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of dominant types of assessment specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The assessment types are mainly written, e.g. closed book class tests, open book tests and practical assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity of assessment guidance</td>
<td>General and subject specific, as detailed guidelines are given in the Assessment guidelines(^{53})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of assessment guidance</td>
<td>The guidance given in the Subject Guidelines provides moderate detail on how the outcomes should be assessed. However, the Assessment Guidelines give very clear guidelines on what to assess and how it should be assessed. (However, no tools or instruments have been developed and provided and this leads to extra pressure for the lecturer to ensure that standards are maintained.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{50}\) Doc H/11, p.8
\(^{51}\) Doc H/10, Levels 2-4, p.8
\(^{52}\) Docs H/12, H/13, Levels 2-4, pp.7-8
\(^{53}\) Docs H/10, H/11, H/12, H/13 Levels 2-4
3.2.7 Availability and user-friendliness of the curriculum documents

3.2.7.1 Integration between different subjects

Integration of topics, if not necessarily of teaching, between the subjects in the NC (V) Hospitality is moderate. In the different subjects, certain topics are repeated from different perspectives but no specific links are made. So, for example, among all four Hospitality subjects the following topics are included: Health and Safety; Time management, and Customer Satisfaction.

Between Hospitality Generics and Food preparation specifically, the following topics are common: Personal hygiene; Cleaning equipment and Waste management. Unless there is an effort to demonstrate the links across the subjects, these overlaps may simply constitute content overlap and needless repetition.

3.2.7.2 Integration within subjects

Food preparation

Generally, there is very limited integration across levels in the subject. Only two topics show a moderate degree of integration, e.g. vegetables in Level 2 and more complex dishes with vegetables in Level 4. This lack of integration may be a function of how the curriculum is expressed as it is at least possible that, in the teaching of a practical subject such as this, integration of knowledge and skills happens quite easily.

Hospitality Generics

The integration across the levels is of a moderate degree, especially with regard to the topic “health and safety”. The topics on “teamwork”, “applying for a job” and “self-employment” show integration within Levels 2 and 3. The topic “menu planning” shows a moderate degree of integration from Level 3 to Level 4.

Hospitality Services

There is a high degree of integration across the levels within this subject but not within the topics. Thus, for example, the topic “drinks service” moves from table, to wine, to cocktails and finally to drinks service from Level 2 to Level 4, which is evidence of progression within the topic. There is also progression evident in the “table service” to “silver service” from Level 3 to Level 4.

3.2.7.3 Relationship between subjects and everyday knowledge

Food Preparation

This subject has evidence of a high degree of integration with everyday knowledge. For example, in Levels 2 – 4, this relationship is evident in the preparation and cooking of different commodities and the garnishing of the prepared dishes, something which happens in homes every day. The use and cleaning of different kitchen areas and equipment used in the preparation of food is also common to the home and the workplace.

54 Doc H/8, Level 2, p.5; Level 4, p.4
55 Doc H/9, Levels 2 – 4
Hospitality Generics

This subject shows evidence of a high degree of integration with everyday knowledge. For example topics in Level 2 cover “teamwork”, “personal health”, “hygiene”, and “professional appearance”, the “handling and disposing of waste” as well as “food hygiene”, which are all relevant to everyday life. In Level 3, relevant topics include “maintaining effective working relationships”.

Hospitality Services

This subject has a moderate degree of integration with everyday knowledge. Hygiene and safety, as well as service levels and customer satisfaction are themes threaded through most of the topics, and are very relevant and important to everyday life.

3.2.7.4 Relationship between subjects and the world of work

Food Preparation

This subject shows a high degree of integration with the world of work. For example, the application of “hygiene and safety”, “preparation of pastry products” and “hygiene and safety” (once more) are all directly linked to the world of work.

Hospitality Generics

In this subject, the team also found evidence of a high degree of integration between the subject and the world of work. In Level 2, the topic “learning (about) equipment and materials”, and in Level 3, “applying for work or work experience placement” both relate directly to the world of work. So, too, does the topic “analyze and develop new menus” in Level 4.

Hospitality Services

All topics in the curriculum are highly relevant, as the subject prepares students for the world of work. For example, service skills, food and beverage skills, accommodation service skills, across all three years of study are relevant to the industry.

3.2.7.5 Subject Guidelines

The Subject Guidelines for each of the four subjects are focused on skills development and on a variety of topics. However, there is no indication of adequate pacing, depth (range) and sequencing. The documents vary between 7 and 11 pages per subject per level with a total of 103 pages across all 3 levels and 4 subjects.

The structuring of the documents are not very clear as the documents provide only the Topics and Subject- and Learning Outcomes, but little further relevant information.

56 Doc H/6, p.4
57 Doc H/7, p. 4
58 Doc H/10, p.5
59 Doc H/10, p.6
60 Doc H/11, p.4
3.2.7.6 Assessment Guidelines

The Assessment Guideline documents are currently both generic and subject specific. The evaluation team recommends that it would be better to focus on subject specific guidelines as the documents tend to be long and repetitive throughout.

3.2.7.7 How do the guideline documents relate to one another?

The Subject and Assessment Guideline documents relate to one another. However, in the Subject Guidelines and Assessment Guidelines, bullets are used so that cross-referencing becomes very difficult.

3.2.7.8 Accessibility of the language

The level of language used in the Subject and Assessment Guidelines is clear and easy to follow and understand.

3.3 Concluding comments on the subject curricula for the Hospitality programme

Firstly, it seems likely that students completing the NC (V) Hospitality at Level 4 will have a good grounding for going into industry operations. Whether they would be able to enter at managerial level remains to be seen, and will doubtless depend on the individual’s capabilities, training and intellectual ability. However, there is concern that some students enter the programme because they believe that it is easy an easy option.

The second finding is that NC (V) Hospitality curriculum has the following problems:

- The pedagogic approach and the general aims are not stated clearly enough in the Subject Guidelines, which creates the possibility for misinterpretation and confusion;
- Specific detail on how the subjects should be paced is not given;
- The matter of curriculum breadth and depth across the three levels needs scrutiny in order to structure the subjects more carefully, reduce repetition, and develop the necessary depth of content knowledge and mastery of skill;
- The links between the levels are not strong enough;
- There are insufficient examples of assessment tasks for internal continuous assessment to guide lecturers.

In view of the above, a third finding is that, in general, there is not enough on-going training and mentoring of lecturers. This development of the teaching community, which is not growing at present, is a significant requirement to bolster the Hospitality programme. Both CATHSSETA and the DHET have plans to implement programmes for lecturer development in this field, and these should be strongly motivated, funded and supported by all concerned.

A fourth finding is that the articulation of the NC (V) Hospitality is problematic. Currently no specified and preferred articulation with Higher Education qualifications in hospitality management exists. Nonetheless, the NC (V) Hospitality provides a better overall background to the hospitality industry than any other FET qualification on offer.

A fifth finding is that the NC (V) Hospitality as currently presented in FET Colleges does not allow for enough contact with the hospitality industry. The team concurred that a college simulated environment cannot replace work placement.
CHAPTER 4

ARE WE THERE YET? THE EVALUATION OF THE ASSESSED CURRICULUM

4.1 Introduction

As with the intended curriculum analysis, the assessed (attained) curriculum evaluation is based on a document analysis. In this case, the exam papers for one or more years are analyzed using Umalusi’s exam evaluation instrument. This first part of the chapter summarizes the process used to answer the research questions in the investigation and the remainder provides an overview of the research findings.

The findings from the analyses include information about compliance with the Assessment Guidelines, the cognitive categories and demand in the paper, the difficulty of questions, comments on whether these papers provide a good model for the future and the appropriateness of the language used in the papers. The analysis also included information about the progression between the three levels in the NC (V) as evidenced in the exam papers.

The conclusions and recommendations are based on data analysis and the opinions of the team members that flowed from the analysis.

4.2 The evaluation process

It is worth remembering that the individual members of the Umalusi evaluation teams were selected based on their knowledge of the subject, their experience in the subject area and in the education system.

The reference material for the investigation included background information (see Chapter 1 and 2 of this document) about the assessment in the NC (V). Furthermore, each Umalusi evaluation team received information about the purpose of the research, the NC (V) Assessment Guidelines, an MS Word version of the evaluation instrument (see Chapter 2), as well as an example of the Excel spreadsheet into which the data collected would be entered. These spreadsheets were used to analyze NC (V) Level 4 papers of the subjects in the Hospitality and Tourism programmes, as well as those of the subject, Consumer Behaviour, which is an elective in the Marketing programme. This subject was added to the set of subjects analyzed, as it was felt that it has a good synergy with the Hospitality and Tourism programmes.

The evaluation teams analyzed the approach to assessment in both the Hospitality and Tourism programmes. As previously mentioned, an overview of the papers written in Levels 2 and 3 formed an important part of the investigation. The reason for their inclusion was to determine conceptual and cognitive progression between Levels 2, 3 and 4.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, three evaluation teams participated in the bigger project, analyzing intended and assessed curricula. They dealt with the hospitality and tourism fields, and that of consumer sciences. The teams were referred to as the Hospitality Studies team, Tourism team and Consumer Studies team. The Consumer Studies evaluation team included experts in food nutrition and consumer science and technology, and was therefore tasked to analyze the examination papers written in the subject, Consumer Behaviour. The Consumer
Studies evaluation team was also tasked to analyze the papers written in Food Preparation, a subject included in the NC (V) Hospitality programme and to share their insights with the Hospitality evaluation team.

In preparation for the analysis of the Level 4 examination papers in particular, the evaluators were asked to note the following in the Assessment Guidelines (AGs) in the three years of study: the cognitive categories required; the prescribed exam paper format (if any), and the subject outcomes and assessment tasks or activities.

The evaluation teams also had to revisit their findings and comments regarding assessment guidance as reported on in the intended curriculum evaluation. They were tasked to make general comments on the format, structure, layout and general impression of the examination papers.

The general comments on the examination papers were followed by an item-by-item analysis of the 2011 Level 4 examinations. As outlined in Chapter 2, Umalusi’s evaluation teams considered:

1. The compliance of examinations with the requirements stipulated in the Assessment Guidelines;
2. Evidence of progression from the Level 2 and Level 3 papers to the NC (V) 2011 Level 4 papers;
3. The cognitive categories required;
4. The level of difficulty of the questions in the examination papers;
5. The format of the 2011 papers, and their suitability as a model for future papers; and
6. The general standard and quality of the 2011 papers.

The Assessment Guidelines (AGs) specify three cognitive categories, namely Knowledge and Comprehension; Application; Analysis and Synthesis. Both the AGs and Umalusi’s evaluation instrument are based on Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy. It was therefore a relatively straightforward calculation to determine how the percentages found in the five-category typology translated into the three-category typology required in the Assessment Guidelines.

To be able to complete an item-by-item analysis, it was necessary for the teams to familiarize themselves with the evaluation instrument and to arrive at a common understanding of the categories of cognitive demand, and the explanations of the category types. A whole group discussion of the cognitive categories was followed by a further in-depth discussion in the groups.

The teams’ discussions included the analysis of questions, the use of action verbs in a question, the alignment of a question to the guidelines, the demand of a question and the proposed answers in the memorandum.

The evaluation teams noted the importance of the use of a range of cognitive categories in the examinations, from reproduction of information, to replication of basic procedures, to analysis, to evaluation and synthesis. The percentages of marks awarded to each of these categories in the Assessment Guidelines are supposed to be adhered to, as this would give students the opportunity to demonstrate a variety of cognitive skills.

The evaluation teams used the examples given in the evaluation instrument for each cognitive category to determine the level of difficulty in a question. The level of difficulty is based on one or more of the following factors: the concepts or subject terminology, the question in itself, the stimulus material (question or text) and the process required to answer
the question. All of these have an impact on the required response. The teams made
judgements about whether each examination question makes low, medium or high demands
on the average NC (V) Level 4 candidate, and thus identified the demands as “easy”,
“moderate” or “difficult”.

The evaluation teams realized in the discussion that questions that align to a particular type
of cognitive category are not always as difficult as other questions that align to the same
cognitive category. For example a recall question that asks students to recall an abstract
theory is often much more difficult to accomplish than one which asks candidates to recall a
straightforward set of facts.

The evaluation teams also noted that grammatical errors in the formulation of questions might
cause students to misunderstand the question and prevent them from demonstrating what
they know.

The evaluation teams were requested to rate the level of the difficulty of a particular question
or item for the average NC (V) Level 4 candidate, who should be representative of the entire
(overall) population at that particular level of study in FET colleges across the country. This
means that the evaluation teams should not reference only students from one area or region
in the country, or only a certain group of colleges, but the student population in general. The
findings of the analysis follow in sections 4.3 and 4.4.
4.3 General trends in the examination papers of the NC (V) Tourism programme

4.3.1 Tourism Operations

The NC (V) Level 4 paper in the subject Tourism Operations is set out of 200 marks and needs to be completed in three hours.

Did the 2011 NC (V) level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The cognitive range in the 2011 Level 4 exam paper in Tourism Operations does not comply with the Assessment Guidelines. The table indicates the required and the actual cognitive categories covered in the paper, calculated as percentages.

Table 18: Level 4 Assessment Guideline requirements and actual weighting in the 2011 examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE AND COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Guideline requirements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Examination weightings</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The action verbs like “source”, “access”, “explain”, and “convert”, suggested in the Assessment Guidelines, did not appear at all in the 2011 examination paper. The paper mainly uses the verbs “list” and “name”, which fit into the conceptual knowledge category. The evaluation team found that the verb “list” is used to request simple recall or to refer to vocabulary. If the word “list” were, for instance, used in combination with an action to be taken such as “to sequence”, or in combination with idea of classification, the question would test the application of known knowledge.

Is the NC (V) level 4 Tourism Operations paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

Cognitive demand

Umalusi’s evaluation team found that the 2011 paper is based largely on testing Conceptual Knowledge (70%), with a little assessment of Application (9%). It had no question requiring judgement, the weighing of possibilities or innovating solutions or formulating any form of new idea. The absence of questions requiring applied knowledge or analysis, evaluation and synthesis is a matter of concern.

The questions identified as being in the Conceptual Knowledge category constitute 140 out of the 200 marks. Very few questions require students to distinguish, interpret or to solve problems. The graph below illustrates the number of marks out of the total of 200, which were judged to be in the various cognitive categories:
As is evident from the graph, mainly Conceptual Knowledge, Comprehension and Application are called for in the 2011 paper. Together, the Conceptual Knowledge and Comprehension categories comprise 182 (140 + 42) marks out of 200, or 91% of the paper. The team found no evidence of questions requiring the demonstration of Analysis, Problem Solving, or Evaluation and Synthesis.

Level of difficulty

As described in Chapter 2, the five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The team used the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:

CK: Conceptual knowledge
C: Comprehension (Understanding)
A: Application
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team referred to the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

As described earlier in this chapter, the team considered the formulation of the question, the task and what is expected in the response to determine the difficulty level in each question. Most of the questions in the paper (57%) were rated as “easy”, whereas 39% of the questions were judged to be “moderate(ly)” difficult. Only 4% of questions were judged to be “difficult”. The pie graph below illustrates the percentages of questions considered to be on an easy, moderate or difficult level. In this instance, the marks are reflected in the pie graph and the slices represent how many marks out of the total of 200 are representative of the different difficulty levels.
The team found that questions were heavily weighted towards “easy” and “moderate” levels. The evaluation team rated only seven marks of the total of 200 marks as “difficult” questions.

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When combining the results of the cognitive categories evident in the paper and the levels of difficulty, it becomes clear that questions considered to be difficult in the L4 Tourism Operations paper are reflected in only two cognitive categories.
Evidence from the graph above reveals that the seven marks out of 200 which were rated as “difficult” questions were questions based on the recall of complex content, the identification of correct explanations of terminology (Conceptual Knowledge) and being able to sort information, for instance, in a descending order (Application).

Progression from Level 2 to Level 4 in Tourism Operations

Only very weak progression in the cognitive range can be identified when the NC (V) Levels 2, 3 and 4 papers are compared. In the Level 4 question paper, 70% of the mark allocation was awarded to questions based on the recall of conceptual knowledge, while in the Level 2 paper, 50% was awarded to the recall of conceptual knowledge. This indicates a marked swing towards this cognitive category by Level 4. In the Level 3 paper, 60% of the questions are based on questions requiring the recall of conceptual knowledge. One would reasonably expect a reduction in recall questions across the three levels, with greater emphasis being placed on analytic and synthesizing skills in the later years.

The same is true for the weak progression in difficulty level: the questions judged to be “difficult” account for 9% of the Level 2 paper, 9% of the Level 3, and for 4% in the Level 4 paper.

Is the format of the 2011 Level 4 Tourism Operations paper a good model for future papers?

Although the layout of the questions and the readability of the questions are good, the types of question being asked should be revisited to include paragraphs and essay-type questions so as to include higher levels of difficulty and a broader range of cognitive categories.

The scaffolding of questions is sometimes good, e.g. in question 1, students are required to “identify the country in the cartoon”, then to “name the currency of the country”, after which they need to “explain where to obtain information about foreign exchange” and finally to speak about a “client’s itinerary”. The marks move from two marks each for the first two items above, to six marks for the next item and finally 10 marks for the final item.
The evaluation team described the paper as “busy”, meaning that it jumps between different levels of mark allocation and similar sub-questions. It was felt that that the sub-questions within the main question could be more interrelated. Although the examiner’s linking all sub-questions to the main tourist destination is noted, leading to a natural flow to the paper, it also leads to similar or repetitive sub-questions across different questions which frequently target knowledge recall or the description of basic facts.

The format of the paper is regarded as good: 80% of the questions are based on suitable, stimulating cartoons. However, it was noted that for some of the cartoons, students could lose up to 40 marks in a question if they were unable to answer the first sub-question e.g. 1.1 “Identify the city in the picture”.

How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Tourism Operations paper?

The use and level of language must be commended as any student should be able to comprehend the language. However, students at Level 4 should be encouraged to read and write more. It is therefore suggested that in place of a fourth cartoon, a case study (requiring analysis, evaluation and synthesis skills) could be introduced which would require extended reading and perhaps an extended written response from students.

Concluding remarks and recommendations about the Tourism Operations examinations

The instrument used for the analysis of the NC (V) papers based on a 5-category scale provided a more nuanced indication of cognitive categories than the three categories used to set the paper. The investigation of levels of difficulty within a category, made it clear how an intended question in a particular cognitive category, e.g. comprehension or application, could be formulated as an easy or a difficult question.

The team noted that, although the information required by some of the questions is in the tourism text books, i.e. travellers’ cheques, telegraphic transfers, (e.g. in question 4.2 and 4.3), these forms of monetary transaction are irrelevant in today’s tourism business. It is suggested that up-to-date relevant tourism information be assessed.

The use a wider range of cognitive categories in the assessment is recommended (as is required by the Assessment Guidelines). Higher levels of difficulty could be introduced by including case studies which would require students to break a problem down into its constituent parts or for them to extrapolate solutions for familiar problems based in unfamiliar contexts.

4.3.2 Sustainable Tourism

The NC (V) Level 4 paper in the subject, Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel, is set out of 200 marks and has to be completed in three hours. In general, the layout of the question paper was considered to be neat, with enough open spaces.

The mark allocation was regarded as appropriate. The highest allocation was 10 marks for three of the questions (questions 4.1.2 and 4.2.1, 5.1). However, candidates were not required to give extended responses that demonstrate logical and systematic thinking.
Did the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 paper comply with the Sustainable Tourism Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The Level 4 paper does not comply with the Assessment Guidelines set for the NC (V). Though the content of the paper correlates with the Subject Guidelines, the paper does not comply with the percentages required in the different cognitive categories.

Table 19: Level 4, 2011 Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Guideline requirements</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE AND COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Examination weightings</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical nature of the subject requires many more opportunities for application to be assessed. According to the Assessment Guidelines, 70% of the paper should include questions requiring application, interpretation, judgement and recommendations for new methods of sustainability.

Is the NC (V) Level 4 Sustainable Tourism paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the exam?

Cognitive demand

The evaluation team noted that the 2011 Level 4 paper mostly requires the reproduction of knowledge. The team could not find evidence of extended systematic thinking in the questions, and therefore argued that assessment on this level does not equip students for industry or tertiary education.

![Cognitive categories in Level 4 Sustainable Tourism examination](image)
As is evident above, the Level 4 paper is heavily weighted towards conceptual knowledge as 136 marks of the total of 200 marks are allocated to questions requiring conceptual knowledge. These questions comprised 67% of the paper. The extensive use of ‘list’ and ‘explain’ questions is inappropriate at this level, as this means only recall and knowledge of particular concepts and limited understanding (explanation of concepts) are required to answer the questions. Only 23% of questions require comprehension skills, e.g. to “understand and be able to react to responses”, while only 9% required the analysis of content.

**Level of difficulty**

As described in Chapter 2, the five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The team used the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:

- **CK**: Conceptual knowledge
- **C**: Comprehension (Understanding)
- **A**: Application
- **AP**: Analysis & Problem-solving
- **ES**: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team identified the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The evaluation team considered the 2011 Level 4 paper to be “easy”, because only 8% of the questions can be thought to fall in the “difficulty” category. As reflected in the pie graph below, 136 marks of a total of 200 are considered “easy”, whereas 48 marks from the 200 are questions of “moderate” difficulty and only 16 marks are awarded to questions on a “difficult” level.

![Figure 6: Level of difficulty of questions in the 2011 Sustainable Tourism examination](image)
Calculated as percentages, the Level 4 paper is slanted towards “easy” questions, which constitute 68% of the paper. The “moderate” questions count for 24% of the paper and “difficult” questions only 8%.

The following abbreviations are used to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining the cognitive categories and the levels of difficulty, the Tourism team found that, though some questions demand analysis and problem-solving, these questions are also considered to be “easy”. The questions considered to be “difficult” require the identification of principles in a novel context, and more complex reasoning.

Figure 7: Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Sustainable Tourism examination paper
It was concluded that the Level 4 paper focuses on easy and moderately difficult conceptual knowledge questions, with 49% of the paper judged to be easy questions in the conceptual knowledge category, and 19% of the question to be moderately difficult questions in the conceptual knowledge category. Where comprehension and application are required, these too, are set at an “easy” level. The absence of questions requiring analysis, problem-solving, evaluation and synthesising skills poses a problem, especially since this is not in line with the Assessment Guidelines.

Progression from Level 2 to Level 4 in Sustainable Tourism

No evidence of progression along the three levels in Sustainable Tourism was found. The examination papers for Levels 3 and 4 mainly required the same cognitive skills. In all three levels, the weighting towards conceptual knowledge does not correlate with the 30% required for “Knowledge and Comprehension” in the Assessment Guidelines.

In the Level 3 paper, conceptual knowledge comprised 72% of the paper, followed by 21% comprehension, and 7% analysis. None of the questions in the Level 3 paper focused on application and evaluation. In the Level 2 paper, conceptual knowledge comprised 88% of the paper, followed by 12% comprehension with no other cognitive categories included in the paper.

Thus, comparing the range of cognitive categories in the three papers, it was found that the same pattern was followed in all three years. There was less conceptual knowledge in the Level 4 paper and slightly more questions demanding comprehension skills than in the Level 2 and 3 papers. The Level 4 paper included 9% questions requiring analytic skills, although the questions are rated to be on an “easy” level. This is a further indication that the papers in the three levels do not reflect any progression in complexity or demand.

The absence of skills requiring the use of information, the use of procedures, being able to make conversions or measure and apply actions is worrying. The team was also concerned about the absence of questions requiring evaluation skills or questions requiring the defence of an opinion; the substantiation for an opinion and/or the reasoning involving synthesis as the nature of the tourism industry, especially since the Subject Guidelines and the Assessment Guidelines require the inclusion of these skills.

A comparison of the level of difficulty of the three papers across the three years revealed that the percentages of “easy” questions are almost the same, especially between Levels 3 and 4. The percentage of “difficult” questions is also almost the same between Level 4 and Level 2.

In summary, it is clear that the papers at the three levels currently all require student performance in the same limited cognitive categories. The inclusion of questions requiring application and analysis should be speedily introduced as this will prepare candidates to be able to interpret situations and deal with innovative solutions.

Is the format of the paper a good model for future Sustainable Tourism papers?

The Level 4 paper was not considered to be a good model for future examinations and a serious review of both the format and standard of the paper was recommended. Dedicated attention should be given to the relationship between the questions posed and the cognitive category required in the Learning Outcomes. For example, in Question 2.1, learners are asked to “discuss” “explain” and “identify”, when in fact they are required to recall, name, tell or list facts from the text book.
The same content, “daylight saving” was repeated in Questions 3.5 and 5.4. The same question regarding “an instrument used for finding direction” was repeated in Questions 1.2.5 and 5.2.1. The answer, “lines of latitude and longitude” is given in Question 3.4, which is the answer to Question 5.2.2! These repetitions not only increase the weighting in the paper towards certain topics, but also result in a double advantage to students who know the right answer.

The quality of the illustrations could be improved. For example the photograph of Rio de Janeiro in Question 1.3c is too dark to be identified easily.

The memorandum provides answers to some of the questions that are questionable: for example, Question 2.1.1 asks for three stakeholders. The marking guideline does not include the possibility of the “Wildflower Guesthouse” being a stakeholder. In Question 2.1.5 three “role-players” are required; the “tourism industry”, given in the marking guidelines, is not a role-player. Question 3.1.4 asks how passengers pay airport tax; the answer should be “ticketable and non-ticketable taxes”; it is not “automatically added to the cost of the ticket” as stated in the marking guideline.

**How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Sustainable Tourism paper?**

In some cases the language and the sentence structure are poor. For example, Question 4.1.4 reads: “State THREE activities that are inclusive in the heritage management and briefly explain each.” Question 3.1.3 reads “Furnish the IATA codes...”, instead of “Give”. Question 2.2.4 reads: “Identify the TWO different ways that can be used to evaluate the staff performance”.

The evaluation team found instances where the readability level of the case studies was too difficult for the specific level. To determine the readability, the team made use of the Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid readability tests.

The Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid readability tests indicate comprehension difficulty when reading a passage of contemporary academic English. There are two tests, the Flesch Reading Ease, and the Flesch–Kincaid Grade Level. Although they use the same core measures (word length and sentence length), they have different weighting factors. The results of the two tests correlate approximately inversely: a text with a comparatively high score on the Reading Ease test should have a lower score on the Grade Level test.

In the Flesch Reading Ease test, higher scores indicate material that is easier to read; lower numbers mark passages that are more difficult to read. The formula for the Flesch Reading Ease Score (FRES) test is:

\[
206.835 - 1.015 \left( \frac{\text{total words}}{\text{total sentences}} \right) - 84.6 \left( \frac{\text{total syllables}}{\text{total words}} \right)
\]
Scores can be interpreted as shown in the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.0–100.0</td>
<td>easily understood by an average 11-year-old student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0–70.0</td>
<td>easily understood by 13- to 15-year-old students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0–30.0</td>
<td>best understood by university graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Flesch Reading Ease Scores for the three case studies in the paper are:
- Case Study 1: 50
- Case Study 2: 59.9
- Case Study 3: 30

According to the test, the last case study is best understood by university graduates (NQF Level 6/7), and is therefore beyond the comprehension of these NC (V) students who have not yet qualified at NQF Level 4.

The “Flesch – Kincaid Grade Level Formula” translates the 0–100 score to a U.S. grade level, making it easier for educators, parents, librarians, and others to judge the readability level of various books and texts. It can also mean the number of years of education generally required to understand this text, relevant when the formula results in a number greater than 10. The grade level is calculated with the following formula:

\[
0.39 \left( \frac{\text{total words}}{\text{total sentences}} \right) + 11.8 \left( \frac{\text{total syllables}}{\text{total words}} \right) - 15.59
\]

The Flesch-Kincaid Grade levels for the three case studies in the examination are:
- Case Study 1: 11.2
- Case Study 2: 8.4
- Case Study 3: 13.7

The Grade Level Test concurred with the Reading Ease Score as to confirm that the last case study will be best understood by a person with almost 14 years of secondary school study. Clearly, this requires a level of comprehension beyond these students who have just under 12 years of formal study. In addition, it must be borne in mind that the Flesch-Kincaid scores are standardised on English home-language speakers in the United States; many of our students are English second- and third-language speakers.

**Concluding remarks and recommendations about the Sustainable Tourism examination**

The cognitive range in the Level 4 paper should be re-visited and, at the very least, aligned with that suggested in the Assessment Guidelines. A great concern expressed by the team was that the standard of the paper raises questions about the quality of knowledge and applied knowledge about Sustainable Tourism in South Africa and International Travel as the paper represents a Level 4 subject which counts towards the awarding of a final exit certificate in NC (V).

The examination papers require more stringent language and content editing to avoid the repetition of questions or the possibility that an answer to a question is given in a different question. The concern about the narrow range of possible answers in the memorandum, led to the suggestion that provision should be made for all possible answers for a question.
The Sustainable Tourism team strongly argued for the inclusion of extended response questions, case studies and simulation-type questions, but also cautioned that case studies should be tested against readability tests such as the Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid tests.

4.3.3 Science of Tourism

The NC (V) Level 4 paper in the subject, Science of Tourism, is set out of 200 marks and has to be completed in three hours.

Did the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The Science of Tourism NC (V) 2011 examination paper covers the content as stipulated in the Assessment Guidelines, with the exception of Question 2.3.3, which requires knowledge of procedures regarding travelers on chronic medication, and Question 4.4, which asks students to list five items that can be brought into South Africa only with a permit – both of which are not in the Subject Guidelines.

The paper deviates from the Assessment Guidelines in relation to the cognitive categories, as the paper is slanted towards questions requiring recall of knowledge and comprehension.

Table 20: Required and actual cognitive categories, 2011 L4 examination paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Guideline requirements</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE AND COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Examination weightings</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated above, the evaluation team found that 82% of the questions require recall of knowledge and comprehension skills, deviating by 52% from the Assessment Guidelines’ requirements of a 30% inclusion of knowledge and comprehension type questions. The questions requiring application comprised 19%, of the paper, which is a long way off the 35% required. No questions require analysis, evaluation or synthesis, while the requirement is 35%.

Is the NC (V) Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

Cognitive demand

The evaluation team did not find evidence that students are required to demonstrate reflexive thinking as only 3% of the paper deals with questions requiring some sort of analysis, but none of the questions dealt with making judgements, weighing possibilities or finding new solutions. This has important negative implications for entry into the workplace and higher education.
Figure 8: Level of cognitive categories of the Level 4 2011 Science of Tourism examination paper

As illustrated in the graph above, questions to the value of 163 marks of the total of 200 are questions requiring recall of knowledge; this accounts for 58% of the paper.

Level of difficulty

As described in Chapter 2, the five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The team used the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:

CK: Conceptual knowledge
C: Comprehension (Understanding)
A: Application
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team referred to the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The evaluation team considered the 2011 Science of Tourism Level 4 examination paper to be “easy”, as nearly 81% of the total number of questions in the paper fell in this category, 18% of the paper was seen to be “moderately” difficult, whilst a mere 1.5% can be regarded as “difficult”.
Figure 9: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Science of Tourism examination

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining the cognitive categories and the levels of difficulty, the team found that though some questions demand analysis and problem-solving, these questions are also considered to be “easy” questions, demanding analysis dealing with simple procedures or identifying strengths and weaknesses.
The high number of “easy” conceptual knowledge questions is a cause for concern, as these questions require students simply to identify specific data, part of a whole or to match known concepts or words with given definitions. The low number of marks allocated to even moderately difficult questions in the different cognitive categories was noted. Asking the majority of questions at easy levels of difficulty is regarded as inappropriate for an exit-level examination delivering students to the workplace, or to further or higher education.

Is the format of the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 Science of Tourism paper a good model for future papers?

The format of the Science of Tourism 2011 NC (V) final paper was found to be clear with enough white space. With the exception of one pixelated illustration (Question 1.4), the illustrations are clear.

The team noted that the scenarios are intended to link the theory with practice. However, the questions should require students to focus more on the workplace and its need for reflexive thinking, rather than merely asking students to copy sections from the scenarios presented in the paper (such as happens in Questions 1.3 and 1.4). There tends to be a sameness of type of question: short scenario, followed by short answers.

How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Science of Tourism paper?

The evaluation team considered the length of the paper and the amount of reading to be done in the given time for the three hours to be fair for 200 marks.

The Flesch Reading Ease Scores for the two sets of stimulus material are:
Stimulus material, Question 2.2, p.5: 49.7
Stimulus material, Question 2.3, p.6: 46.6

According to the FRES scores, the stimulus material would be best understood by university students and the texts are therefore beyond the comprehension levels of these NC (V) students who have not yet qualified at NQF Level 4.
The Flesch-Kincaid Grade levels for the two sets of stimulus material in the examination are:
Stimulus material, Question 2.2, p.5: 14.6
Stimulus material, Question 2.3, p.6: 12.1

In other words, the first set of stimulus material would best be understood by a person with more than 14 years of schooling; the second by students who have passed NQF Level 4. Clearly, such stimulus materials require a level of comprehension beyond these students who have just under 12 years of formal study. In addition, it must be borne in mind that the Flesch-Kincaid scores are standardized on English home-language speakers in the United States, while the majority of South African students are English second- and third-language speakers.

**Concluding remarks and recommendations about the Science of Tourism examination**

The inclusion of questions which require extended responses in paragraphs and essays is highly recommended by the evaluators. Such questions would allow for complex reasoning involving synthesis, critical argument, working with complex problems involving insight. Examiners would do well across the three Levels to emulate the cognitive demands of Question 6 in the Level 3 paper, which presents, in a scaffolded fashion, a scenario requiring students, to read and interpret the scenario, then to follow an extended set of instructions, to sort information and to extrapolate from a complex set of variables.

It is felt that the intended curriculum as outlined in the Subject Guidelines and in the Assessment Guidelines would certainly equip students with entry-level skills into the tourism industry. However, the final examination does not require students to demonstrate the capacities spelled out in the intended curriculum.

The mark allocation for items is largely in the range of 1 to 5 marks. Only one item (Question 2.2.1) requires a “report”. This question supposedly asks students to “write a report on road deaths”, but in reality report writing skills are not being assessed. Students can merely repeat what is in the stimulus material. So too in Question 5.1, where students are asked to “create rules and regulations”. This question does not in fact require evaluation or synthesis skills, as students can merely repeat what they have already learned.

The language demands of the Level 4 examination are in places beyond the comprehension level of the average students. All papers should be subjected to a reading ease test to ensure that students at a particular level are able to comprehend what the texts in the examination.

Regarding the evidence of progression from the Level 2 to the Level 3 paper towards the Level 4 paper, the team noted:

- The mark allocation and paper length progresses from 150 marks (2 hours) in Level 2, to 180 marks (3 hours) for Level 3, and 200 marks (3 hours) for Level 4.
- The cognitive demand generally tested throughout the three papers is essentially easy conceptual knowledge.

In short, the analysis reveals that the disparity between the Assessment Guidelines for this subject and the final exam papers is significant, which suggests that this analysis should form the basis to train examiners, internal and external moderators to understand and apply the assessment requirements more effectively. The failure to test in accordance with the requirements does a disservice to the reputation of the Tourism programme, undercuts the value of the qualification and sends underprepared students into the workplace with unrealistic expectations.
4.3.4 Client Services and Human Relations

The evaluation team found that the length of the paper compared to the time and mark allocation for the different levels of the papers for Levels 2, 3 and 4 for the subject Client Services and Human Relations is acceptable. The Level 4 paper did not contain pictures, but the quality of visuals in the other papers was acceptable. The cover pages are clear with the examining body and qualification, paper and mark allocation indicated.

The team was of opinion that the instructions to students could be elaborated upon, by giving students more guidance with respect to time allocation, for instance. The number of pages is listed so papers can be checked for completeness. There are clear instructions on what must be done on page 2 in each case. The look is clean, the font easy to read and important data are highlighted by the use of capital letters. The visual appearance of the papers is good.

Did the 2011 NC (V) Client Services and Human Relations Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The Assessment Guidelines are very vague regarding the External Summative Assessment, i.e. the National Examination. The only information available is the weighting of cognitive categories for the paper with no further guidelines as to the weighting of topics or mark allocation per question. This may be a possible reason for why the paper is inconsistent regarding the weighting of topics.

Determining the weighting of the topics was challenging. It was decided to establish the number of sub-topics and express these as a percentage of all the content in this subject as a means of giving the weighting.

Table 21: Weighting of topics in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to topic weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTING OF TOPICS: CLIENT SERVICES AND HUMAN RELATIONS LEVEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Staff development and Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: The effect of solved problems on client care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Ways to ensure the health and safety of clients and colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that too much emphasis was placed on Topic 3 while Topics 1 and 2 were under-weighted.

The analysis found that 15% of the marks allocated to topics or content were not stipulated in the Subject Guidelines. Question 3.2 requires students to demonstrate knowledge of “promotion of services to clients” and Question 4.4.2 speaks of “lack of dietary iron”. Neither of these are mentioned in the Subject Guidelines.
With regard to the cognitive categories to be represented in the examination, the Level 4 paper seriously deviates from the Assessment Guidelines. The paper leans very heavily towards conceptual knowledge and comprehension (72%), with very little testing of application skills. There are no questions that require analytic skills, providing or defending and opinion, or demanding questions dealing with complex reasoning involving synthesis.

Table 22: Weighting of cognitive categories in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to the recommended weightings in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Knowledge</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the NC (V) Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

Cognitive demand
The evaluation team found significant shortcomings with regard to cognitive demand in the examination papers of Levels 2, 3 and 4, as all displayed deviations from the AG requirements.

Establishing progression of topics between the Levels was a challenge. The papers are not structured according to the topics indicated in the Assessment Guidelines, and the topics differ across all three levels or years of study.

Table 23: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTING OF TOPICS: CLIENT SERVICES AND HUMAN RELATIONS LEVEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Staff development and Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: The effect of solved problems on client care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Ways to ensure the health and safety of clients and colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total topics in this subject:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Level 3 paper contained no questions on Topic 2: “Health and safety procedures to ensure a safe and secure environment.” The paper assessed only Topics 1 and 3 with too much emphasis on Topic 3 (52% as opposed to the suggested 38%).
Table 24: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 3 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>Number of sub-topics</th>
<th>Suggested weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Human Relations requirements according to various acts.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Health and safety procedures to ensure a safe and secure environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: The impact of cultural knowledge on client care</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total topics in this subject:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at the table reflecting the topics in Level 2, the weighting of the topics is most accurately represented in the examination paper. However, the choice between questions indicated in the Assessment Guidelines does not appear anywhere in the paper.

Table 25: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 2 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>Number of sub-topics</th>
<th>Suggested weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Function in a business environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Human relations with respect to colleagues with special needs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Client service in a cultural context</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 4: Health and Safety according to the OHS act.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total topics in this subject:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Learners are required to do any THREE questions (3x50 marks) for a total of 150 marks.

From the total of 200 marks in the paper, 115 marks were assigned to questions requiring knowledge recall.
Figure 11: Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Client Services and Human Relations examination

The graph above indicates that Conceptual Knowledge and Comprehension category questions comprise 72%, or 144 marks of the total of 200; Application comprises 25% (or 50 marks); Analysis comprises 3% (6 marks). The evaluation team did not find any questions requiring an opinion, needing to provide substantiation, creating solutions for problems or modifying any procedures or methods, which means that no evaluating or synthesising skills were assessed in the Level 4 paper. The fact that this paper does not require reflexive thinking skills indicates that students will in all likelihood be inadequately prepared for entry into Higher Education in this field of study.

It is a concern that many of the questions in the paper refer to the two case studies provided. While the paper included these “case studies” in an attempt to provide application of content, the questions related to the case studies were pure recall questions, and required little specific application to the content of the case study. The first case study on “Tour Operating” was acceptable. However, the second case study on the “Pot Delight Restaurant” is superfluous, as ensuing questions are based purely on recall of theoretical facts and not on real application to the case study. The questions that followed the case studies did not provide an opportunity for any cognitive demand such as analysis, evaluation or application.

The longest question was allocated eight marks, and there were no long application questions where students are required to think, develop, compare, present ideas or use their knowledge in any applied way.

Level of difficulty

As described in Chapter 2, the five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The team used the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:
The evaluation analysed the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The level of difficulty is also unbalanced at 66.5% “Easy”, 33% “Moderate” and 0.5% “Difficult” as indicated by the graph below:

![Figure 12: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination](image)

The evaluation team rated the difficulty of questions as “easy” to “moderate” which makes the paper unchallenging. Even where the slightest attempt was made to set questions requiring application, evaluation or synthesis demands, the level of difficulty is still classified as “easy”.

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CKE</th>
<th>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13: Cognitive level combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination**

As evident in the figure above, the problems with the two case studies notwithstanding, the paper did require some application at a moderate level of difficulty.

**Is the format of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations paper a good model for future papers?**

The Level 4 final paper is not considered to be a good model for future examinations, as there are serious shortcomings with the structure and layout of the paper. It is suggested that the format of the paper be reviewed. The following issues should receive urgent attention:

- The paper is not divided into logical sections according to the topics. It was therefore challenging to establish at a glance if all topics received adequate coverage in the paper.
- The paper does not follow a logical layout according to the topics. Various examples of questions on all topics are found scattered across the entire paper.
- The Assessment Guidelines do not give guidance on the weighting of topics, hence the questions on certain topics appear haphazardly across the paper.
• The weighting of the marks should be aligned to the weighting of the Topics in the Subject Guidelines.
• The way in which certain questions are formulated makes it difficult to allocate them to a particular topic.
• The way in which some questions are formulated and the use of action verbs should also be revisited. Some questions may confuse students as to what response is expected of them, due to the incorrect use of action verbs. For example Question 2.1 “Motivate the statement…” / Question 2.6 Identify six work environments … (where no extract or source is given to identify from) / Question 3.1 Differentiate… (where the memo “defines”).
• Scaffolding of questions must receive attention as suggested in Science of Tourism in section 4.3.2 above.

How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Client services and Human Relations Level 4 paper?

The language level was regarded as suitable for the target group i.e. Level 4 students. Some of the questions could be written more clearly, which would facilitate interpretation by English second-language students. For example, Question 3.3: “Suggest why it would be advisable for the Pot Delight management to accommodate local clients” could be changed to read “Why should the Pot Delight management provide for local clients?”

Concluding remarks and recommendations about the Client Services and Human Relations examination

Most importantly, it is recommended that the cognitive demand for the paper be aligned with the requirements stipulated in the Assessment Guidelines, but the Assessment Guidelines should also be updated to include appropriate and much needed guidelines regarding the division of topics and questions in the paper and the relevant mark allocation for each.

Consistency should be built into the three levels of the subject with regard to the use of “choice questions.” Only the Level 2 examination gives the students the opportunity to select certain questions.

It is suggested that the papers are structured into topics with clear headings so that students will know exactly which part of the content is being assessed.

The Level 4 paper has no visual stimulation at all. The evaluation team strongly recommends that visual stimuli (pictures, cartoon strips, graphs, etc.) be included in the paper. Examiners must ensure that text and/or any form of visual stimuli are appropriate and facilitate appropriate responses from students.

Parts of the paper follow a theme-based approach. Questions 3.4 and 5 refer to a case study about a restaurant, but irrelevant questions appear in between those questions that do refer to the case study. Students may find this very confusing. If this approach is followed, the examiner needs to ensure that only questions relating to the case study are used and ordered appropriately. Case studies can be employed to make the paper current and can include reference to recent happenings or events in the field of tourism.

The evaluation team recommends that the use of the action verbs be revisited because these words are supposed to inform students clearly what responses are expected from them. It is also suggested that the addendum be done away with. Visual stimuli and sources can be incorporated into the paper along with the questions based on them.
The Level 4 question paper for Client Services and Human Relations is not aligned to the cognitive categories specified in the Assessment Guidelines, a matter of real concern. In its current form, the examination (and presumably the teaching that led up to it) does not adequately prepare students for entry into industry and/or higher education as it does not equip them to demonstrate their thinking skills.

Finally, the evaluation team argued strongly that the intended curriculum may provide entry into industry and/or higher education, but that the current assessed curriculum does not. However, with the suggestions and recommendations implemented, the assessed curriculum can readily fulfill the objectives as intended.
4.4 General trends in the examination papers of the NC (V): Hospitality programme

4.4.1 Food Preparation

As previously mentioned, the Consumer Studies team analyzed the subject Food Preparation and shared the insights with the Hospitality Studies team.

The Level 4 examination paper is set out of 200 marks and candidates have three hours to complete the paper.

Did the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The evaluation team noted that the distribution of this paper’s cognitive range does not adhere to the suggested percentages for the cognitive categories in the Assessment Guidelines. The table and graph below illustrate the discrepancies:

Table 26: Weighting of cognitive categories in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Food Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE AND COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Guideline requirements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Examination weightings</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found that though questions of all cognitive categories are included in the paper, there is still a heavy weighting towards questions requiring recall of knowledge and comprehension.

Figure 14: Comparison between weighting of cognitive categories suggested in the Assessment Guidelines and weighting in the 2011 Level 4 examination for Food Preparation

The evaluation team felt that too many questions requiring the identification of specific data and simple recall were included and too few questions requiring interpretation and finding solutions were asked. This Level 4 Food Preparation paper is considered to include too few of the application and evaluation type of questions that could reasonably be expected in an exit examination for an NQF Level 4 qualification.
The weighted values suggested for topics in the Subject Guidelines were compared to those included in the 2011 Level 4 final examination. Only one topic, viz. “prepare, cook and finish complex vegetable dishes” is in line with the suggested coverage in the Subject Guidelines.

The graph below illustrates the deviation from the expected topic weighting in percentages:

Figure 15: Comparison between the weighted topic suggestions in the Subject Guidelines and weightings in the final 2011 Level 4 examination for Food Preparation.

Nonetheless, the weighting of topics in the examination was felt to be within acceptable limits.

Is the NC (V) Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

The practical nature of the subject demands application questions requiring students to illustrate, align, or to make conversions. Though it is commendable that 31% of the total marks allocated in the paper require some form of application, there is still a 9% difference from the required 40% required as stipulated in the Assessment Guidelines.

Figure 16: Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Food Preparation examination
It is commendable that 31% of the questions asked students to apply their knowledge, as the subject has a heavy (60%) practical component. This approach will help prepare students well for the workplace. So, too will the 20% of questions requiring reflexive thinking, demanding evaluation, complex reasoning involving synthesis or making modifications to procedures or methods.

**Level of difficulty**

The five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The team used the following abbreviations to describe the particular cognitive category:

CK: Conceptual knowledge  
C: Comprehension (Understanding)  
A: Application  
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving  
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team referred to the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

As illustrated in the graph below, the paper is unbalanced with regard to its level of difficulty. Only 1% of the paper’s questions were rated as “difficult”; 82% of questions were rated as “moderate” and 17% of the paper was on an “easy” level. The team felt however, that the large number of moderately difficult questions included in the paper suggests a welcome move towards more demanding assessment.

![Figure 17: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Food Preparation examination](image)

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining the cognitive categories and the levels of difficulty, it is evident that the moderately difficult questions were included in the whole range of cognitive categories:

- 13% or 26 marks requiring conceptual knowledge
- 20% or 39 marks requiring comprehension
- 30% or 60 marks requiring application
- 12% or 23 marks requiring analysis and problem-solving
- 8% or 16 marks requiring evaluation or synthesis

Figure 18: Cognitive categories combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Food Preparation examination

Progression from Level 2 to Level 4

The layout of the papers at all three levels is consistent. However the evaluation team was concerned about the limited evidence of progression from Level 2 to Level 3 and the lack of upward progression from the Level 3 paper to the Level 4 paper. Visual images were included in Level 2 and Level 3, but none was included in the Level 4 paper.

Language errors, in particular clumsily constructed sentences, were found in all three levels, e.g. in the Level 4 paper p. 9, Question 7.3: “Baking is mostly used for potatoes, as their skins provide a natural protection from the dry heat”; the Level 3 paper p.11, Question
11.1: “Explain how to store biscuits and indicate the solutions for the mistakes that Peter has made”; the Level 2 paper: p. 9, Question 7.7: “Joe has ordered too much vegetable for the week”, and p. 11, Question 9.6: “How full must the deep fat fryer be made?”. There is no progression of cognitive demand or level of difficulty from Level 2 to Level 4. The same types of action verbs and similar forms of contextualization are found throughout the three levels.

The team suggested that questions should be scaffolded to display progression within a question as well, e.g. p. 10, Question 10.3, which reads:

There should be an individual bin card for each item held in stock. Peter asks you to design a bin card. Your bin card should show all the details clearly.

This activity could be scaffolded to read:

Design a bin card.
The bin card must be for an individual item held in stock.
The card must show all the details required on a bin card.

Is the format of the Food Preparation paper a good model for future papers?

The layout of the paper creates a good impression: all pages are numbered and the font size is acceptable. The format of the paper is acceptable too. The questions are grouped according to the main topics prescribed in Food Preparation (meat, poultry, game and offal), with good incorporation of questions on sub-topics (like food and safety and storage). A few cases were found where the preamble to the question was not relevant or required unnecessary reading. For example, Question 9.4, reads:

Food preparation areas in the restaurant should be clean in accordance with hygiene principles. A checklist would be an ideal tool to check that cleaning is done according to the hygiene standards.

9.4.1 Design a checklist to help Peter in this regard.

This question could be phrased more simply as:

Design a checklist that can be used to check the cleanliness of food preparation areas. The checklist must reinforce hygiene principles and standards.

The team suggests that the question be placed separately from the preamble using a sub-number to prevent questions from “disappearing” amongst other content. Examples where this occurs include:

- Question 10.1
  It is important to Peter to secure the storage areas in the restaurant, because stock represents money. Make suggestions on how to secure storage areas.

- Question 8.7
  Eggs are a common ingredient used in desserts and are classified as a high-risk food. They provide a perfect breeding ground for bacteria. Give recommendations on how to prevent contamination, when preparing desserts containing eggs.
• Question 5.3
  A big function is taking place in five days’ time. Peter instructs you to prepare the beef lasagne and freeze it when done. Indicate how you will freeze the lasagne correctly.

The implementation of this suggestion would improve the presentation of content in the paper, and provide a clearer, more open format.

The structuring of Question 6.2 also needs attention. The question itself should be broken up into two parts and the list of ingredients should have a border around it. The mark allocation should be more clearly set out, especially since it is one of the questions with the highest mark allocation in the paper.

Comments such as these point to principles that inform good assessment, and should be understood in those terms.

How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Food Preparation paper?

The vocabulary used throughout the paper is suitable for this level of students. However, concern was expressed regarding the language editing of this (national level) exam paper. Questions and case studies were often worded clumsily, which made reading and understanding unnecessarily difficult.

Some instances were found of the incorrect use of terminology or statements. For example, in Question 6.2, there is no “recipe”, only a list of ingredients; in Question 7.3 where baking is not used mostly for potatoes.

Punctuation also requires attention: for example, in Question 8.1 where a full stop should be a colon and Question 8.6 where there is an unnecessary use of the comma.

Concluding remarks and recommendations about the Food Preparation examination

It is recommended that a brief summary of the outline of the examination paper (sections and mark allocations) should be included as part of the instructions and information sheet at the beginning of the paper.

Furthermore, examination papers for the subject should be reviewed and moderated collectively and comparatively across the three levels. This would ensure better progression in cognitive demand and difficulty over the three years of study.

All papers should be submitted for stringent language and technical editing.

In conclusion, the team was of the opinion that the Level 4 intended and assessed curriculum do not currently provide the right mix of academic skills and knowledge to provide entry into higher education. The assessment (and so too presumably the teaching) relies too heavily on recall and comprehension of conceptual knowledge, considered to be at an easy to moderate level of difficulty. Furthermore, it is argued that the nature of the Level 4 assessment should prepare students well to support access to entry-level work in the hospitality industry. It doesn’t do so yet.
4.4.2 Hospitality Generics

The Level 4 examination paper is set out of 200 marks and candidates have three hours to complete the paper.

Did the 2011 NC (V) Hospitality Generics Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The evaluation team compared the weighted requirements in the Subject Guidelines with the marks awarded to questions in the 2011 Level 4 examination. As illustrated in the table below, the required weighting of topics and the actual coverage in the examination paper are aligned. The evaluation team concluded that the questions in the paper cover the content satisfactorily.

Table 27: Weighting of topics in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines for Hospitality Generics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Weighted value from Subject Guidelines</th>
<th>Actual value in exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitor and Maintain Health, Safety and Security</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analyze and develop new menus</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manage one’s own development</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source information about self-employment opportunities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weighting of cognitive categories required for the paper is specified in the Assessment Guidelines. This is indicated in the table below as “intended weighting”.

The “actual weightings” for the marks awarded to questions in the examination paper are also provided in the table to follow:

Table 28: Weighting of actual cognitive categories in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to weighting specified in the Assessment Guidelines for Hospitality Generics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge and comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended weighting</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual weightings</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team found that the focus in the examination leans heavily towards questions requiring conceptual knowledge and comprehension skills with some questions requiring application of knowledge. Questions requiring analytic thinking and evaluation skills that would challenge the students are generally absent, as only 3% of questions require any of the skills.
Is the NC (V) Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

Cognitive demand

As noted above, the cognitive demand is too heavily weighted towards questions requiring the recall of knowledge, locating information, naming, matching or identifying a correct explanation.

Of the 200 marks in the paper, only five are allocated to analysis and problem-solving skills, viz. in Question 5.5:

Thabo is appointed as Health and Safety officer at the Lindaba Lodge. He needs to communicate new safety procedures to the staff.

Explain what Thabo can do to make sure that the staff understands the information given to them. 5 marks

The assessment of evaluation and synthesis skills is not evident in any of the questions.

![Cognitive categories](image)

**Figure 19: Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Hospitality Generics examination**

As evident in the graph above, 134 marks of the total of 200 (or 67%) are allocated to questions requiring the recall of conceptual knowledge, working with simple laws or methods, general perceptions, explanations and understanding conventions. The team expressed concern that only five marks were awarded to problem-solving skills (which might be too few marks for what is actually required by the question), as well as the exclusion of any evaluation type questions.

Level of difficulty

The five cognitive categories included in the analysis had to be entered in Column 3 (C3) of the data-collection spread-sheet. The cognitive categories were:

CK: Conceptual knowledge
C: Comprehension (Understanding)
A: Application
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)
The evaluation team referred to the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The levels of difficulty were found to be most heavily weighted towards “easy” and “moderate” questions. Only two questions were evaluated as “difficult”: Question 5.4 for six marks, requires students to synthesize information, and requires insight to make logical connections. Question 8.5, for ten marks, requires calculations. This translates as just sixteen marks out of 200 (or 8%) being used to assess higher order thinking skills. This is evident in the graph below:

![Figure 20: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Hospitality Generics examination](image)

The evaluation team regarded this paper as insufficiently rigorous for a Level 4 exit examination. By testing mostly conceptual knowledge, it disadvantages students with good practical or application skills, and provides no opportunities for very good students to excel. There are too few long questions with application where students would be required to think, develop, compare, present ideas or use their knowledge in an applied way.

The assessment of application is too low for a vocationally-based subject. Hospitality Generics is a practical subject, and so more emphasis should be placed on questions requiring students to analyze work-related challenges, apply problem-solving skills, defend opinions, do modifications and create new solutions to problems. In short, this practical subject is assessed in this paper in a highly theoretical manner, which is inappropriate.

An example of a good question is Question 8.5, as it challenges the student to apply learning and foundational skills and knowledge by having to calculate total food costs from nine ingredients, and then to extrapolate from that calculation, the cost of one portion.

The following abbreviations were used to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:
As can be seen from the graph, this paper is heavily weighted towards simple recall of conceptual knowledge. While many of the questions were suitable, they were “easy”, posing little challenge or opportunity to engage critically. The paper places too much emphasis on retrieving data, locating information or finding data from known texts and too little emphasis on the other range of cognitive categories.

**Progression from Level 2 to 4**

**Table 29: Weighting of cognitive category in the 2011 Level 2–4 examination for Hospitality Generics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total marks</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
<th>Knowledge and comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis, Synthesis and evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above it is evident that the duration of the examination papers shows an increase from Level 2 to Level 3. Furthermore, the total number of marks increases from 150 marks for the Level 2 examination paper to 180 marks in Level 3 and 200 marks in Level 4. Due to the increase in time and mark allocation the students’ ability to persevere and concentrate for longer periods of time has to improve to successfully complete each examination paper.

With regard to questions requiring recall of knowledge and comprehension, there is no clear progression from Level 2 to Level 4. The Level 3 examination is an outlier with a plunge to 49% from the Level 2 (87%) to the Level 4 (68%).

The questions on the application level show an increase from Level 2 to 3 and 4 which indicates limited progression, and which is in line with expectations regarding the increased demand for applied knowledge.

The percentage of the questions which assess skills requiring analysis, evaluation and synthesis increases sharply from Level 2 to 3, but decreases significantly from Level 3 to 4. This is evidence of a lack of proper progression from Level 2 to 4.

Based on the data, the team concluded that the 2011 Level 3 examination paper is more difficult than the Level 4 paper.

Is the format of the 2011 Hospitality Generics Level 4 paper a good model for future papers?

The cover page is clear, with the examining body and qualification, subject name, date and times (duration). The number of pages is listed so papers can be checked for completeness. The look is clean, with an “easy to read” font and important information is highlighted by the use of capital letters. There are instructions on what must be done on p. 2 and this instructive approach is continued throughout.

Some questions are not clear, appropriate or specific. Examples of this are: Question 3 for ten marks is not an appropriate type of question for students on Level 4; Question 5.7 asks for numbers but requires words; in Question 7.5 the use of the word “predict” is not appropriate in relation to the answers required, which require the student to “explain”; and Question 6.2 uses the word “discuss” which is a misnomer – “explain” would be more appropriate.

The main concern is the marking guideline which needs to be much more specific with clear mark allocations and answers. For example: the answers are swapped round for Questions 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 – this could result in marks being awarded for incorrect answers. The marking guideline for Question 5.4 is unclear: two marks are awarded per answer, but it is not clear how the two marks must be allocated. The same is true for Questions 5.2. and 6.1.

For Questions 7.1.1 to 7.1.3 there are more possible correct answers than the one provided on the marking guideline.

Questions 7.2 and 7.4 do not encourage systemic thinking as they do not require all seven steps in the process. Thus, for example, in the answer for Question 7.2, the seven steps in the Marking Guideline are:
• Step 1: Identify the decision to be made. E.g. what career path should I follow and should I study further.
• Step 2: Get to know yourself: Develop a true understanding of whom and what you are.
• Step 3: Identify career options.
• Step 4: Gather information and data about career options identified in step 3
• Step 5: Evaluate options that you identified.
• Step 6: Select one of the options.
• Step 7: Develop and implement your plan of action.

But the guideline asks for “Any 5” of those listed above. This means that a student can leave out two steps, and thus not display an understanding of the systematic order of the steps.

The paper is an acceptable basic model for future examinations as it covers the content, but needs to be improved in respect of presenting the students with challenges, even if this is done in a scaffolded way. Students must be expected to break a problem down into its constituent parts, to pinpoint the difficulty/ies and to use appropriate methods to solve the problem.

In addition, the marking guideline must be improved to be accurate and specific.

**How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Hospitality Generics Level 4 paper?**

The examination paper is of an acceptable standard and quality with regard to the language level and format of questions, but the marking guideline is problematic as indicated above.

The level of language is suitable for the multi-lingual students at Level 4. However, as in the examples cited above, the wording of questions is unclear and could result in confusion for the candidates. Appropriate industry and subject jargon is used.

The marking guideline is not sufficiently specific for all answers.

**Concluding remarks and recommendations about the 2011 Hospitality Generics final examination**

Firstly, the range of cognitive skills and the difficulty level of the final examination must be significantly increased by including questions requiring analysis, evaluation and synthesis to improve the rigour of the paper. Students should be required to demonstrate complex reasoning involving critical argument, breaking problems down into their constituent parts, pinpointing the central difficulties and using appropriate methods to solve the problem. They should be expected to solving non-routine problems in an examination setting as well.

The types and variety of questions must be revised. Question papers should include real case studies or situations that require the same thinking skills expected in industry.

The answers in the marking guidelines must be accurate and specific. The extent of the answer required should be more closely aligned to the mark value of the questions.

The evaluation team suggested that a question bank could be developed to collect and use questions that are considered to be good. These could be made available to lecturers in colleges as exemplars that could help promote a better understanding of the required standard at Level 4 (and at the other levels too).
A way of strengthening the quality of the examination would be that the examiners should be taught to use an analysis grid to track the level of each question to ensure coverage of the range of cognitive categories.

The 2011 Level 4 examination does not provide a good model of assessment at this level, as it fails to assess the levels of cognitive demand that would benefit students wanting to enter into the industry. The high levels of recall of conceptual knowledge, the lack of difficulty and insufficient application of knowledge and skill to problems similar to those in the workplace is of serious concern. Greater emphasis should be placed on assessing the acquisition of skills and knowledge as they apply in industry. In summary, the paper seems to be set on textbook content, without application to the hospitality industry.

4.4.3 Hospitality Services

The Level 4 examination paper is set out of 200 marks and candidates have three hours to complete the paper.

Did the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?

The paper is divided into eight questions. Questions 2 – 8 are each focussed on a specific or related topic. For example, all the items in Question 4 cover Topic 7 in the Subject Guidelines. Question 1, which consists of fifteen multiple-choice questions, covers all the topics.

Although topic weightings are specified in the Subject Guidelines, these are not specified or mentioned in the Assessment Guidelines (AGs). It is concerning that the Assessment Guidelines fail to indicate to the examiner where and how much emphasis (depth) should be placed on any of the topics, and it is assumed that the examiner would have insight into both documents.

The Assessment Guidelines (p. 3) outline criteria for the validity of assessments, requiring assessments to cover a broad range of skills, knowledge, values and attitudes. However, 77% of the actual examination paper focuses on skills requiring conceptual knowledge and recall of facts. It is recognised that the final examination is only one of fifteen assessments and it is therefore not possible to determine to what extent the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes are assessed in the other assessments, hopefully making the complete assessment process more valid.

The table below compares the topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines with the weightings as found in the 2011 Level 4 examination:
Table 30: Weighting of topics in the Subject Guidelines and in the 2011 Level 4 examination for Hospitality Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Suggested weighting (%) in Subject Guidelines</th>
<th>Actual Weighting (%) Exam 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Serve Bottled Wine</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prepare and serve cocktail</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Silver Service</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintain a drinks service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintain the cleaning programme in a specified area</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plan and conduct meetings</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maintain the receipt, storage and issue of goods</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the examination is set with approximately the same weighting for topics as that proposed in the Subject Guidelines.

As far as cognitive demand is concerned, the paper does not conform to requirements in the Assessment Guidelines. The table below indicates the extent of the deviation:

Table 31: Weighting of cognitive categories in the Assessment Guidelines compared with the weighting in the 2011 Level 4 examination for Hospitality Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Category</th>
<th>Suggested Weighting (%)</th>
<th>Actual Weighting (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Comprehension</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, Evaluation and Synthesis</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these data, it is evident that there is an over-emphasis on Conceptual Knowledge (77%) and Comprehension (6.5%), which together constitute 83.5% of the paper. The requirement in the Assessment Guidelines is 30%. Application-type questions constituted only 16.5% of the paper, where the requirement is 40%. The evaluation team found no evidence of any questions targeting thinking skills, for instance analysis of non-routine problems based on real contexts.

Is the NC (V) Hospitality Services Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the NC (V) exam?

Cognitive demand

The graph below represents the proportions of the cognitive categories represented in the 2011 Level 4 paper:
As indicated above, questions requiring knowledge recall, account for 154 of the paper’s 200 marks (or 77%). The questions requiring application skills account for 16.5% of the paper. Few questions (6.5%) requiring comprehension skills are asked and no evidence was found of any questions requiring analytic skills, problem-solving or evaluation and synthesis skills. In short, most of the questions were simple recall-type questions that require one word or a short statement as answer, giving obvious facts, giving simple relationships or one-step answers.

**Level of difficulty**

The five cognitive categories included in the analysis are the following:

CK: Conceptual knowledge  
C: Comprehension (Understanding)  
A: Application  
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving  
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team identified the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The graph below reflects the level of difficulty in each of the questions. It is clear that in most instances there is a bias towards questions that were judged to be “easy”. “Easy” questions comprise 161 marks (or 80.5%) of the paper; only 18.5% of the paper was considered either “moderate” or “difficult”. This is evidence of an imbalanced assessment approach.
Figure 23: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Hospitality Services examination

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining cognitive categories with degrees of difficulty, the following pattern emerges:
Figure 24: Cognitive category combined with levels of difficulty in the 2011 Hospitality Services examination

As the bar chart makes clear, the majority of questions are at an “easy” level (80.5%) regardless of the cognitive category being assessed. The Conceptual Knowledge Easy (CKE) is by far the most dominant type of assessment, followed by easy application (Application Easy (AE)) questions.

The examination paper is thus not aligned to the actual requirements of this exit-level Level 4 examination. It is argued that this level of assessment (and presumably also of teaching) cannot equip students with the necessary reflexive thinking required for tertiary-level study, or for the workplace.

While most questions are relevant and could be used in future, the frequency of the same type of questions (e.g. matching terms and definitions) is unacceptable in a single paper. A variety of question types, covering the same content, would have contributed to assessing a wider range of cognitive categories and at higher levels of difficulty. This would have added more interest and rigour to the paper.

The action verb “discuss” was often used. However what the students were actually expected to do was “list” and “name” – such is evident from the answers required in the Marking Guidelines. It was almost as if examiners were told to refrain from using only “name” and “list”, but then inappropriately used “explain” and “discuss”. This practice disguises the actual nature of the question or attempts to give the impression that a specific question requires the comprehension of data.

In a few instances, the same learning outcome is assessed in more than one question. For example Question 6.3.2 requires the student to identify how stock on hand impacts on customer service, and then Question 6.4.2 it asks for a discussion on how customer service can be improved by having sufficient stock. These are simply too closely related to be in a single exam paper.
Progression from Level 2 to 4

The examinations for the three levels provide little evidence progression. Simple recollection of knowledge is the major requirement in all three Levels and similar types of questions are used throughout. Considering the aims expressed in the qualification and the curricula, this is a real pity.

As far as level of difficulty is concerned, the analysis shows that Level 2 has the highest level of difficulty, with “only” 59% of the questions classified as “easy”! However, questions regarded as “easy” make up 77% of the Level 4 paper. While there is a small increase in the level of difficulty by Level 4 (6% of questions are now regarded as “difficult”), it can hardly be regarded as significant.

The range of cognitive categories remains similar over the three years, with none of the three years requiring students to analyse, solve problems, evaluate or synthesize. When the evaluators combined the cognitive category and level of difficulty scores for the three papers by averaging the cognitive category score and level of difficulty score, the results are:

- Level 2: 76%
- Level 3: 77%
- Level 4: 76%

This means that, although there may be a decrease in questions requiring conceptual knowledge, it goes hand-in-hand with a corresponding increase in the level of easiness. It is therefore concluded that the cognitive demand and level of difficulty over the three levels remains much the same and that there is no gradual increase in the expectations required of the students across the programme, a sobering finding.

It should be noted that the Level 3 assessment shows the best balance between cognitive demand and level of difficulty, though the difference between it and the other papers is slight.

Is the format of the 2011 Hospitality Services Level 4 paper a good model for future papers?

The team found no problems with the layout, language, jargon, format, instructions and other technical issues in the paper. The questions were well numbered, spaced and clearly written, but it is questionable that students would require 3 hours to answer such a paper, especially given the type of questioning being asked.

Using different types of questions and more demanding ones could help address the manifest shortcomings in the present paper. Tightening up the final exam papers (at the least by aligning them to the requirements in the Assessment Guidelines), and by doing so across the three levels, would enhance the credibility of the subject, better prepare students for further education and the workplace, and challenge students to step up to the mark.

How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Hospitality Services Level 4 paper?

The use of language, both the level of English as well as subject specific jargon, is considered to be appropriate throughout. However, the incorrect use of certain verbs, for example “discuss”, “explain” and “describe” in some of the questions, is troubling as it disguises to some extent the very limited horizons of the paper itself. For example, Question 5.5, “Discuss the importance of reaching a decision during a meeting” appears to require the discussion of
an opinion, whereas in the marking guideline, it is apparent that the question only requires a student to write down any two of three points from the ext.

**Concluding remarks and recommendations about the 2011 Hospitality Services Level 4 examination**

The incorrect use of directive words such as “Discuss”, “Describe” and “Explain” in questions suggests that guidelines for setting good quality items as well as the professional development of examiners and moderators is called for. A workshop designed to help examiners and moderators gain a clear understanding of the various cognitive categories and how these can be assessed would be most useful.

The Assessment Guidelines for this subject should also include an indication of the weight each topic should carry in the assessment – currently this information is only available in the Subject Guidelines.

The need to make use of a much greater variety of questioning techniques and to guard against the overuse of the same type of questions, such as matching terms to definitions, must be taken seriously by the Departmental examiners and Umalusi’s moderators alike. Care should also be taken that the same content is not required in more than one question, asked in a different way or using different words, but these are principles that need to be absorbed by Hospitality programme examiners and moderators across the board.

Whilst the overuse of matching columns should be avoided, it is possible to increase the range of cognitive categories by including, for example, a third and even a fourth column that would require different skills, knowledge or values to be assessed. The subject lends itself to very interesting and alternative types of questioning, specifically in the application domain. As a “service” subject, most Learning Outcomes are of the “to do” sort, where practical application is required to be assessed – even in writing.

Looking at the progression from Level 2 to Level 4, it is clear that this subject on the three levels is inter-dependent and cannot add to a student’s understanding in isolation. Level 4 must be underpinned by Levels 2 and 3. However, at the same time Levels 2 and 3 should deliver upwards to Level 4 to provide a more complete learning experience ultimately.

The present style of questioning leaves students disadvantaged, and unable to cope with types of assessment which are the norm in higher education, even at first-year (NQF 5) level. Students would struggle, not necessarily on account of a lack of knowledge but because they have not acquired the necessary writing and thinking skills expected in higher educations.

An additional concern is that if students are allowed to exit at Levels 2 or 3 without completing Level 4, there will be large gaps in the knowledge and skills. The team therefore recommends that the three years of study be combined into one exit-level qualification at NQF Level 4.

Since this is an exit level qualification at NQF Level 4, the present assessment of the various categories of cognitive demand at the current levels of difficulty are considered unacceptable. The NC (V) Hospitality qualification should provide successful students with a well-rounded vocational experience that stands them in good stead for further study or meaningful entry into the workplace. It should provide successful candidates with an exit-level qualification that has status in the industry and is of sufficient standing to be recognized
for entry into certain hospitality-related qualifications. In its current format, this programme does not do that. It can, however, and should: this report provides multiple ways in which the delivery of the qualification can be strengthened, and the final exams are certainly the first port of call.

### 4.4.4 Client Services and Human Relations

The Level 4 examination paper is set out of 200 marks and candidates have three hours to complete the paper.

The length of the paper compared to the time allocation for the different levels of the papers for Levels 2, 3 and 4 for the subject Client Services and Human Relations is found to be acceptable. The visual appearance of the papers is also good (cover page, printing and page numbers are clear and of good quality).

**Did the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 paper comply with the Assessment Guidelines (AGs)?**

The Assessment Guidelines are vague regarding the External Summative Assessment, i.e. the National Examination.

The only information available is the weighting of cognitive categories for the paper with no further guidelines to weighting of topics or mark allocation per question. This may be the reason why the paper does not have consistency regarding weighting of topics.

Determining the weighting of the topics was challenging. It was decided to establish the number of sub-topics and express that as a percentage of all the content in this subject. This gave an indication of the weighting.

**Table 32: Weighting of topics in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>Number of sub-topics</th>
<th>Suggested weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Staff development and Human Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: The effect of solved problems on client care</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Ways to ensure the health and safety of clients and colleagues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total topics in this subject:</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that too much emphasis was placed on Topic 3 while Topics 1 and 2 were under-weighted.

Fifteen percent of the marks allocated to questions on content which was not included in the Subject Guidelines. For instance, Question 3.2 requires students to demonstrate knowledge of “promotion of services to clients” and Question 4.4.2 speaks of “lack of dietary iron”. Neither of these are included in the Subject Guidelines.
With regard to cognitive categories, the Level 4 paper seriously deviates from the requirements of the Assessment Guidelines. The paper leans heavily towards conceptual knowledge and comprehension (72%), with very little by way of assessment of application skills. There are no questions that require analysis, evaluation nor any demanding questions dealing with complex reasoning involving synthesis.

Table 33: Weighting of cognitive categories in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to cognitive category weighting in the Assessment Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Knowledge</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the NC (V) Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the exam?

Cognitive demand

The analysis of the examination papers for Levels 2, 3, and 4 showed significant discrepancies between the requirements expressed in the Assessment guidelines and the actual cognitive categories assessed.

It was difficult to establish any forms of progression between the Levels. The papers were not structured according to the topics indicated in the Subject Guidelines, not do the topics remain the same across all three years of study.

Table 34: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 4 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTING OF TOPICS: CLIENT SERVICES AND HUMAN RELATIONS LEVEL 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sub-topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Staff development and Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: The effect of solved problems on client care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Ways to ensure the health and safety of clients and colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total topics in this subject:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Level 3 paper contains no questions on Topic 2: “Health and safety procedures to ensure a safe and secure environment.” The paper assesses only Topics 1 and 3, with too much emphasis on Topic 3 (52% as opposed to the suggested 38%).
### Table 35: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 3 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>Number of sub-topics</th>
<th>Suggested weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Human Relations requirements according to various acts.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Health and safety procedures to ensure a safe and secure environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: The impact of cultural knowledge on client care</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total topics in this subject: 34 | 100 | 100

### Table 36: Weighting of Topics in the 2011 Level 2 examination in relation to Topic weighting in the Subject Guidelines for Client Services and Human Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>Number of sub-topics</th>
<th>Suggested weighting in the paper (%)</th>
<th>Actual weighting in the paper (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Function in a business environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Human relations with respect to colleagues with special needs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: Client service in a cultural context</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 4: Health and Safety according to the OHS act.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total topics in this subject: 31 | 100 | 120* | 100

* Learners are required to do any THREE questions (3x50 marks) for a total of 150 marks. All questions however, carry the same weight in the AGs – irrespective of the amount of content in a particular topic.

When looking at the table reflecting the topics in Level 2, the weighting of the topics is most accurately represented in the examination paper. However, the choice between questions indicated in the Assessment Guidelines does not appear anywhere in the paper.

From the total of 200 marks in the paper, the evaluation team ascribed 115 marks to the Conceptual Knowledge category. Very little testing of Application and almost none of Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation is evident in the paper.
Figure 25: Cognitive categories of Level 4 2011 Client Services and Human Relations examination

The bar chart above indicates that questions requiring recall of knowledge and understanding comprise 72%, or 144 out of 200 marks; questions requiring application skills comprise 25% (50 marks); and those requiring analytic skills comprise 3% (6 marks). The team found no questions requiring evaluation skills or the weighing up of possibilities, making judgements, or creating or finding innovative solutions.

The fact that this examination does not require reflexive thinking skills points to the likelihood that students will be ill prepared for entry into Higher Education in this field of study.

It is also a concern that many of the questions in the paper refer to the two case studies provided. The first case study on “A cancelled trip” (Tour Operating) was acceptable. However, the second case study on the ‘Pot Delight Restaurant’ is superfluous, as the ensuing questions are based purely on recall of theoretical facts and not on real application of knowledge and skills to the case study.

Level of difficulty

The five cognitive categories included in the analysis are:

- CK: Conceptual knowledge
- C: Comprehension (Understanding)
- A: Application
- AP: Analysis & Problem-solving
- ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team analyzed the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The level of difficulty across the paper is unbalanced since 67% of the paper is considered to be “Easy”; 33% of it “Moderate” and just 0.5% “Difficult”, as indicated by this graph:
Figure 26: Level of difficulty of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations examination

The evaluation team placed almost all questions on the “Easy-Moderate” level of difficulty which makes the paper even less challenging. Even where the slightest attempt was made to set questions requiring application, evaluation or synthesis demands, the level of difficulty is still classified as “easy”.

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Comprehension (Understanding) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Application on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Application on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Application on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Problem-solving on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on an Easy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Moderate difficulty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Synthesis (Creation) on a Difficult level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It must be mentioned in mitigation, however, that the two case studies included in the paper did require application at a moderate level of difficulty.

Is the format of the 2011 Level 4 Client Services and Human Relations paper a good model for future papers?

The evaluation team did not consider the Level 4 final paper to be a good model for future examinations, as there are serious shortcomings with the structure and layout of the paper. It is suggested that the format of the paper be reviewed. The following matters require urgent attention:

- The paper is not divided into logical sections according to the topics. It was therefore challenging to establish at a glance if all topics received adequate coverage in the paper.
- The paper does not follow a logical layout according to the topics. Various examples of questions on all topics are found scattered across the entire paper.
- The Assessment Guidelines do not give guidance on the weighting of topics, hence the questions on certain topics appear at random across the paper.
- The weighting of the marks should be aligned to the weighting of the topics in the Subject Guidelines.
- The way in which certain questions are formulated, makes it difficult to allocate them to a particular topic.
- The way in which some questions are formulated and the use of action verbs should also be revisited. Some questions may confuse students as to what response is expected of them, due to the incorrect use of action verbs: for example, Question 2.1 “Motivate the statement…”; Question 2.6 Identify six work environments … (where no extract or source is given to identify from), and Question 3.1 Differentiate… (where the memo “defines”).
How appropriate are the language levels in the 2011 Client Services and Human Relations Level 4 paper?

The language level is considered suitable for the target group i.e. Level 4 students. Some of the questions could be written more clearly, which would be helpful to English second-language students.

Concluding remarks and recommendations for the Client Services and Human Relations examination

Please refer back to the concluding remarks in section 4.3.4.

4.5 Concluding comments on the examinations in the Tourism programme

According to the Tourism teams, the intended curriculum as outlined in the Subject Guidelines and in the Assessment Guidelines could certainly equip students with entry-level skills into the tourism and hospitality industries and higher education. However, the final Level 4 examinations are not rigorous enough to require students to demonstrate the intentions of the intended curriculum.

The evaluation teams concluded that the cognitive demands in the Level 4 paper should be re-visited and aligned with the requirements in the Assessment Guidelines. The teams recommend that the range of cognitive skills and the difficulty levels of the Level 4 examinations must be significantly increased to include questions requiring the much needed cognitive skills such as analysis, evaluation and synthesis to improve the rigour of the papers. Thus students should be required to demonstrate complex reasoning involving critical argument, interpreting problems into their constituent parts, pinpointing the core issues and using appropriate methods to solve problems, as well as having to solve non-routine problems. Furthermore, assessment tasks must be based on the most recent developments and technologies associated with the two industries.

In the opinion of the evaluation teams, perpetuating the present style of questioning in the Level 4 examinations will continue to disadvantage students, compromising their ability to cope with assessment in higher education, even at first-year (NQF 5) level. Failure to address this shortcoming in assessment could potentially lead to high NC (V) student failure rates in higher education. This would not be due to a lack of subject content knowledge, but because students have not had the opportunity to develop their writing and thinking skills sufficiently. The inclusion of questions which require extended responses in paragraphs and essays is critical as this will allow students to practice and develop complex reasoning involving synthesis, critical argument, and working with complex problems involving insight.

As mentioned previously, it is critical that the examination papers and marking guidelines undergo thorough language, content and technical editing to minimize errors that could lead to confusion, and a concerted effort must be made to include a wide variety of accurate possible answers to the memo in order to guide the markers well. In addition, the mark value should be much more closely aligned to the actual requirements for answering the question.

It has also been suggested that the examination papers should also be subjected to readability tests such as the Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid tests to check that the language is correctly pitched at for second- and third-language English speakers, since these constitute the majority of learners at FET Colleges.
A strong recommendation is that the examination papers for a subject should be reviewed and moderated collectively and comparatively across all three years of study. This approach would monitor the progression in cognitive demand and level of difficulty over the three years of study. It would strengthen consistency in the format of papers, such as the use (or not) of “choice questions”, the use of illustrations and the use of themes.

The examiners, both internal and external, should be required to complete an analysis grid to track the difficulty level of each question, compliance with the suggested weighting of the cognitive categories in the Assessment Guidelines, and the match with the weighting of topics in the Subject Guidelines.

A suggestion is that a question bank of sound questions should be established across all Tourism and Hospitality subjects to aid examiners and lecturers at colleges. Coupled with this suggestion, the evaluation teams felt that focused and dedicated training in assessment design and the use of analysis grids is required for examiners, internal moderators, external moderators and lecturers. This should achieve the outcome of achieving a clear, shared understanding of the various cognitive categories and how these can be assessed through the formulation of different types of questions. The effective use of case studies that require students to demonstrate the thinking skills required in the industries was noted in particular.

Umalusi’s evaluation teams noted that the instrument used for the analysis of the NC (V) papers, which is based on a five-level scale provided a more nuanced indication of cognitive categories. The further investigation of levels of difficulty within a category made it clear how an intended question in a particular cognitive category, e.g. comprehension or application could be phrased as a difficult question.

Parallel to this process, it is suggested that the Assessment Guidelines should also be updated to include appropriate and much needed guidelines on the division of topics and questions in the examination papers and the relevant mark allocation for each.

Finally, it is worth repeating that the evaluation teams argued strongly that the intended curricula have the potential to provide entry into industry and/or higher education, but that the current assessed curricula do not. However, with the suggestions and recommendations offered here actually implemented, the assessed curriculum for each subject could help fulfill the generous subject aims as intended.
CHAPTER 5

CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR AS A SUBJECT IN THE NC (V) MARKETING PROGRAMME

5.1 Overview of the place/role of the subject Consumer Behaviour in the NC (V) Marketing programme

Consumer Behaviour is an elective subject in the Marketing programme of the NC (V). Its focus is on products and services that would satisfy the needs of customers in the broader business environment. The reason for its limited consideration in this research arose from an awareness among the research team members that certain topics in this subject complement topics dealt with in both the Tourism and Hospitality programmes. It was felt that certain topics in Consumer Behaviour might be considered for the Entrepreneurship component of Level 3 Tourism Operations, and that some elements in this subject might strengthen subjects in Hospitality.

In theory, it would be possible to use this subject as an elective in the Hospitality programme because the qualification allows for such a possibility: one of the four vocational subjects is considered an elective, and could be replaced with a subject offered in another NC (V) programme. In reality, the individual vocational programmes are treated as wholes, and the colleges do not, in fact, allow for the exercise of choice in respect of the last subject. The inclusion of Consumer Behaviour as an actual elective subject in the Hospitality programme would ultimately depend on its suitability for industry.

In the research, Consumer Behaviour was not analyzed in the same depth as the subjects in the two programmes under scrutiny: the curriculum was considered but not evaluated but the examination was analyzed. This work was undertaken because it was felt that Consumer Behaviour is, in some senses, a kindred subject to the ones being evaluated.

Table 37: Documents referenced: Consumer Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents referenced</th>
<th>Reference Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Consumer Behaviour NQF Level 2. Pretoria, 2007</td>
<td>Doc C/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NC (V) Subject Guidelines: Consumer Behaviour NQF Level 4. Pretoria, 2007</td>
<td>Doc C/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Findings in the Consumer Behaviour exam analysis

Consumer Behaviour at NQF Level 4 is divided into seven (7) content topics. These are:

Weighting of marks per topic

The content of the subject Consumer Behaviour in the NC (V) programme at NQF Level 4 is divided into seven (7) topics. These are:
1 Consumer behaviour and decision making  
2 Branding & packaging  
3 Channels and logistics  
4 Identify customers  
5 Liaise with customers  
6 Take orders from customers  
7 Handling complaints

The Assessment Guideline document for this subject specifies the mark allocation for each of these topics in the examination papers (refer to the Table below), and these marks total 150 for the NQF Level 2, 3 and 4 exam papers.

**Progression from Level 2 to 4**

All three examination papers (NQF Level 2, 3 and 4) are similar in format and difficulty level, and none stands out as making greater demands on students than any other. However, while all three question papers have high knowledge and comprehension weightings, the Level 2 paper is more appropriately worded for the level for which it is set.

There is thus no discernible progression in the nature and complexity of the tasks assessed between Levels 2 and 4:

**Table 38: Comparison between Level 2, 3 and 4 examination papers in 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark allocation</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of paper</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format &amp; layout</td>
<td>Good spacing and font size and pages all numbered.</td>
<td>Similar to Level 2 paper’s format.</td>
<td>Similar to Level 2 and Level 3 paper’s format.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of compliance with the Assessment Guidelines, as can be seen in the table below, the content is not fully assessed, for example, Topic 6 is not assessed at all. Furthermore, the weighting of the marks is not according to the Subject Guidelines. For example, Consumer Behaviour and Decision Making is too heavily weighted, Branding and Packaging exceeds the prescribed weighting by 8 marks while the topic Channels and Logistics is under-assessed by 3 marks.

**Table 39: Weighting of marks per topic: Consumer Behaviour – 2011 Level 4 examination compared with Assessment Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Required by Subject Guidelines</th>
<th>Actual Marks Exam Paper 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour and decision making</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Branding &amp; packaging</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Channels and logistics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify customers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liaise with customers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Take orders from customers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Handling complaints</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighting of marks per cognitive demand level

The NC (V) Assessment Guideline document divides the cognitive demand levels into three broad categories, namely:

1) Knowledge and Comprehension,
2) Application, and
3) Analysis, Evaluation and Synthesis.

The Subject Guidelines document specifies that the final Level 4 examination paper for this subject may comprise up to 75% test items requiring knowledge and comprehension. Only 25% of the paper needs to be made up of application and evaluation type questions or questions requiring synthesizing skills. This accounts for the low prevalence of questions requiring students to interpret, solve problems, defend opinions, and reason involving synthesis.

As can be seen in the table and figure below, the weighting in the 2011 question paper in terms of cognitive demand is heavily biased towards conceptual knowledge and comprehension. It contains 93% knowledge and comprehension, with 7% of the questions addressing application. None of the questions required analysis, problem solving, evaluation or synthesis.

Table 40: Weighting of marks per cognitive level: 2011 Level 4 examination compared with Assessment Guidelines for Consumer Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cognitive demand</th>
<th>% Required by Assessment Guidelines</th>
<th>Actual percentage in 2011 paper</th>
<th>Marks required out of 150</th>
<th>Actual marks out of 150 in 2011 paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Comprehension</td>
<td>55-75%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82.5 – 112.5</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>20-35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30-52.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, Evaluation and Synthesis</td>
<td>5-15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75-22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the 2011 Consumer Behaviour Level 4 paper at a suitable level of cognitive demand and difficulty, and is there a vocational focus in the exam?

Cognitive demand

The Subject Guideline document indicates a range for each category of cognitive demand, for example 55% to 75% of marks are to be allocated to questions testing knowledge and comprehension. Individual examiners are expected to use their discretion in this regard. With a change of examiner, the balance could change significantly and this could result in inconsistencies from year to year.

The 2011 examination paper does not include questions that sufficiently link the content to the work environment. No adaptation of content to unexpected situations is evident in the questions set. The fact that no reflective, systemic and systematic thinking is assessed in the paper, makes it inappropriate for a final NQF Level 4 examination.
The Subject Guidelines specify that there should be a split of 40% theory and 60% practical in the weighting of the teaching of the subject and that this division must be carried through the internal and external summative assessments. Certain topics in the subject lend themselves to practical application questions, for example, Topic 6: “Take orders from customers” and Topic 7: “Handle a range of customer complaints”. This practical bias is not evident in this examination paper with only 7% (11 of the 150 marks) allocated to questions requiring application. Furthermore there is no requirement for innovation in the question content. Such case studies as there are, are restricted to elementary scenarios.

**Figure 28: Weighting of marks by cognitive category in the 2011 Consumer Behaviour Level 4 examination**

**Level of difficulty**

The five cognitive categories included in the analysis of the exam paper are:

CK: Conceptual knowledge  
C: Comprehension (Understanding)  
A: Application  
AP: Analysis & Problem-solving  
ES: Evaluation & Synthesis (Creation)

The evaluation team analyzed the level of difficulty of each item/question, using a scale where Easy (E) represents simple and basic items; Moderate (M) is for items of average difficulty, and Difficult (D) for difficult items involving more sophisticated competence.

The marks allocated to the three levels of difficulty in the 2011 examination paper can be seen in the figure below. All together 72 of the 150 marks (48%) are for “moderately” difficult questions, 58 of the 150 marks (39%) are for “easy” questions and 20 of the 150 marks (13%) are for “difficult” questions. While the majority of the questions are either “easy” or “moderately” difficult, the use of complex language often masks the fact that the questions are easy.
The focus of the assessment in the 2011 question paper is on content, which is assessed at conceptual knowledge or comprehension level. Within these cognitive categories, 48% (72 of the 150 marks) fall into the moderately difficult category, 39% (58 of the 150 marks) of the paper is pitched at an easy level and 13% (20 of the 150 marks) is at a difficult level.

**Cognitive demand and level of difficulty**

The table below gives the breakdown of the number of marks per cognitive category and level of difficulty:

**Table 41: 2011 Consumer Behaviour examination by cognitive category and level of difficulty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive categories</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Knowledge</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team used the following abbreviations to code the combination of the cognitive category and the level of difficulty found in each item:
The figure below presents in graphic form the information contained in the previous table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive category and level of difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure below presents in graphic form the information contained in the previous table:

![Figure 30: Number of marks allocated by cognitive categories and level of difficulty in the 2011 Consumer Behaviour examination](image)

Is the format of the 2011 Consumer Behaviour paper a good model for future papers?

The current visual presentation of the paper is good. Spacing and font allow for easy reading. The format of the headings for the questions is consistent; however the numbering of the questions is inconsistent.

Instructions do not match the content of the question and different test items are, on occasion, combined in one question, for example, “Complete the sentence” test items have been combined with statements which do not require completion (eg. Question 2).

The words used in the matching items questions have not been carefully selected to match the options. The words that the student must choose from in order to complete sentences could apply to more than one sentence (eg.: Question 3).

The question paper has two sections. Section A contains short questions and Section B contains long questions. This format is consistent throughout NQF Levels 2 and 3; however in all instances there are short questions intermingled with the long questions.
The 2011 Level 2, 3 and 4 question papers are not clearly structured into Topics and Learning Outcomes. The Topics and Learning Outcomes are not cohesively grouped and this is a reason for the topic weighting being incorrect. The student is required to shift focus from one topic to another within the same question, which is not conducive to a logical thinking process, especially given the number of subject and learning outcomes.

Mark allocation and time allocation

In some instances 2 marks are allocated per fact for a conceptual knowledge question, which is excessive; for example, allocates ten marks for stating five facts. These additional marks could be used to assess the topics that are neglected.

How appropriate is the language level in the 2011 paper?

The standard of the language leaves room for improvement. In some instances the use of language in the setting of the questions is so poor that the student would find it difficult to interpret these questions and come up with the answer required in the memorandum. The language used in the paper is text-book based and is not contextualized to industry.

Furthermore, terminology used in the questions is unnecessarily difficult: simpler terms would suffice. Some statements and stimuli are superfluous to the question, and the question could stand alone (e.g. Question 7.4).

Concluding remarks and recommendations for the Consumer Behaviour examinations

The assessment of Consumer Behaviour can be significantly strengthened as a result of this analysis, and recommendations made by the evaluation team are:

a. The Subject Guidelines provide too broad a mark allocation (55-75%) for Knowledge and Comprehension questions). The mark allocation to each cognitive category should be more precise.
b. The NQF Level 2, 3 and 4 exam papers for Consumer Behaviour should become consistent with all other NC (V) papers with regard to time and mark allocation. Other NC (V) Level 4 question papers such as Food Preparation are out of 200 marks and the time allocated is 3 hours. The time allocated to a 150 mark paper should therefore be limited to 2 hours and not 3 hours. The Level 4 paper should become a 200 mark paper as this would allow for more extensive and searching assessment.
c. The questions must become more industry relevant, using industry-based case studies and examples.
d. Attention to detail would avoid conflicting information as in Question 7.4, where what was bought and what was returned to the supplier was not the same item!
e. Careful checking of the mark allocations of questions by both the examiner and the moderators is recommended.
f. Careful moderation would ensure that the memorandum reflects the whole answer to the question, as well as acceptable alternative answers where these exist.
g. Regarding the clarity of language, it is recommended that the language used should be simplified, especially for second- and third-language students; for example, the word "determinants" could read "factors determining". In addition, instructions to the student should be simplified and to the point. Spelling errors should be eliminated; for example "advice" should be "advise" in the context of the question. The use of the instructing verb "state" should be restricted when it does not match the required outcome of the question, which in all instances in the 2011 Level 3 paper require explanations (Level 3, Question: 3.3: Questions 5.3, 5.7 and 5.8).
h. Duplication of questions should be avoided as happens in the Level 4 2011 paper: Question 6.3 is a duplication of Question 6.2.

i. Case studies should be relevant to the questions asked. More and better use of stimulus-based questions require, for example a case study to be positioned first, followed by related questions. Positioning of illustrations should be below the question (See Level 3: Question 5.4). Separation of the statement from the question by means of spacing or borders is preferable.

j. Combining all short questions into Section A and all long questions into Section B should be maintained across all levels of exam papers.

k. A scaffolding of questions within the paper is advisable. This will mean that students are guided into the paper with easier questions at the beginning, with questions becoming more difficult as the paper progresses. Also, within questions, answers required from students can start off with easier sub-sections, progressing to ever more difficult sub-sections.

5.3 Findings and recommendations regarding the NC (V) subject Consumer Behaviour as an elective in the Tourism and Hospitality programmes

The subject, Consumer Behaviour, has a definite link to the world of work: we live in a consumer-driven economy and the content of the subject is relevant to understanding the behaviour of consumers as well as the marketing and packaging of products for the consumer. The assessed curriculum needs to be carefully aligned to the intended curriculum since at present it is text book-focused rather than looking to the world of work.

With regard to adding Consumer Behaviour as an optional subject in the Tourism and Hospitality programme, the opinion arising from the work is that this would not be possible, as in the Tourism programme, Tourism Operations would have to give way as an optional subject, and in the Hospitality programme Client Services and Human Relations would have to stand aside.

In the Tourism programme, it is therefore recommended that during the curriculum rationalization process, Entrepreneurship at Level 3 in Tourism Operations, be further strengthened with topics such as: “Consumer behaviour and decision making”, “Branding and packaging”, “Identifying customers”.

In the same way, when the review of the Hospitality programme takes place, the two topics in the subject Consumer Behaviour: Topic 6: “Take orders from customers” and Topic 7: “Handle a range of consumer complaints” should be referenced for possible inclusion in the Hospitality subjects.
6.1 Tourism

Table 42: Australian documents referenced: Tourism and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents referenced</th>
<th>Reference Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Australian Curriculum Council (2011) Tourism: VET industry specific</td>
<td>Doc AT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Western Australian Curriculum Council (2010) The WACE</td>
<td>Doc AT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Australian Curriculum Council (2011) Workplace Learning</td>
<td>Doc AT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sunset Coast College Senior Secondary school assessment policy, 2011</td>
<td>Doc AT7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 WACE Manual 2012, Communications, Section 3</td>
<td>Doc AT8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 WACE Year 12 Information Handbook, 2011</td>
<td>Doc AT9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Unit SITGGDE009A: Interpret aspects of local Australian Indigenous culture</td>
<td>Doc AT10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Unit SITXCCS002A: Provide quality customer service</td>
<td>Doc AT11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Unit SITIND001A: Develop and update tourism industry knowledge</td>
<td>Doc AT12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Unit SIT10107: Certificate I in Tourism</td>
<td>Doc AT13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Unit SIT 20107: Certificate II in Tourism</td>
<td>Doc AT14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 SITXENV00A: Participate in environmentally sustainable work practices</td>
<td>Doc AT15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 SITXINV001A: Receive and store stock</td>
<td>Doc AT16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 SITIND001B: Develop and update tourism industry knowledge</td>
<td>Doc AT17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.1 Rationale of the learning

The overall rationale of the programme is to give students in schools opportunities to achieve national vocational qualifications. This is done through granting credits towards the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE).

In addition, the programme aims to provide options that would maintain young people’s interest and participation in post-compulsory senior secondary years of schooling. It is thus used as a strategy for retaining and/or engaging students in senior secondary education or to “value add” to a senior school programme.

---

61 Doc AT18, p.8
The Australian Curriculum Council, in its document: Tourism: VET industry specific\textsuperscript{62} provides a clear and comprehensive rationale for the programme. The document states: “This course encourages students to engage with Senior Secondary Education, fosters a positive attitude from school to work and provides a structure within which students can prepare for further education, training and employment. Employment in the hospitality industry is projected to remain strong.” It is thus in line with the principle of lifelong learning, regardless of age or experience.

The programme combines individual needs with the needs and requirements of industry, through the development of relevant technical, vocational and inter-personal competencies in individuals, in order to access short- and long-term employment opportunities.

Transition from learning to the world of work is inherent in the programme which:

- fosters a positive transition from school to work;
- develops employability skills over a lifetime which are valued in education, training, the workplace and community environments;
- makes skills, knowledge and experiences transferable to other industry areas;
- allows movement from one institution to another/ one state to another / one employer to another.

### 6.1.2 Structure and organizing principle

#### 6.1.2.1 Organizing principle

The organizing principle of the course is the industry-developed units of competency, which are made up from a range of relevant training packages. These units of competency are driven by industry requirements and must be supported by workplace learning. The above is evident from the course outline. It is specifically mentioned that non-completion of any required workplace units may result in a “requirements not met” status for the course units.

A unit of competency consists of:

- Elements of competency
- Performance criteria
- Range statement
- Evidence guide
  - Specific knowledge required to achieve the performance criteria
  - Relationship to other units
  - Specific resource requirements
  - Context of assessment
  - Critical aspects of evidence required to demonstrate competency
  - Methods of assessment.

The training package contains further details of the elements, performance criteria, underpinning knowledge and skills, range of variables and evidence requirements for specific units of competency.

The second organizing principle focuses on the discipline itself. It requires a minimum number of compulsory units which are relevant to the industry at Certificate Level 1, which are then included in Certificate Level 2.

\textsuperscript{62} Doc AT2, p.3
There is coherence and connectedness in the structure/selection of the competency units. Pacing is specified as it refers to class contact time; class contact time equal to 55 notional hours is specified for each course unit.

6.1.2.2 The structure of and coherence in the documents

The unit SITXCCS002A, “Provide quality customer service” provides a well-structured and coherent document. There appears to be consistent throughout the various units within the Certificate II in Tourism (SIT20107).

The systematic layout includes clear main titles that give the facilitator and student a concise overview of the required outcomes. Furthermore the outcomes are detailed in a table format which makes for a user friendly, workable document. The document details the essential outcomes and highlights in bold italics the required transfer of skills and knowledge and/or the range statements to monitor performance. This information will assist the facilitator in assessing the performance of the student.

There is a logical flow throughout the document from where it first gives a “Description of the Unit” to where it ends with the “Required Skill and Knowledge”, “Evidence Guide and Range Statements”. These are evident in the layout of the tables under the specific headings, “Unit descriptor”, “Application of unit”, “Employability Skills Information”. These elements describe the essential outcomes of a unit of competency: “Elements and Performance Criteria”, “Required Skills and Knowledge”, “Evidence Guide and Range Statement”.

The required outcomes are listed as “Elements” and each element shows clear criteria required for the student to perform and achieve competency. There is a logical sequence and a progression of cognitive demand levels, e.g. identify, use, share, suggest, determine, anticipate, analyze, reflect, evident in the table below:

Table 43: Performance Criteria for an Element in Tourism SITXCCS002A: “Provide quality customer service”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and maintain product, service and market knowledge.</td>
<td>1.1 Identify opportunities and use <em>formal and informal research</em> to develop and maintain knowledge of products and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Use customer feedback and workplace observation to evaluate <em>products, services and promotional initiatives</em> and identify changes in <em>customer preferences, needs and expectations</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Share market, <em>product and service knowledge</em> obtained with colleagues to enhance the effectiveness of the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Suggest ideas to appropriate person for product and service adjustments to meet customer needs for future planning according to organization policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range statements appear to be well-structured and provide sufficient information to ensure that there is no misinterpretation of the outcomes that the student is required to achieve. This approach ultimately ensures standardization of the delivery of the unit.

---
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In conclusion, the unit is well articulated with good structure and coherence.

**6.1.2.3 Sequencing**

Certificate I is not necessarily a prerequisite to Certificate II in Tourism. Many of the compulsory units are included in both. However, the number of compulsory units increases between the two certificates. The number and selection of the elective units also changes and expands from Certificate I to Certificate II.

This principle applies to the other qualifications in the Training Package.

No prerequisites could be found for any of the Tourism qualifications, even up to the Advanced Diploma level.

**6.1.2.4 Pacing**

The units of competency do not give any indication of pacing, and neither do the qualifications. It is assumed that these would be provided in curricula developed from these documents.

The Curriculum Council’s document: “VET Industry Specific Document”\(^{65}\) provides some indication of pacing. “VET industry specific course programmes can be delivered over one year or two years, with class contact time a notional 55 hours for each course unit.” The Council’s document: “Workplace Learning”\(^{66}\) also provides very broad indication of time, stating that units can be completed over one semester or over a longer period. However, it does stipulate that the unit is only completed once a number of listed requirements have been met.

Each qualification states the number of additional workplace learning units or equivalent necessary for the qualification component. These workplace units can be completed as units from the workplace learning course or as the student’s outside employment. The workplace, however, should be industry-related and be entered during the time when the course is undertaken.

**6.1.3 Course content coverage**

This section refers to the units of competency as mentioned in the “Training packages.”\(^{67}\)

**6.1.3.1 Content coverage**

It is clear from the documents analyzed that a balance between knowledge- and skills-development is kept. The separation of skills and knowledge required is very specific and it applies directly to the specific unit. The skills address the content of the unit. There is also a direct link between the skills and knowledge required. The range statements are very focused on specific performance criteria. The unit descriptor document is user friendly and it is easy to orientate oneself in the document. The knowledge and skills indicated in the certificates directly relate to identified job roles.

For example:
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Table 44: The relation between knowledge and skills development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITXCCS002A Provide quality customer service^{68}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems or faults with the service or product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays or poor timing of product or service supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstandings or communication barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult or demanding customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers with different or special needs or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalated complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading organisation information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research of product and service information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of industry associations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at conferences, trade shows and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing surveys and questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.4 Levels of difficulty and progression

Using the revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy (2001), the action verbs in different courses indicate increasing levels of cognitive demand. Thus, for example:

- SITXENV00A: “Participate in environmentally sustainable work practices”^{69}: identify, measure, report, make suggestions;
- SITXINV001A: “Receive and store stock”^{70}: identify, inspect, record;
- SITTIND001B: “Develop and update tourism industry knowledge”^{71}: identify, access, obtain, apply, monitor.

Progression is evident within a unit (e.g. moving from the knowledge recall to evaluation and synthesis, as well as moving from knowledge to skills application).

However, progression was not found between the Certificate I and II. Each certificate focuses on training for specific job roles. Certificate III in Tourism allows for a higher and wider scope of job opportunities, indicating progression.

6.1.5 Assessment guidance

Assessment guidance is very detailed. School-based assessment involves teachers gathering, describing and quantifying information about student achievement.
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Assessment tasks include tests, examinations, essays, reports, investigations, exhibitions, productions, performances and presentations. Assessment guidance also includes a programme of assessment. The assessment policy covers the assessment of all WACE courses at Stage 1, 2 or 3. Assessment guidance can be found in the following documents:

- WACE Manual 2012, Communications
- Sunset Coast College Senior Secondary School Assessment Policy

It is evident that teachers and students are adequately guided towards expectations in assessment. A number of assessment guidance documents are available to schools, teachers and students. The WACE “Year 12 Information Handbook” refers to the achievement of standards across the units. Requirements for examinations and grading are provided to students and teachers.

The Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) requires that a competency-based approach to assessment be used and that a record be held by the registered training organization (RTO) of the competencies achieved by each student. The assessment must be conducted by a qualified assessor under the auspices of an RTO which may be a school, TAFE campus or other VET provider. All performance criteria need to be met concurrently to demonstrate the achievement of an element of competency. All elements of competency must be achieved to demonstrate the achievement of a unit of competency.

The Council does not prescribe a format for the presentation of an assessment outline, but each outline must include information on certain assessment criteria, e.g. the number of tasks, a general description of each task, the weighting of each assessment task and the weighting of each assessment type, as specified in the assessment table of the syllabus. The set of tasks in the assessment outline must provide a comprehensive sampling of the syllabus content. The number of assessment tasks is determined by the teacher. Over-assessment should be avoided as too many assessment tasks can interfere with the teaching and learning process.

Should changing circumstances require that the assessment outline be amended (e.g. deleting a planned assessment task and re-weighting all other tasks), students must be informed and provided with the amended assessment outline. Documents supporting assessment guidance are:

- WACE Manual 2012, Communications
- Tourism VET Industry VET specific
- WACE Year 12 Information Handbook

6.1.6 General

6.1.6.1 Skills and competencies fostered in and through the particular course

Courses encourage high levels of engagement by students to improve their literacy and numeracy skills. There is also a focus on education for students with disabilities. Other skills and competencies are exemplified in Unit SITTGDE009A: “Interprets aspects of local Australian Indigenous culture”:
• employability skills,
• business skills,
• research skills,
• copyright and accountability skills,
• interpretation,
• communication and
• cross-cultural skills.

**Do the vocational and interpersonal competencies expected to be developed in the course serve as a good foundation for further training in the industry?**

The Certificate II in Tourism Course (SIT20107) provides a good foundation for both vocational and interpersonal competencies. The student is immediately able to ascertain what career-pathing is available that would assist in developing skills for further training in the tourism industry. This is evident in the Skills Development Summary which includes a table containing a list of the employable interpersonal competency skills required by the tourism industry for this course. This list includes:

• communication,
• teamwork,
• problem solving,
• initiative and enterprise,
• planning and organising.

The document also includes good examples of elective units that a student could combine to have the required vocational skills to be employed in a particular job or position.

Some examples are:

**Office assistant for a small tour operator**

SITITTSL007B: Receive and process reservations  
SITITTSL009B: Process travel-related documentation  
SITXCOM004A: Communicate on the telephone

**Retail sales assistant in an attraction**

SIRXCCS001A: Apply point-of-sale handling procedures  
SIRXSL001A: Sell products and services  
SIRXSL002A: Advise on products and services

**Museum attendant**

CULMS201B: Develop and apply knowledge of the museum industry  
SIRXCCS001A: Apply point-of-sale handling procedures  
SIRXSL001A: Sell products and services  
SITTVAF002A: Provide a briefing or scripted commentary  
SITXCCS001B: Provide visitor information

This serves as a good foundation for the student to progress further into their chosen vocation.
6.1.7 Additional intentions regarding skill transfer

The documents assist students in transferring skills from one workplace context to another, such as knowledge of compliance with current Occupational Health and Safety legislation and developing positive attitudes towards work.

This generic workplace understanding is further enhanced by requiring students to develop additional employability skills and knowledge and asking students to compare across workplace learning situations for procedures such as using performance criteria.

6.1.8 Guidance regarding requirements for the completion of a course/programme

Guidance towards 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 above include:

- Units of competence, consisting of:
  - Elements of competency;
  - Performance criteria;
  - Range statement;
  - Evidence guides which include:
    - Specific knowledge required to achieve the performance criteria;
    - Relationship to other unit standards;
    - Specific resources required;
    - Context of assessment;
    - Critical aspects of evidence required to demonstrate competency;
    - Method of assessment.

- Student logbooks maintained by the student, contain:
  - Schedule of tasks completed in the workplace;
  - Attendance record completed progressively by the student;
  - Workplace requirements such as dress code, confidentiality arrangements;
  - Daily self-reflection section to record progress towards attaining skills and identifying strategies for further skills development.

- Workplace reflection to help individuals recognize when something learnt or achieved is valuable for the future. This is an important step in becoming a life-long student.

6.1.9 Examples of outstanding practice for consideration in the South African context

The Western Australian case is instructive in that it –

- allows movement from one institution to another/one state to another/one employer to another;
- uses single packages by various institutions meeting national standards;
- gives credits towards the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE);
- stresses lifelong learning irrespective of age;
- closely monitors and keeps records which will help students to recognize when something is achieved;
- has close cooperation between the workplace and training institutions;
• carefully structures the context and specific resources in the Evidence Guides, (e.g. SITTIND001B: “Develop and update tourism”). The layout of the method of assessment is well presented and easily readable. There is in-depth layout of the range statements. The programme of assessment is comprehensive and well structured;
• lays out documents in a user-friendly and easy to follow style;
• provides guidelines to use the documents.

6.2 Hospitality

Table 45: Australian documents referenced: Hospitality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents referenced</th>
<th>Reference Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Curriculum Council. Hospitality VET Industry Specific. 2011</td>
<td>Doc AH1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Australian Government SIT07 Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package</td>
<td>Doc AH3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Wace Manual 2012 Communications section 3 School-based Assessment of student achievement in WACE courses</td>
<td>Doc AH4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council (CD labelled as WACE Western Australia Qualification information)</td>
<td>Doc AH8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Integrated approaches to teaching and learning in the senior secondary school (CD labelled as guidelines for integrated approaches to teaching and learning)</td>
<td>Doc AH9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vocational education and training (VET). CD labelled as VET industry specific and general course comparison)</td>
<td>Doc AH10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 Rationale of the learning

Vocational Education and Training (VET) in school programmes was introduced in Western Australia (WA) in 1997, according to the Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council’s Report on Vocational Education and Training in Senior Secondary education Western Australia, with the intention of providing options that would maintain young people’s interest and participation in post-compulsory senior secondary years of schooling. The goal of this program is to have all 17-year-olds involved in some or other form of training and education as is stated by the Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council: “Under the Higher School Leaving Age and Related Provisions Act 2005, all Western Australian 17-year-olds have to be engaged in full-time school or a combination of school, training and/or employment.”

The Curriculum Council, in its Hospitality VET Industry Specific, provides a clear and comprehensive rationale for the qualifications. The document states: “This course encourages students to engage with Senior Secondary Education, fosters a positive attitude from school to work and provides a structure within which students can prepare for further education.

---
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training and employment. Employment in the hospitality industry is projected to remain strong.”

Furthermore, the rationale aims to:

- provide students with the opportunity to achieve a national vocational qualification under the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF);
- gain Council-developed course unit credits towards the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE) based on nationally endorsed training packages;
- specify the range of industry developed units of competency from the relevant training WACE packages;
- provide programmes for the completion of Certificate 1 and Certificate II Qualifications to access both short-term and long-term employment opportunities;
- empower the students with technical, vocational and interpersonal skills and experience that are transferable to the hospitality and other industries;
- encourage students to articulate to senior secondary education;
- foster a positive transition from school to work and
- provide a structure within which students can prepare for further education, training and employment in the hospitality industry.

The Vocational education and training (VET) document differentiates between Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE) courses and WACE Vocational Education and Training (VET) industry-specific courses. The rationale provided in each WACE course explicitly states the purpose for learning, whereas with WACE VET industry-specific courses, the focus is on opportunities to achieve national vocational qualifications under the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and gain council course unit credit towards the WACE.

6.2.2 Structure and Organizing Principle

It is important to note at the outset that Umalusi’s Hospitality evaluation team dealt with a significant volume of documents, one of which was over 3 500 pages long. Because of the volume of information, it was difficult to find all the explanations needed to understand the system.

6.2.2.1 Organizing principle

The organizing principle comprises units of competence which are similar to the South African Unit Standards. The units of competence are very detailed and comprehensive. These are arranged into clusters of both compulsory and elective units to make up various qualifications.

The qualifications are achieved through the completion of a specified number of compulsory workplace learning unit equivalents in order to meet the programme requirements, as outlined in the Curriculum Council’s Hospitality VET Industry Specific document. These are assumed to be smaller courses counting towards achieving the full qualification. It appears to be completed in industry. The content and structure of the workplace and theoretical learning is unclear which made evaluation of the unit standards and related qualifications difficult.
What is of interest is that there is no indication of either a level or a weighting (credit value) in the WACE standards of competency of the qualifications. Therefore the evaluation team had no idea, beyond the depth implied by the detail of the content in the unit standards, of how big or high the level of the units and qualifications were.

6.2.2.2 Units of competency

Units of competency are defined as a statement of a key function or role in a particular job or occupation, according to the Curriculum Council’s Hospitality VET Industry Specific document.86

The units of competency consist of modification history, unit descriptors, application of the unit, licensing information, employability skills information, elements and performance criteria, required skills and knowledge, evidence guidance and range statements as discussed in the following paragraphs:

a) **Unit descriptor:** The unit descriptor gives details of both what is included and also clearly specifies what is excluded. For example: “This unit describes the performance outcomes, skills and knowledge required to provide arrival and departure services to guests in commercial accommodation establishments. It requires the ability to check daily arrivals, allocate rooms, check guests in and out of their accommodation and complete invoicing of guest charges. It **does not include** receiving and processing reservations, which are addressed in SITTSSL007B “Receive and process reservations” and SITTSSL010B “Control reservations or operations” using a computerized system. No licensing, legislative, regulatory or certification requirements apply to this unit at the time of endorsement.”

b) **Application of the unit:** For example: “This unit has application to all types of commercial hospitality venues where accommodation is provided. It applies to such venues as hotels, pubs, motels, caravan parks, hostels, bed and breakfast providers, lodges and farm stays of any style, grade or size and to enterprises operating seasonal temporary accommodation.”

c) **Licensing/Regulatory Information (if applicable):** South African unit standards do not include any licensing or regulatory information, which could be considered as this is useful information where applicable.

d) **Employability Skills Information:** For example: “The required outcomes described in this unit of competency contain applicable facets of employability skills. The Employability Skills Summary of the qualification in which this unit is packaged, will assist in identifying employability skills requirements.

e) **Elements and Performance Criteria:**

Unit standards are divided into Elements and Performance Criteria. Elements describe the essential outcomes of a unit of competency. Performance criteria describe the required performance needed to demonstrate competence of the element. Where bold italicized text is used, further information is detailed in the required skills and knowledge and/or the range statement. Assessment of performance is to be in accordance with the evidence requirements.

For example:
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Table 46: The expansion of Elements into Performance Criteria in the Hospitality VET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for guest arrival</td>
<td>Prepare reception area for service and check all necessary equipment prior to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check and review daily arrival details prior to guest arrival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocate rooms according to guest requirements and enterprise policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up uncertain arrivals or reservations according to enterprise procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) **Required Skills and Knowledge**
   This section describes the essential skills and knowledge and the level of competence required for this unit.

g) **Evidence Guide**
   The evidence guide provides advice on assessment and must be read in conjunction with the performance criteria, required skills and knowledge, the range statement and the Assessment Guidelines for unit of competence. For example:

Table 47: Example of an Evidence Guide in the Hospitality VET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical aspects for assessment and evidence required to demonstrate competence</th>
<th>Evidence of the following is essential: ability to check daily arrivals accurately, allocate rooms, check guests in and out of their accommodation and complete invoicing of guest charges within typical workplace time constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and specific resources for assessment (this is not included in South African unit standards)</td>
<td>Assessment must ensure: demonstration of skills within a fully equipped industry-realistic accommodation front office environment, as defined in the Assessment Guidelines, using appropriate telephones, computers and printers access to a computerized or manual front office reception system currently used by hospitality industry operators to control guest registration and accounting function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very detailed assessment guidance is provided, including assessing for employability skills. For example:
Table 48: Assessment detail, including Employability Skills in the Hospitality VET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of assessment</th>
<th>A range of assessment methods should be used to assess the practical skills and knowledge required to provide front office reception services. The following examples are appropriate for this unit: direct observation of the candidate providing arrival and departure services, including financial transactions; role-play to assess ability to deal with differing customer queries, requests or complaints; case studies to complete arrival or departure processes and documentation for different customer scenarios.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing employability skills</td>
<td>Holistic assessment in combination with other units relevant to the industry sector, workplace and job role is recommended. For example: SITTITSL007B Receive and process reservations SITTITSL010B Control reservations or operations using a computerized system SITXCCS001B Provide visitor information SITXFIN002A Maintain financial records. Employability skills are integral to effective performance in the workplace and are broadly consistent across industry sectors. How these skills are applied varies between occupations and qualifications due to the different work functions and contexts. Employability skills embedded in this unit should be assessed holistically with other relevant units that make up the skill set or qualification fitting to the context of the job role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) **Range Statement**: The range statement relates to the unit of competency as a whole. It allows for different work environments and situations that may affect performance. The range statements are very detailed and specific. For example:

Table 49: Example of Range Statements in the Hospitality VET

| Reservation details may include: | name | contact details | arrival and departure times | length of stay | type of accommodation required and bed configuration | payment details | special requests | rates and discounts. |

6.2.3 The structure and coherence of the documents

6.2.3.1 Qualifications structure

Qualifications consist of clusters of units of competency, both compulsory and electives. These qualifications appear to be achieved through workplace learning unit equivalents, but this is not clear as no further information could be found on how these are structured.
In the Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package, it is evident that a wide range of qualifications can be constructed using the units of competence as building blocks. What is of interest is that the qualifications have a range of electives that give different specializations to the qualifications, for example:

- SIT30707 Certificate III in Hospitality
- SIT30807 Certificate III in Hospitality (Commercial Cookery)
- SIT30907 Certificate III in Hospitality (Asian Cookery)
- SIT31007 Certificate III in Hospitality (Catering Operations)
- SIT31107 Certificate III in Hospitality (Patisserie)

The choice of electives will provide an indication of the job to which the graduate aspires. For example, the Certificate II in Hospitality offers a range of electives from both Food and Beverage, and from Catering, which provide for a range of job titles as included in the qualification description. Possible job titles include:

- bar attendant
- bottle shop attendant
- catering assistant
- food and beverage attendant
- housekeeping attendant
- porter
- receptionist or front office assistant
- gaming attendant.

6.2.3.2 Coherence

Coherence relates to the aims, the content and progression. Sequencing and pacing of the content is discussed below.

6.2.3.3 Sequencing

It appears that Certificate I is not necessarily a prerequisite to Certificate II in Hospitality. Many of the compulsory units such as “Develop and update hospitality industry knowledge” are included in both. However, the number of compulsory units increases between the two certificates. The number and selection of the elective units also changes and expands from Certificate I to Certificate II.

This principle applies to the other qualifications in the Training Package.

No prerequisites could be found for entry into any of the hospitality qualifications, even up to the Advanced Diploma level.

6.2.3.4 Pacing

The units of competency do not give any indication of pacing, and neither do the qualifications. It is assumed that these would be provided in curricula developed from these documents.
The Curriculum Council’s Hospitality VET Industry Specific provides some indication of pacing: “VET industry specific course programmes can be delivered over one year or two years, with class contact time a notional 55 hours for each course unit.”

The Curriculum Council’s Workplace Learning document also provides a very broad indication of time, stating that units can be completed over one semester or over a longer period. However, it does stipulate that the unit is only completed once a number of listed requirements have been met.

The Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council’s document states that in order to meet the course requirements and achieve course unit credits towards a WACE, students must follow the course structure, attain required units of competency and fulfill work placement requirements. The workplace requirements require additional workplace learning time for each qualification in the course.

Each qualification states the number of additional workplace learning units or equivalent necessary for the qualification component. These workplace units can be completed as units from the workplace learning course or as the student’s outside employment. The workplace, however, should be industry-related and coincide with the time when the course is undertaken. Non-completion of any required workplace units or equivalent may result in a “requirements not met” status for course units.

Umalusi’s Hospitality evaluation team concluded that anyone teaching or training in this regard would need to be well-versed in this system as there are some assumptions apparent regarding the understanding of requirements. A great deal relies on assumed knowledge of the national education and training environment: for an outsider, there is a lack of clarity about what is expected regarding the bigger skills development system and framework, which could compromise the quality of delivery.

6.2.4 Course content coverage

6.2.4.1 Content coverage

A broad structure of the content is provided in each course, as well as detailed information on the major content areas of each curriculum.

The elements and the performance criteria clearly outline the knowledge and skill that will have been acquired with completion of the units. Detailed information is provided in each unit to ensure that the knowledge and skills cover a wide variety of range items. Furthermore, information is provided in the range statements to allow for different work environments and situations that may affect performance.

From the Government of Western Australia Curriculum Council’s document, it transpires that the Hospitality VET industry-specific course endeavours to give students the opportunity to work towards a nationally-accredited qualification undersigned by the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and to gain, in the process, course-unit credit towards the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE).
The whole process of teaching and learning, assessment and certification of qualifications within the course is required to be done by working closely with a Registered Training Organization (RTO) in fulfillment of the requirements by the Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF). In order to achieve the various course units the students need to adhere to the requirements regarding course structure, achieving the competencies and fulfilling the workplace requirements.

6.2.5 Levels of difficulty and progression

The levels of difficulty are identified by a variety of different verbs in different cognitive categories, e.g. “research to identify, interpret and sort, read to comprehend, organize, developed, analyze, develop, etc.”

Certificate I describes the activities as “routine and predictable”, e.g. to demonstrate knowledge, practical skill, sequence of routine tasks and to pass on information. However, after analyzing/evaluating the units, the evaluation team found that many of the Performance Criteria were more complex than what was indicated in the requirements of the unit. The compulsory section of the units is clustered around vocational exposure and is repeated in each level with some additional units as progression take place.

When progressing to the next level, further choices under the elective units are available according to the different functional areas. By completing each level’s units, credits are carried over to the next level. Repetition of Level I units are found in the Certificate II. The table on the next two pages shows the progression in cognitive and skills demand across the certificate qualifications. A summary of the learning outcome characteristics and their distinguishing features for each VET-related AQF qualification is provided below.
Table 50: Progression in cognitive and skills demand through the Hospitality Certificate Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate I</th>
<th>Certificate II</th>
<th>Certificate III</th>
<th>Certificate IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics of Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics of Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics of Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth, depth and complexity of knowledge and skills would prepare a person to perform a defined range of activities most of which may be routine and predictable (Qualifications Framework: Tourism, Hospitality and Events). Applications may include a variety of employment-related skills including preparatory access and participation skills, broad-based induction skills and/or specific workplace skills. They may also include participation in a team or work group.</td>
<td>Breadth, depth and complexity of knowledge and skills would prepare a person to perform in a range of varied activities or knowledge application where there is a clearly defined range of contexts in which the choice of actions required is usually clear and there is limited complexity in the range of operations to be applied. Performance of a prescribed range of functions involving known routines and procedures and some accountability for the quality of outcomes. Applications may include some complex or non-routine activities involving individual responsibility or autonomy and/or collaboration with others as part of a group or team.</td>
<td>Breadth, depth and complexity of knowledge and competencies would cover selecting, adapting and transferring skills and knowledge to new environments and providing technical advice and some leadership in resolution of specified problems. This would be applied across a range of roles in a variety of contexts with some complexity in the extent and choice of options available. Performance of a defined range of skilled operations, usually within a range of broader related activities involving known routines, methods and procedures, where some discretion and judgement is required in the section of equipment, services or contingency measures and within known time constraints. Applications may involve some responsibility for others. Participation in teams including group or team co-ordination may be involved.</td>
<td>Breadth, depth and complexity of knowledge and competencies would cover a broad range of varied activities or application in a wider variety of contexts most of which are complex and non-routine. Leadership and guidance are involved when organizing activities of self and others as well as contributing to technical solutions of a non-routine or contingency nature. Performance of a broad range of skilled applications including the requirement to evaluate and analyze current practices, develop new criteria and procedures for performing current practices and provision of some leadership and guidance to others in the application and planning of the skills. Applications involve responsibility for, and limited organization of, others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate I</th>
<th>Certificate II</th>
<th>Certificate III</th>
<th>Certificate IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguishing Features of Learning Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do the competencies enable an individual with this qualification to:&lt;br&gt;- demonstrate knowledge by recall in a narrow range of areas;&lt;br&gt;- demonstrate basic practical skills, such as the use of relevant tools;&lt;br&gt;- perform a sequence of routine tasks given clear direction;&lt;br&gt;- receive and pass on messages/information.</td>
<td><strong>Distinguishing Features of Learning Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do the competencies enable an individual with this qualification to:&lt;br&gt;- demonstrate basic operational knowledge in a moderate range of areas;&lt;br&gt;- apply a defined range of skills;&lt;br&gt;- apply known solutions to a limited range of predictable problems;&lt;br&gt;- perform a range of tasks where choice between a limited range of options is required;&lt;br&gt;- assess and record information from varied sources;&lt;br&gt;- take limited responsibility for own outputs in work and learning.</td>
<td><strong>Distinguishing Features of Learning Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do the competencies enable an individual with this qualification to:&lt;br&gt;- demonstrate some relevant theoretical knowledge;&lt;br&gt;- apply a range of well-developed skills;&lt;br&gt;- apply known solutions to a variety of predictable problems;&lt;br&gt;- perform processes that require a range of well-developed skills where some discretion and judgement is required;&lt;br&gt;- interpret available information, using discretion and judgement;&lt;br&gt;- take responsibility for own outputs in work and learning;&lt;br&gt;- take limited responsibility for the output of others.</td>
<td><strong>Distinguishing Features of Learning Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do the competencies enable an individual with this qualification to:&lt;br&gt;- demonstrate understanding of a broad knowledge base incorporating some theoretical concepts;&lt;br&gt;- apply solutions to a defined range of unpredictable problems;&lt;br&gt;- identify and apply skill and knowledge areas to a wide variety of contexts, with depth in some areas;&lt;br&gt;- identify, analyze and evaluate information from a variety of sources;&lt;br&gt;- take responsibility for own outputs in relation to specified quality standards;&lt;br&gt;- take limited responsibility for the quantity and quality of the output of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is clear but generic evidence of progress from Certificate I to IV: for example, where Certificate I requires a range of actions that are mostly routine and predictable, Certificate II requires actions in a range of contexts with some complexity; Certificate III requires students to offer technical advice and leadership in a variety of roles with discretions and judgements; Certificate IV requires students to providing leadership to self and others in a wider context with problem solving, where the student is able to evaluate and analyse contexts and provide leadership to a group. The use and application of such requirements do, however, require the facilitators, assessors and participating workplaces to be on the ‘inside track’, since standards of this sort cannot capture the professional knowhow (meaning) that is abstracted in these descriptions.

Furthermore, the number of workplace learning course units serves as indication of the increase in volume of learning material, which results in an increasing level of difficulty, as shown in the following three examples.

a) **Certificate I in Hospitality: SIT10207**
   A student must complete a total of seven units of competency comprising five compulsory units and two electives. Two Council-developed VET industry specific course units should be achieved. The completion of one workplace learning course unit or unit equivalent is compulsory to meet programme requirements. It can either be a Workplace Learning course unit or Workplace Learning-endorsed programme from industry-related employment relevant to the job outcome.

b) **Certificate II in Hospitality: SIT20207**
   Students must complete a total of twelve units of competency. There are nine compulsory units of competency and three electives. A student should attain four Council-developed VET industry specific course units. The completion of two workplace learning unit equivalents is compulsory to meet programme requirements. These can be Workplace Learning course units or a Workplace Learning endorsed programme from industry-related employment relevant to the job outcome at this level.

c) **Certificate II in Hospitality (Kitchen Operations): SIT20307**
   Students must complete a total of sixteen units of competency. There are eleven compulsory units of competency and five electives. A minimum of three electives may be selected from the list provided in the training package for this qualification.

### 6.2.6 Assessment guidance

Clear guidance is provided as to how school grades are to be moderated and statistically adjusted, so that all students have an equal chance and that all marks translate to the same standard. The Assessment principle of authenticity is regarded to be very important in the whole assessment process and clear stipulations are given to address this. Even the possibility of students challenging the teacher’s assessment and how that should be handled is addressed.

---
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A high premium is placed on written examinations and clear indication is given on how these should be conducted and counted. All stipulations regarding school and private candidates’ fees and other practical issues are addressed. The evaluation team noted the emphasis placed on anonymity so that no candidate could be identified as individual or representing a specific institution. In the rest of the documents there are very specific requirements for specific subjects such as aviation, dance, drama, etc. Nothing is left to chance – everything is clearly specified in what is allowed and what not. The completion of the process – marking, recording of results and announcement of results are stipulated and how to conduct assessment is explained. The students also receive guidance on how to prepare for the exam. Clear instructions and guidelines are provided in the certification process.

The Sunset Coast College Senior Secondary School Assessment Policy is specific in the responsibilities of both the student and the teacher. Part of the teacher’s responsibility is to provide clear guidelines on what is expected of the student, the assessment outline and pathway. All information regarding the course and the assessment process is available to the students.

Students with specific needs, special circumstances and cultural beliefs are accommodated where teachers have to adapt tasks and assessments so that all students can take part and have the same advantage as the other students. The principle of fairness is taken very seriously.

Students are informed when non-compliance will result in an “unfinished” assessment and reasons for acceptable non-compliance or non-submissions are clearly stated. Transfer between courses and schools is addressed, as well as the consequences of cheating and plagiarism. A high premium is placed on the security aspects of assessments. The full assessment process is explained and stipulated.

For completion of requirement purposes the students in the secondary school can select a combination of course units, VET units of competency and endorsed programmes – to have a combination that is in preparation for after school pathways and to achieve a WACE. Strong emphasis is placed on literacy and numeracy skills and everything possible is done to help the students reach competency levels in this regard.

Integration asks for a multi-disciplinary approach where the ability to transfer skills, and application of knowledge is evident and meaningful. The “fabric” of each student – the way they operate best – is taken into consideration and these things are taken seriously – all in the quest of providing the students with the best possible options for them to work and achieve optimally. It is noted in the document Integrated Approaches to Teaching and Learning in

---
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The Training package for Hospitality includes detail for the assessor on registration, learning pathways, critical factors, e.g. working with alcohol, recognition of prior learning, assessor competencies, including specifics for Hospitality and the qualifications. Some sequencing is also included. There are details on the assessment environment and required equipment. Links are made for integration of assessment of unit standards that fall into other qualifications.
the Senior Secondary School\textsuperscript{108} that although everything possible is done to accommodate the various needs of students, the standard of the requirements is never compromised. Proper marking and recordkeeping are imperative for a system that is intended to run with integrity.

The importance of teacher support is noted through “consensus moderation meetings” and “assessment seminars” which are not compulsory, but highly recommended.\textsuperscript{109}

The WACE Manual 2012\textsuperscript{110} has a section on Assessment: Section 3: School-Based Assessment of student achievement in WACE courses, which is very comprehensive, consisting of 45 pages. It clearly lists all components of assessment, e.g. principles, requirements, guidelines for the outlines which must be developed by the teacher as well as information, security and additional information such as dealing with special needs assessment, group assessment and non-compliance.

The teacher/trainer has to develop a detailed assessment outline using the weightings and types of assessment as given by the assessment table.\textsuperscript{111}

The assessment has to have a grade as an outcome. The following is adapted from the WACE manual\textsuperscript{112}:

a) Each grade is based on the student’s overall performance for the unit as judged by the teacher with;

b) reference to a set of pre-determined standards. These standards are defined by grade descriptions which describe the general characteristics of student performance and achievement at each of the grades A, B, C, D and E. The grades in the school environment are in addition to marks, as they describe competencies and are not ‘tested’ but assessed. Teachers make grading judgements based on a variety of student assessment data. These judgements reflect the marks awarded to the student throughout the unit, not just a single assessment task.

c) These marks are compiled in accordance with the task weightings planned in the assessment outline for the units which must comply with the assessment type weighting ranges from the assessment table of the syllabus;

d) Grade descriptions relate directly to the content of the units studied at a particular stage;

e) Grade descriptions express, in positive terms, what a student knows, understands and is able to do;

f) Grade descriptions clearly define the level of proficiency for each grade on a continuum of performance which is developed by the Council with reference to student work samples and should be read in conjunction with these work samples;

Each person involved in training and assessment must be competent for the functions they perform and clear details are provided. There are also clear standards for registration of assessors (and trainers) and training organisations with specific competency requirements (Essentials for Registration).
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g) Grade descriptions are not used to grade individual assessment tasks;

h) Grade descriptions provide a guide for teachers when developing teaching and assessment programmes;

i) Grade descriptions provide improvement targets for students;

j) Grade descriptions provide a guide to parents, employers and post-school education and training providers of the relative achievement of students against defined achievement standards; and

k) are subject to continuing review by the Council.

The unit standard clearly states the knowledge and skills to be assessed and includes:

a) critical aspects for assessment;

b) evidence required to demonstrate competency;

c) context of and specific resources for assessment;

d) examples of appropriate methods of assessment for the particular unit standards;

e) integration of the employability skills; and

f) very detailed ranges.

From the documentation it seems that only formative assessment is done. The assessment guide is very detailed and comprehensive.

The workplace assessment\(^\text{113}\) is well structured and clear and gives guidance to the student, assessor and the on-the-job supervisor. Roles are clearly defined. Assessment information is of comprehensive. The Western Australia Curriculum Council’s Hospitality VET Industry Specific document\(^\text{114}\) AH1 states grading is a ‘C’ but the WACE Manual\(^\text{115}\) allows for grading to be specified, based on achievement. This is confusing and the evaluation team was not able to gain any clarity on why these two information sources are different.

Additional specifications for assessment include Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), which should meet the requirements of the relevant Training Package or accredited course, be conducted in accordance with the principles of assessment and the rules of evidence, meet workplace and, where relevant, regulatory requirements.

Good guidance is provided to the assessors: the evidence guide provides advice on assessment and must be read in conjunction with the performance criteria, required skills and knowledge, the range statement and the Assessment Guidelines for this Training Package.\(^\text{116}\) It stipulates that all performance criteria should be met concurrently to demonstrate the achievement of an element of competency. All the assessment requirements must be met to demonstrate the achievement of a unit of competency.

Each unit gives clear guidance to the assessor of what should be assessed, e.g. the skills and knowledge applicable to that unit as well as the employability skills and the range statements. The assessment methods applicable to each unit standard are also indicated.\(^\text{117}\)

---
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6.2.7 General

6.2.7.1 Skills and competencies fostered in and through the particular course

It is evident that a developed and developing workforce is of the utmost importance in Western Australia and that requirement forms the backbone of the VET industry—right from school-level apprenticeships that are in place to attract students to make a choice regarding their futures. There are pathways of learning and training available in order to grow the workforce. The aims are to attract and maintain skilled workers. Therefore, the employability skills as stipulated in the Australian Government SIT07 Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package 118 (skills, knowledge and experience (i.e. the ability to do) are addressed and developed. The detail of this is available in the units of competence as stipulated in each certificate.

The high value placed on workplace experience was considered impressive by the evaluators. This value is reinforced by the statement that if the workplace learning is not completed to satisfaction, the qualification will not be achieved. There is strong evidence of the importance of transferable skills where links can be made to other industries as well, but always with relevant career opportunities in mind.

The hospitality industry requires specific employability skills for each qualification. These employability skills vary depending on the qualification packaging options.

The following employability skills are listed for the hospitality qualification:

a) Communication
   Good communication skills are required to determine and interpret the needs of colleagues and customers; to interpret and provide information to colleagues in a culturally appropriate manner and to speak clearly and directly to colleagues to ensure a positive outcome.

b) Teamwork
   A student must be able to follow instructions and work as a team member and with colleagues under supervision to ensure that the requirements of customers are met.

c) Problem solving
   To identify and clarify the extent of operational problems in the kitchen and to request the assistance of team members and supervisors to resolve it using predetermined policies and procedures to guide solutions to operational problems in the kitchen.

d) Initiative and enterprise
   To take initiative to maintain high standards of personal hygiene and to identify better ways to manage safety risks by participating in group risk assessment activities.

e) Planning and organizing
   Collecting, analyzing and organizing information by using appropriate predetermined policies and procedures to allow for safe and efficient kitchen operations.
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f) Self-management
   To take responsibility for his/her own role in safe working practices by understanding and
   complying with legal responsibilities that apply in kitchen operations.

g) Learning
   To know the structures of networks and sources of new information on the hospitality
   industry to be able to source ongoing learning opportunities and to provocatively seek
   and share information with other colleagues on new hospitality products and services.

h) Technology
   To understand the operating capabilities and demonstrating the correct use of
   technologies by selecting and using the correct personal protective equipment in order
   to manage personal safety in the workplace.

The employability skills described above are representative of the hospitality industry in
general and are not reflected in specific job roles.

Each unit included in a certificate, develops the skills of an individual to be competent in a
range of functions and activities that is required of a specific certificate. For example:

The wide variety of units to select from enables the student to obtain for example the
Certificate I in Hospitality (SIT10207)\(^{119}\) with the skills to be competent in various hospitality
areas as required by the specific qualification.

Each qualification/certificate stipulates which industry/employability skill should be included,
e.g. the Certificate I in Hospitality (SIT10207) requires technology: Understanding the operating
capability and demonstrating the correct use of technologies; selecting and using the right
personal protective equipment to manage personal safety in the workplace.\(^{120}\)

6.2.7.2 Do the expected required vocational and interpersonal competencies serve
as a good foundation for further training in the industry?

The evaluation team found that the units demonstrate and integration of competencies, with
detail of the particular competence(s) provided. The units within the Certificates are seen
to be relevant to the industry. For example: Certificate I in Hospitality (SIT10207) provides the
skills and knowledge for an individual to be competent in routine tasks in various hospitality
settings such as restaurants, hotels, motels, catering operations, clubs, pubs, cafes and coffee
shops. Individuals may work in a team but always under direct supervision. The qualification is
suitable for an Australian apprenticeship pathway.\(^{121}\)

If the foundational training and development is in place, the possibility of articulation into
further training and development is strong. The fabric of the courses is woven in such a
manner that “students are encouraged to engage with further education, fosters a positive
transition from school to work and provides a structure within which students can prepare for
further education, training and development.”\(^{123}\)

---
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6.2.7.3 Transfer of skills between contexts

Allowance is made for the recognition and transfer of assessed unit standards that fall into more than one qualification, as in the following example: the elective unit SITHFAB012B (Prepare and serve Espresso coffee) appears in the Certificate I in Hospitality as well as in the Certificate III in Tourism.

The Australian Government SIT07 Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package\(^{123}\) indicates that an RTO will award a qualification when the required number of units of competency, as determined by the packaging rules for the specific qualification, has been demonstrated. If a student does not complete all of the units of competency required for a qualification, he/she will nevertheless receive a Statement of Attainment for the units completed.

According to the Wolf report\(^{124}\), it is evident that young people from all over the world are likely to remain in the school education system until they are 18 years old. The time that the young people stay in school must be effective in helping them find their purpose for their futures – therefore the school systems should be more flexible, innovative and cost effective in ensuring employability. It is clear that the Western Australian VET system makes a concerted effort to create an environment which encourages young people to continue learning in a wide variety of contexts in such a way that they are able to recognize their own accumulation of skill and knowledge. Furthermore, this learning is achieved in ways that allow for its formal recognition through certification, and its ultimate acceptance in the workplace.

6.2.8 Guidance regarding requirements for the completion of a course/programme

Definite guidance is provided in the form of qualification rules laid out in a Training Package. The higher the level of qualification to be achieved, the greater the number of requirements. To achieve a Certificate I in Hospitality, seven units must be completed, namely five core units and two elective units. The selection of electives must be guided by the job outcome sought, local industry requirements and the characteristics of this qualification.

To achieve a Certificate III in Hospitality, sixteen units must be completed consisting of eight core units and eight elective units. For this qualification, electives may be selected to meet either a specialist or multi-skilled job outcome. The requirements for a specialist outcome are:

- a minimum of six units must be selected from either Elective Group A - Food and Beverage, Elective Group B - Accommodation Services, or Elective Group C – Gaming;
- the remaining units may be selected from the general elective units, or from an endorsed Training Package or accredited course.

The requirements for a multi-skilled job outcome are:

- a minimum of six elective units must be selected from the general elective units;
- the remaining units may be selected from an endorsed Training Package or accredited course;
- a maximum of one Language other than an English unit may be counted as an elective within this qualification.
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In all cases selection of electives must be guided by the job outcome sought, local industry requirements and the characteristics of this qualification.

The evaluation team felt that the Australian Government SIT07 Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package\(^{125}\) is not user-friendly and could be improved by putting each qualification in a separate document.

### 6.2.9 Examples of outstanding practice for consideration in the South African context

Initially the evaluation team found the documentation cumbersome and difficult to work with. The “thin” documents from the Curriculum Council seem to be very easy to work with and understand, but to get the “full picture”, the teacher or trainer has to access many other documents. The breadth and scope of this necessary information implies that thorough and ongoing training must be in place to ensure that trainers and teachers are able to follow the requirements to the satisfaction of the assessment body.

However, once the explanatory information is accessed,

- the amount of detail in which the requirements are set out, is commendable. Nothing is left to guesswork – everything is explicitly spelt out – what the students must do and also what they must not do!

- Assessment outlines with weightings are provided.\(^{126}\) This clarity is also present in the Australian Government SIT07 Tourism, Hospitality and Event Training Package:\(^{127}\)
  
  - A range of assessment methods must be used to assess practical skills and knowledge, e.g. direct observation of the candidate preparing stocks, sauces and soups;
  - sampling of dishes prepared by the candidate;
  - written or oral questions to test commodity knowledge of stocks, sauces and soups;
  - the grades used for the completion of the units in the Australian Curriculum Council (2011) Workplace Learning document\(^{128}\) give more detail than just “achieved” or “not achieved”.

- The Curriculum Council’s Workplace Learning document provides a clear outlay of how each unit is organised into three content areas, namely “Workplace foundations, Workplace skills and Workplace reflection”. It is clear that the Western Australian Council understands that not all students are geared to follow the university route and the emphasis that is placed on vocational training and education is commendable.

- The range categories in the Western Australian documents are fully descriptive, providing information on equipment needed, styles of service, pre-service requirements, for instance.
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• Employability skills are written into the Western Australian documents. Thus for example, it is clear where units fit into the industry, e.g. bar attendant, or kitchen cleaner, together with their expected performance roles on completion of a qualification, as well as the sectors to which the qualification will apply.

• The qualifications stress holistic assessment with other units relevant to the industry sector, workplace and job role.

Umalusi’s evaluation team found the qualification under question to be well structured. This is borne out by the inclusion of structured and assessed workplace learning.

From Umalusi’s perspective, engaging with the Western Australian Certificate of Education has been important because it provides a model of school-and-work integration different from anything South Africans know. What the study has made clear is how complex such a system is, and how well-trained the users of the system must be in order for it to work. The emphasis on the quality of assessment, and the direct relationship between what is studied and what is current in the industry are recurrent themes in the WACE documentation. The model of articulation presented by the WACE not only reinforces the importance of close cooperation between the major stakeholders in the Hospitality and Tourism programmes in the NC (V), but is also suggestive of how formal learning from the workplace could be integrated into a larger, more general qualification in the education and training system.
CONCLUDING IDEAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Towards answering questions about the intended curricula in the NC (V): Tourism and NC (V): Hospitality programmes

Chapter 2, which reviewed the research process and methodology, concludes with a list of questions about the kinds of competency fostered in the programmes, and their suitability as a foundation for further training in the hospitality and tourism industries. This research cannot fully answer all those questions, especially since there was a very tight focus on understanding the similarities and differences between the respective curricula and examinations for the four vocational subjects in the two programmes.

With regard to their quality and standing, Umalusi’s evaluation teams agreed that the Tourism and Hospitality NC (V) programmes as presented in the curriculum documents are credible and worthy, and speak to the skills shortages in the industry.

More specifically, the Hospitality evaluation team felt that the NC (V) Hospitality curriculum covers food and beverage topics as well as topics related to other sectors necessary for operation of the hospitality industry.

The Tourism evaluation team found that the NC (V) Tourism covered a very wide range of skills and content/concept across all three Levels, and that the programme was possibly too packed and intense. The four tourism subjects cover, in broad terms, what would be required of a person studying a course in Tourism, and were found to be broadly complementary.

Articulation presents a problem: while the NC (V) Level 4 exit point is benchmarked against the National Senior Certificate, the teams could not say with certainty that the two programmes prepared students for tertiary education. This had less to do with the intended curriculum, and more to do with the examined curriculum.

Regarding articulation with the workplace, the Tourism curriculum speaks in all the Subject Guideline documents of “Job Shadow or Industry Practicum” and “Practical/Application Assessments”, but the Tourism evaluation team felt that there was generally insufficient depth of industry experience in the FET college curriculum, and that such practical work as there is does not sufficiently equip students to exit the Tourism programme and enter the workplace seamlessly.

The Hospitality evaluation team, on the other hand, was more positive about articulation with the workplace. With its wide coverage of the hospitality industry, including areas such as client services and human relations, as well as hospitality generics, at both a theoretical and a practical level, the programme articulates well with the requirements of the industry, providing a better overall background to the hospitality industry than any other FET qualification.

With regard to preparation of students for managerial skills in the tourism and hospitality sectors, the teams were less positive. Both the Hospitality and the Tourism evaluation teams doubted whether students would be able to enter the two industries at a managerial level. As they stand, the two programmes do not equip candidates adequately to operate on a managerial level in the two industries.
At present, there is no specified and preferred articulation in to Higher Education qualifications in hospitality or tourism management. Universities accept students in these fields on an *ad hoc* basis and not necessarily on the strength of an NC (V) Level 4 qualification.

### 7.2 Towards answering questions about the assessed curricula in the NC (V): Tourism and NC (V): Hospitality programmes

While the intended curricula were adjudged to be credible, the same could not be said of assessment in all the vocational subjects of the Tourism and Hospitality NC (V) programmes.

Umalusi’s evaluation teams found that the 2011 NC (V) examination papers did not comply with the Assessment Guidelines: mark allocations did not correlate, specified content was omitted, unspecified content included and the range of cognitive categories was not adhered to. In addition, the teams found that the 2011 NC (V) Level 4 papers were generally too easy for an exit-level programme leading to higher education and into the industry. In this area, both Umalusi and the Department of Higher Education and Training must be required to strengthen the capacity of examiners and moderators through structured training. Because Umalusi’s exam analysis instrument had yielded helpful results, its use in such training could help to establish a common understanding for the setting and moderating process.

Umalusi’s teams were asked to step back from the papers to consider whether, at a general level, the 2011 examination provided an acceptable model for future exams. The Tourism evaluation team felt that a lot needed to be done to make the Tourism papers good models of “best practice”. Lecturers at colleges who use the examination papers as models to set their own internal examinations should take note: poor models will inevitably result in poor practice. The Hospitality team was more positive about their Level 4 examination papers: in three of the four subjects (excluding Client Services and Human Relations), examination papers were regarded as acceptable models for future use.

### 7.3 Final conclusions and recommendations regarding the NC (V): Tourism, NC (V): Hospitality and the subject, Consumer Behaviour

#### 7.3.1 The Tourism curriculum

#### 7.3.1.1 The intended curriculum – findings

The recommendations given below are not intended to diminish the worth of the Tourism programme, but rather to ensure better delivery and to create greater synergy with the workplace.

**Random distribution of topics**

The Tourism team found that, with the exception of the subject Sustainable Tourism, topics are distributed randomly over the three years of the other three vocational subjects in the NC (V) Tourism, with little or no scaffolding evident within these subjects.

**Curriculum structure**

The Tourism NC (V) curriculum has no clear overarching structure. The evaluation team found that limited specification of sequencing means that topics are presented without scaffolding or logical development.
It is difficult to cross-reference the documents, because bulleted rather than numbering has been used in the layout.

**Packed and repetitive**

The Tourism curriculum is very packed and intense. The team found that, in many cases, far too much content is expected from students in a particular year. In general, the opinion was that the breadth in the four Tourism subjects is too great for the students targeted, especially in Levels 2 and 3. In addition, topics are often repeated in different subjects and over different levels, without scaffolding or logical sequence.

This having been said, the Tourism evaluation team noted the absence of specific types of tourism: Meetings, Incentives, Conferencing and Exhibitions (MICE), adventure, medical, religious and spiritual tourism.

**Three exit-level qualifications?**

The evaluation team noted that each of the three NQF levels was written as an exit level qualification. However, with the lack of progression within and across three of the four subjects, the qualification structures did not conform to well-shaped single-year qualifications, nor like a well-planned three-year programme over three NQF levels.

The team questioned whether NQF 2 and 3 graduates from an FET College could be placed on Band 4 (tourist guides, travel consultants, tourist information officers) or Band 5 (call-centre operators, data capturers, hotel receptionists, and office administrators) of the CATHSSETA Organizing Framework for Occupations (OFO). It is clear that a closer mapping of the relationship between the qualification and the occupations in tourism and hospitality on the OFO would be a useful activity.

**Articulation options**

The evaluation team found no clear articulation options from the NC (V) Level 4 Tourism programme to higher education or to further workplace-based study at Level 5 and beyond, or to the tourism industry in general. Conjecture on the part of the evaluators and limited examples from the real world, led the team to conclude that articulation possibilities have not fully been unpacked by the institutions, training service providers and the industry.

**Reflexivity and the workplace**

The evaluation team found that NC (V) students are not required to demonstrate sufficient reflexivity. The tourism industry requires staff capable of reflecting critically on their own and others’ performance.

Moreover, it was felt that the NC (V) as it is currently presented at FET Colleges does not have enough direct contact with the tourism industry. At best, a poorly-equipped simulated environment in the College must suffice as industry experience/practical application. The team felt that this lack of exposure to industry experience, together with the low level of reflexivity required, does not equip students to exit the programme and enter the workplace seamlessly.
Pedagogical support and assessment guidance

The evaluation team noted that the Tourism Subject Guidelines do not offer pedagogical support to Tourism lecturers in any of the subjects. Furthermore, the Tourism Subject Guideline documents provide no clear guidance on different forms of assessment. Moreover, lecturers are not guided as to how to set and use specific types of assessment, such as case studies.

Over-assessment

The evaluation team found that the number of assessment tasks required in the Assessment Guidelines is too great. A total of sixteen tasks in the four Tourism subjects at Level 4, all needing to be completed in just three terms, caused the team to conclude that students are over-assessed.

Types and clarity of assessment tasks

The Subject Guidelines for all subjects were found to strike a good balance between theoretical and practical assessments, with a wide range of methods of assessment indicated, including tests, internal examinations, assignments, practical exercises, case studies and practical examinations in simulated business environments.

Entrepreneurship

At Level 3 in Tourism Operations, Entrepreneurship is covered in great depth. The Tourism team felt that this should help equip a person to become an entrepreneur, with skills enough to start a SMME in the tourism industry.

7.3.1.2 The intended curriculum – recommendations

a) Rationalization of the curriculum

The evaluation team recommends that the Tourism curriculum be revisited to reduce the breadth of content. Reviewing the curriculum requirements over the three levels would allow topics to be properly consolidated. A judicious pruning of the four subjects would allow space for greater depth in certain areas. By rationalizing what is learned over the three years, and consciously spiralling the content, concepts, skills and cognitive demand as the student progresses through the three years of study, greater coherence within and across the curriculum could be achieved.

This rationalization would then allow for the introduction of the missing types of tourism, such as Meetings, Incentives, Conferencing and Exhibitions (MICE), adventure, medical, religious and spiritual tourism.

The subject Sustainable Tourism provides a good example of spiralling progression as the curriculum moves from local to international tourism, and from conceptualization to evaluation.

The rationalization of the curriculum would also allow for a reduction in the number of assessment tasks required over the three years of study. The team recommends that assessment tasks be integrated across subjects, allowing for fewer tasks that would help students understand the interrelatedness of their subjects.
The re-working of the curriculum must also provide for a greater ease of reading and cross-referencing through the use of a numbering system.

b) One exit-level qualification at NQF Level 4

Given the problems outlined above regarding progression, the curriculum structure over the three years, and the inevitable difficulty Level 2 and 3 graduates are likely to have finding jobs in the tourism industry, the three levels would best be treated as a single qualification with an exit at NQF Level 4.

c) Articulation

It is strongly recommended that the Department of Higher Education and Training should, as a matter of urgency, engage with CATHSSETA and its industry partners, the Committee for Higher Education, and the private training service providers in tourism to establish clear articulation options from the NC (V) Level 4 Tourism programme to higher education and to further workplace-based study at Level 5 and above, and to the tourism industry in general. This strategy would provide legitimacy for a programme which the team considers to be credible and worthy of study.

d) Reflexive contact with the workplace

Urgent attention should be given to providing students with meaningful workplace experience over their three years of study. This proposal is linked with ideas expressed in the Articulation sub-section above. Such experience would equip students to exit the programme and enter the workplace better prepared; it would also provide students with opportunities to use reflexive thinking skills. Workplace experience allow students to make more informed choices about which sectors of the industry they would like to work in. At the very least, it would provide them with the beginnings of a curriculum vitae that speaks to the industry.

e) Pedagogical support and assessment guidance

It is recommended that Tourism lecturers are better supported on matters of pedagogy and assessment practice. The case study of the Western Australia Certificate of Education is instructive, particularly with regard to support for assessment which is provided through highly recommended “consensus moderation meetings” and “assessment seminars”. Furthermore, certain Provincial Departments such as Gauteng, Western Cape and Northern Cape already play a role in moderation and assisting lecturers where necessary.

It is recommended that the Department of Higher Education and Training give urgent attention to pedagogical and assessment practice support to lecturers at FET Colleges, based on the experience of Provincial Departments of Education already providing this support, and on the Western Australian practice. It is recommended that such support must be ongoing, focused, practical and user-friendly in order to engage lecturers fully.

f) Entrepreneurship

It is recommended that in the curriculum rationalization process, Entrepreneurship at Level 3 in Tourism Operations, be further strengthened with topics from Consumer Behaviour, such as: “Consumer behaviour and decision-making”, “Branding and packaging” and “Identifying customers”.
It is not possible for Consumer Behaviour to be offered as a complete subject in the Tourism programme as it would have to displace Tourism Operations.

7.3.1.3 The assessed curriculum – findings

a) Compliance with Subject and Assessment Guidelines

With the exception of Science of Tourism, the Tourism evaluation team found that there was a lack of compliance with the Subject and Assessment Guidelines with regard to weighting of topics and the spread of cognitive skills required in the other three Level 4 examination papers in 2011.

b) Cognitive demand

All four Tourism subject examinations at Level 4 in 2011 were weighted heavily towards Conceptual Knowledge, requiring students to recall, recite and remember. None of the four examinations required students to do any Evaluation or Synthesis. In addition, Sustainable Tourism required no Application of knowledge.

Tourism Operations awarded no marks at all to Analysis and Problem Solving, while Science of Tourism and Client Services and Human Relations allocated only 3% of the total marks and Sustainable Tourism 9% to these cognitive skills.

This could have the unintended effect of discriminating against students who have strong problem-solving abilities, analytical abilities or evaluation and synthesis skills, the very skills most likely to be prized in the workplace setting. But even more seriously, failing to expect students to learn and perform at these more demanding levels does them a profound disservice in the long run, as it leaves them radically under-prepared both for the workplace and for further study.

c) Level of difficulty

The examinations in all four Tourism subjects were found to be too easy: across the four subjects, the evaluation teams adjudged between 58% and 68% of the questions to fall into the “easy” category. Of more concern to the teams is that only between 8% and 0.5% of the questions across the four subjects could be ascribed to being “difficult”. Questions that were adjudged to be “moderately” difficult ranged from 39% to 24% across the four examinations.

d) Cognitive demand and level of difficulty

Most questions across the four examinations were adjudged as having a limited range of cognitive demand, and being easy at the same time. Umalusi’s evaluation teams felt that asking easy questions for operations requiring students to recall knowledge or to express the textbook in their own words, is not appropriate for an exit-level examination delivering students to the workplace or to higher education.

e) Progression from Level 2 to Level 4

In their evaluation of the external examinations of the four Tourism subjects across the three levels, the evaluation teams found that there is not a clear progression in cognitive
demand: questions remain weighted in favour of Conceptual Knowledge; there is a sameness in the way in which questions are asked. The structuring of conceptual and practical progression in the WACE is instructive.

f) Format of the Level 4 examination papers

In general, the teams found that the Level 4 examination papers were not good models for future papers. Besides the compliance issues mentioned above, teams found that:

i. Papers were not logically divided into sections according to the topics in the Subject Guidelines.
ii. Questions were not scaffolded.
iii. Similar questions were repeated in different wording in different parts of the paper, leading to an undue weighting to these topics.
iv. Questions should be linked more directly to the workplace. (Scenarios and case studies presented in the papers often required students merely to copy from the text. An opportunity was lost here for students to employ reflexive thinking and to apply their knowledge to the cases presented.)
v. Action words were often used incorrectly: e.g. “Differentiate” which should be “Define”; “Identify” where no source is provided from which to identify.
vi. The Sustainable Tourism marking guideline was found to have errors.

Despite the above shortcomings, the evaluation teams did acknowledge the following positives:

i. Language levels were found to be appropriate and accessible to students at Level 4 in all three examinations, except for Sustainable Tourism, where the readability level of the case studies presented was too difficult.
ii. In general, the examiners were commended for the layout of the papers: clear cover pages, easily understood instructions, and clear illustrations generally.

7.3.1.4 The assessed curriculum – recommendations

a) Compliance with Subject and Assessment Guidelines – including cognitive demand

It is recommended that a design grid be drawn up by the Department of Higher Education for all examiners and moderators to ensure compliance with the weighting of topics in the Subject Guidelines as well as compliance with the range of cognitive categories required in the Assessment Guidelines.

b) Level of difficulty

In order to achieve a fair range of difficulty, it is recommended that examiners and moderators be given a tool to adjudge the difficulty range of questions, and that the Department of Higher Education and Training provide them with the approximate percentages of questions that should fall into category in the difficulty range. The instrument used for this evaluation would be a useful start.

The scores based on this instrument should be incorporated into the design-grid recommended above. By combining cognitive categories and level of difficulty in the same design grid, examiners and moderators would have a better insight into what they require of students, and also be able to adjust levels of difficulty in combination with cognitive categories.
c) Progression from Level 2 to Level 4

The recommendation of the use of a design grid across all three years of study would also go some way towards bringing about progression. The Science of Tourism evaluation team recommended that examiners emulate the cognitive demand of Question 6 in the Level 3 paper, which requires students to conceptualize, solve a problem, evaluate and synthesize.

d) Format of the Level 4 examination papers

The teams recommend that examination papers be subjected to more stringent quality control mechanisms by the Department of Higher Education and Training to ensure logical divisions, scaffolding of questions, avoidance of repetition of topics in different section of a paper; scenarios and case studies that require students to apply knowledge and reflect, rather than merely copy from the text provided and the correct use of action verbs. Umalusi would need to monitor that this happens.

The use by examiners and moderators of the design grid recommended in the Compliance and Level of Difficulty sections above would help.

It is recommended that questions be linked more directly to the workplace.

All examination papers should be assessed for ease of readability, by using a test such as the Flesch/Flesch–Kincaid readability test[^129], to ensure that students at Level 4 are able to comprehend the material provided in the examinations.

It is strongly recommended that the internal and external moderators pay careful attention to the accuracy of all marking guidelines.

e) Strengthening of capacity

It is strongly recommended that both Umalusi and the Department of Higher Education and Training must be required to strengthen the capacity of examiners and moderators through structured training. Because Umalusi’s exam analysis instrument had yielded helpful results, it was felt that its use in such training could help to establish a common understanding for the setting and moderating process.

This process should build on the positives in setting of the examination papers already noted.

7.3.2 The Hospitality curriculum

7.3.2.1 The intended curriculum – findings

As in the case of Tourism above, the recommendations given below are not intended to diminish the worth of the Hospitality programme, but are rather to improve delivery and create synergy with the workplace.

[^129]: http://www.readability-score.com/
a) Distribution of topics

The Hospitality evaluation team developed its own matrix to analyze the content, concepts and skills covered in the four subjects across Levels 2 – 4.

Apart from what it considered to be the key food preparation and service topics necessary in a Hospitality programme, the team also found wide coverage of sector-related knowledge / concepts / skills in the four subjects. As a vocational qualification, the NC (V) was found to have significant breadth.

However, the team found that the topics in the four subjects are distributed seemingly randomly over the three years, with little or no scaffolding evident within subjects. Learning outcomes are sometimes unrelated to one another and no clear evidence is available as to how the learning outcomes link to the subject outcome. Generally, there are no discernible connections between topics within and across the three levels.

The team noted, moreover, that it is unclear when some topics of the programme are intended to be a theoretical concept or a practical skill.

b) Curriculum structure

The evaluation team found the curriculum to be a topic-structured, outcome-based curriculum as each of the topics is structured around a Subject Outcome and specific Learning Outcomes.

It is difficult to cross-reference the documents, because bulleting rather than numbering has been used in the layout.

c) Sequencing of the curriculum

The evaluation team found that the four subjects in the Hospitality curriculum have a low degree of specification of sequencing. No instructions or guidance are provided for the lecturer with regard to the sequence in which to teach the topics in the curriculum. It is thus left to the lecturer to decide how to order instruction of the topics.

The team found a moderate degree of progression in the topics in the curriculum, but weak progression in terms of the complexity of the learning content within the levels. Hospitality Generics, however, shows strong progression in terms of related topics, but weak progression in terms of the level of complexity.

With regard to pacing, the Subject Guidelines for the four Hospitality subjects do not specify how much time should be spent per topic. The assessment weighting gives the percentage of marks allocated for each topic, but not necessarily the indication of time to be spent on each topic. The assumption must therefore be that the weighted values of each topic should be multiplied by two to calculate the teaching time.

The time allocation for both the practical and the theoretical work is inadequate if the volume of work that needs to be covered is taken into consideration.

d) Articulation options

As the Hospitality curriculum stands, no specified and preferred articulation routes to Higher Education qualifications in hospitality management exist. However, the
NC (V): Hospitality provides a good overall background to the hospitality industry. The team pointed out that no actual articulation possibilities between Higher Education qualifications (NQF Level 5 and upwards) and the NC (V) have ever been determined.

There is also no vocational articulation between the National Senior Certificate (Grades 10 – 12) and the NC (V) College pathways.

e) Contact with the workplace

The NC (V) Hospitality programme, as currently presented in FET colleges, does not provide sufficient contact with the hospitality industry. A simulated environment in a college cannot substitute for work placement.

f) Pedagogical support and assessment guidance

The evaluation team found that the Hospitality Subject Guidelines do not explain the teaching approach. Pedagogical support is not given to Hospitality lecturers.

As far as assessment guidance is concerned, insufficient examples of assessment tasks for internal continuous assessment are provided to guide lecturers. Lecturers are expected to develop their own assessment tools and instruments. This leads to misinterpretation of the outcomes, and could have an impact on standards, as assessment tools may not be developed to the correct requirements.

7.3.2.2 The intended curriculum – recommendations

a) Rationalization of the curriculum

The team recommends that the Hospitality curriculum be reviewed in order to rationalize the distribution of topics, learning outcomes and subject outcomes over the three years and over the four subjects, so that the necessary scaffolding of knowledge, concepts and skills can be put in place. In this process, it should be made clear which topics are theoretical and/or a practical skill.

This review of the curriculum should create better progression within in the topics in the curriculum, as well as progression in the complexity of the learning content within and across the levels. The team recommends that the subject, Hospitality Generics be used as an example of strong progression in terms of related topics.

The reworking of the curriculum should ensure a greater ease of reading and cross-referencing, by using a numbering system, rather than bullets.

b) Sequencing of the curriculum

The team recommends that in the rationalization called for above, the content and skills in four Hospitality subjects should be sequenced to provide guidance about teaching order. At the same time, clearer suggestions about the time to spend per topic can be offered. It is especially necessary to allocate the time necessary for both practical and theoretical work, without overburdening students and lecturers.
c) Distribution of topics

The problem of discerning theoretical concepts from practical skills is likely to result in different lecturers interpreting topics differently. This difficulty calls for lecturer training and/or more comprehensive curriculum guidelines.

d) Articulation

As with the Tourism evaluation team, the Hospitality team also recommends that the Department of Higher Education and Training should, as a matter of urgency, engage with CATHSSETA and its industry partners, the Committee for Higher Education, and the private training service providers in tourism to establish clear articulation options from the NC (V) Level 4 Hospitality programme to higher education and to further workplace-based study at Level 5 and above, and to the tourism industry in general. This strategy will provide much-needed legitimacy for a programme which can be considered to be credible and worthwhile studying.

In addition, the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Higher Education and Training should give urgent attention to articulation between the vocational aspects of the National Senior Certificate (Grades 10 – 12) and the NC (V) Levels 2 – 4.

e) Contact with the workplace

The evaluation team believes that a simulated environment in a college cannot replace work placement. The team recommends that urgent attention should be given to providing students with meaningful work placements.

f) Pedagogical support and assessment guidance

Far more on-going training and mentoring of lecturers is recommended. This is a very important part of development of the teaching community which is stagnant at present. Both the Culture, Arts, Tourism Hospitality and Sport Sector Education and Training Authority and the Department of Higher Education and Training have plans to implement programmes for lecturer development in this field, and these should be strongly motivated, funded and supported by all concerned.

7.3.2.3 The assessed curriculum – findings

a) Compliance with Subject and Assessment Guidelines

The Hospitality team found that, with the exception of Client Services and Human Relations, which weighted Health and Safety too heavily in the examination paper, the other three subject papers generally weighted the topics in line with the Subject Guideline weightings.

However, the Hospitality evaluation team found that all four Hospitality subjects deviated from the cognitive demand suggested in the Assessment Guidelines.

b) Cognitive demand

Food Preparation was found to have a good spread of cognitive demand (albeit not entirely in line with the Assessment Guideline suggestions).
The two next best subjects in terms of spread were found to be –

a) Client Services and Human Relations had an uneven spread across Conceptual Knowledge, Comprehension and Application and Analysis and Problem Solving, but no marks were awarded to Evaluation and Synthesis;

b) Hospitality Generics, which had a fair spread across Conceptual Knowledge, Comprehension and Application, had only 2.5% of the marks awarded to Analysis and Problem Solving, but no marks awarded to Evaluation and Synthesis. However, as this is a practical subject, there should be more emphasis on Application, Problem Solving, Evaluation and Synthesis. However, this practically-based subject is assessed in a highly theoretical manner.

Hospitality Services was found to be the most problematic, with a heavy stress on Conceptual Knowledge, less of a stress on Comprehension and Application, and no marks awarded to questions requiring Analysis, Problem Solving, Evaluation and Synthesis.

This could have the unintended effect of discriminating against students who have strong problem-solving abilities, analytical abilities, synthesis skills and evaluation skills, and leaving students radically underprepared for the demands of the workplace and further study.

c) Level of difficulty

Again, the evaluation team found Food Preparation to be the most rigorous of the four Hospitality papers with 82% of the marks awarded to questions that they judged to be “moderately difficult”.

Hospitality Generics had an almost equal mark allocation to questions that were adjudged “easy” (44%) and “moderate” (48%).

The two most problematic subjects were found to be –

• Hospitality Services with 81% of the questions judged to be “easy”;

• Client Services and Human Relations with 67% of the questions judged to be “easy”.

Questions judged to be “difficult” ranged from .5% (Client Services and Human Relations) to 1% (Food Preparation), to 6% (Hospitality Services) and 8% (Hospitality Generics). The last two subjects are a bit more in line with what should be required from a Level 4 exit-level examination.

d) Cognitive demand and level of difficulty

When the team combined cognitive demand with level of difficulty, they commended Food Preparation for the moderately difficult level of questions across all cognitive levels.

Hospitality Generics, Hospitality Services and Client Services and Human Relations were found to be problematic: they all favoured questions requiring cognitive recall and conceptual knowledge that were easy, while at the same time posing little challenge or opportunity to engage in the critical thinking required for tertiary-level study, or in the workplace.

The examinations tend to be based on textbook content, without sufficient application to the hospitality industry.
e) Progression from Level 2 to Level 4

Subjects found to have limited evidence of progression in terms of cognitive demand across the three years are:

- Food Preparation;
- Hospitality Services;
- Client Services and Human Relations

Hospitality Generics was found to show an increase in Application demand from Level 2 to Level 4. The percentage of the questions which assess Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation increases sharply from Level 2 to 3, but decreases significantly from Level 3 to 4. This is evidence of a lack of proper progression from Level 2 to 4. The team concluded that the Level 3 examination paper is more difficult than the Level 4 paper.

f) Format of the Level 4 examination papers

With the exception of Client Services and Human Relations, the evaluation team found the format of the other three papers to be acceptable basic models for future examinations in general. The team commended the papers for –

- questions being grouped according to main topics prescribed in Food Preparation;
- typography clear and easy to read, with important information highlighted;
- layout creating a good impression, with good use of spacing;
- language usage was clear and comprehensible to students, with only the occasional lapse in terminology and use of action verbs;

The biggest problems were found to be in the marking guidelines where mark allocation and the accuracy of the suggested answers were questioned.

7.3.2.4 The assessed curriculum – recommendations

a) Compliance with Subject and Assessment Guidelines – including cognitive demand

It is recommended that a design grid be drawn up by the Department of Higher Education for all examiners and moderators to ensure:

- compliance with the weighting of topics in the Subject Guidelines;
- compliance with the range of cognitive level requirements in the Assessment Guidelines.

Examiners would do well to study the example of the Food Preparation paper as an example of how to spread the cognitive demand levels in an examination paper.

b) Level of difficulty

As with the Tourism evaluation team, the Hospitality team also recommends that examiners and moderators be given a tool to adjudge the difficulty range of questions. Moreover, it is recommended that the Department of Higher Education and Training provide examiners and moderators with the approximate percentages of questions that should fall into categories of difficulty. The instrument used for this evaluation would be a useful start.
The scores based on this instrument should be incorporated into the design grid recommended above. By combining cognitive demand and level of difficulty in the same design grid, examiners and moderators would gain insight into what they require of students, and be able to adjust levels of difficulty in combination with the range of cognitive categories.

Food Preparation can again be recommended as an example in this regard.

The type and variety of questions must be carefully checked. Questions should include real case studies or situations that require students to break a problem down into its constituent parts, make adjustments, solve non-routine problems and provide substantiation for an opinion, all of which are skills required in the hospitality industry.

Examiners should use/make use of a variety of questioning techniques and guard against the overuse of the same type of questions such as matching terms to definitions.

c) Progression from Level 2 to Level 4

Again, as in the recommendations for Tourism, the Hospitality team felt that the recommendation of a design grid applied across all three years of study and all four subjects would ensure progression of cognitive difficulty levels, and prevent undue spiking in one year of study.

d) Format of the Level 4 examination papers

The evaluation team suggests that examination papers be reviewed and moderated collectively and comparatively across all three levels, as each level is technically an exit-level qualification. All papers should be submitted for language and technical editing.

In addition, it is suggested that a question bank of “best practice” questions be developed.

e) Strengthening of capacity

It is recommended that clear guidelines and/or training on setting of assessments be given to assessors and moderators to strengthen the quality of examination papers and marking guidelines. Both Umalusi and the Department of Higher Education and Training should play a role in this process.

7.4 Final recommendations regarding the NC (V): Tourism, NC (V): Hospitality and the subject, Consumer Behaviour

Tourism

It is recommended that in the curriculum rationalization process, Entrepreneurship at Level 3 in Tourism Operations, be further strengthened with topics from the subject Consumer Behaviour.

It is not possible for Consumer Behaviour to be offered as a complete subject in the Tourism programme, as it would displace Tourism Operations. Tourism Operations should not be taken out of the Tourism Programme, as it includes the important Entrepreneurship component at Level 3.
However, the additional Consumer Behaviour topics should be considered for inclusion in the Tourism subjects.

**Hospitality**

As in the case of the Tourism programme, the inclusion of Consumer Behaviour as an optional subject would mean dropping Client Services and Human Relations. The team did not feel that this is a viable option.

Moreover, the focus in Hospitality is on services. Consumer Behaviour is focused largely on providing products. The only two topics in the Consumer Behaviour that link to the Hospitality programme are Topic 6: ‘Take orders from customers’ and Topic 7: ‘Handle a range of consumer complaints’. These two topics should be referenced for inclusion in a future review of the Hospitality subjects.

### 7.5 Lessons learned from the Western Australian study

The evaluation teams found that the amount of detail in which the requirements are set out in the Western Australian material is commendable. Nothing is left to guess-work – what the students must and must not do is explicitly spelled out!

The value of assessment as part of the teaching-learning situation is evident in the detailed guidance given to both teachers/lecturers and students. School-based assessment involves teachers gathering, describing and quantifying information about student achievement. It seems that the assessment serves a feed-forward purpose, enabling teacher and student alike to reflect on teaching and learning.

In documents referring to assessment guidance, assessment outlines with weightings are provided. Clear guidance regarding the expected coverage of content and the depth in which these topics ought to be dealt with surely has a positive impact on workplace preparation. Assessment of this sort would ensure that students gain the required knowledge and skills for industry, as employability skills are written into the Western Australian documents. It is clear where units of study can be expected to fit into the industry, e.g. for a bar attendant, or kitchen cleaner.

The evaluation team found a range of assessment methods suggested to be used in assessing practical skills and knowledge, e.g. direct observation of the candidate preparing stocks, sauces and soups; sampling of dishes prepared by the candidate and written or oral questions to test commodity knowledge of stocks, sauces and soups.

The qualifications stress holistic assessment that tests skills and concepts relevant to the industry sector, workplace and job role. The inclusion of structured and assessed workplace learning in the Western Australian model points to the importance of learnerships as practical preparation for entrance into industry.

The Curriculum Council’s “Workplace Learning” document provides a clear explanation of how each unit is organized into three content areas, namely “Workplace foundations, Workplace skills and Workplace reflection”. It is clear that the Western Australian Council understands that not all students are geared to follow the university route and the emphasis placed on vocational training and education is commendable.

[130 Doc AHA, pp. 15 & 16]
The meticulous record-keeping of student performance helps students to recognize when outcomes are achieved, and seems to be part of an assessment-as-learning approach. The close cooperation between the workplace and training institutions is noteworthy and is surely an example of stakeholder collaboration which would prepare students better for the labour market and success in industry.

7.6 Proposed timeframes for action regarding the recommendations

Umalusi’s evaluation teams propose the following key interventions to bring about the essential recommendations above:

**Short-term interventions**

**a) In-service training of FET College lecturers in methodology and content**

It is recommended that Tourism lecturers be given far more on-going in-service support on pedagogy and industry knowledge. The Department of Higher Education and Training should take the lead here, together with its partners in the Provincial Education Departments and in industry. Lecturers should be expected to acquire updated industry knowledge and to be given specific support on lecturing methodology and interpreting the curriculum documents in an annual professional development programme.

**b) Training examiners, moderators and external examiners**

It is recommended that the examiners, moderators and external examiners for all the Tourism and Hospitality subjects be trained immediately on compliance with the requirements of the Assessment Guidelines, assessment design, the use of for instance Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy (including an understanding of the meanings of the action verbs used by Bloom and presented to students in the examination papers), levels of difficulty of questions and the use of assessment grids in the development of examinations. Both the Department of Higher Education and Training and Umalusi should be involved in this training.

This training should be done using the papers being set for the 2013 final examinations as exemplars to improve their quality.

Similar training should be given to college lecturers in the medium term.

**c) Industry experience**

The evaluation teams believe that a simulated environment cannot replace work placement. The teams recommend that urgent attention should be given to provide students with meaningful work placements. CATHSSETA should take a lead in this, together with its industry constituents to bring about contact with the two industries through activities such as job shadowing and observation assignments. This will be realized probably only in the medium term.

In the immediate short term, it is recommended that the simulated environments in colleges be upgraded to provide meaningful, up-to-date experience, particularly of the tourism industry. Clear directions should be given to colleges to realize this requirement.
The Department of Higher Education and Training should provide the necessary direction and ring-fenced funding from its latest funding grant to expedite this requirement.

d) Articulation with higher education, industry and the National Senior Certificate

This is presented as an immediate short-term action, which will be achieved probably in the medium-to long-term only: Umalusi and the Department of Higher Education and Training should as a matter of urgency engage with CATHSSETA and its industry partners, the Committee for Higher Education, and the private training service providers in Tourism and Hospitality to establish clear articulation options from the NC (V) Level 4 Tourism and Hospitality programmes to higher education and to further workplace-based study at Level 5 and above, as well as to the tourism industry in general. This will provide legitimacy for two programmes which the evaluation teams considered to be credible and worthy.

In addition, Umalusi, the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Higher Education and Training should give urgent attention to articulation between the Hospitality and Tourism subjects in the National Senior Certificate (Grades 10 – 12) and the NC (V) Hospitality and Tourism programmes, Levels 2 – 4.

Medium-term interventions

a) Review of the Hospitality and Tourism curricula

The evaluation teams recommend a review of the Tourism and Hospitality curricula to reduce the breadth of the topics in the subjects within these programmes. This needs to be done across the three years of study in each subject to achieve greater depth, the introduction of the latest trends in the industries and the spiralling of content, concepts, skills and cognitive demand as the student progresses through the three years of study, in order to achieve greater coherence in the programmes. This curriculum review can include relevant content from the subject Consumer Behaviour.

The Western Australian VET curriculum documents should be consulted as models of sequencing and progression as well as ease of readability.

Such a review should also bring about a rationalization and reduction of the number of assessment tasks which can be integrated across subjects.

b) In-service training of FET College personnel in the examination process

As with the training of examiners, moderators and external examiners for the Tourism and Hospitality subjects, college lecturers should receive ongoing, in-service training on the requirements of the Assessment Guidelines, assessment design, the use of for instance Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (including an understanding of the meanings of the action verbs used by Bloom and presented to students in the examination papers), levels of difficulty of questions and the use of assessment grids in the development of examinations. It will be of value to use a taxonomy that includes examples related to the cognitive categories and the levels of difficulty in demand associated with each category. The Department of Higher Education in partnership with its Provincial Department colleagues should be involved in this training. This training must take place annually, to assist new lecturers.
c) Pre-service and in-service training of FET College personnel in pedagogy and industry content

It is recommended that the Department of Higher Education and Training should work in partnership with the institutions of higher learning to devise pre-service courses and in-service courses in methodology and content for lecturers in Tourism and Hospitality in the NC (V). These courses should provide lecturers with a strong pedagogical foundation, including interpretation of the curriculum, planning and preparation, as well as industry knowledge.

Long-term interventions

a) One exit-level qualification at NQF Level 4

The rationalization of the curriculum should consider the reformulation as a three-year curriculum with a single exit level at the end of NQF Level 4.

b) Introduction of a learnership at NQF Level 5

The evaluation teams recommend an additional year at the end of NQF 4 in the form of a learnership in the industry. Funds for this should be sought from CATHSSETA. This would allow for clearer articulation between the NQF Level 4 programme and the needs of industry.

Last thoughts

This project directed its energies primarily at the intended and assessed curricula for programmes focused for Tourism and Hospitality in South Africa. In doing so, it has been able to make constructive recommendations for improving the curricula for the two NC (V) programmes. It has also provided very specific inputs into the kinds of changes required in assessment to ensure better articulation with higher education and more ready acceptance of successful NC (V) candidates into the workplace.

Umalusi has used the distinctions between the intended curriculum (as represented in the national curriculum documents), the enacted curriculum as it is implemented in classrooms, and the assessed curriculum to shape its work. However, the more fine-grained approach presented in the SLO Curriculum in development (2009) should remind us all that the intended curriculum presents both an “ideal” as a vision of – and for – the curriculum and that, through the “formal written” aspect, its intent is expressed.

The assessed curriculum for Umalusi has primarily been represented by the national examinations. The NC (V), however, has, by its very design, shifted the focus in assessment to learning experiences that should foster the growth of practical skills, a capacity to work and think in a vocational speciality, and the formation of a professional identity is a particular area of work. This is reflected in the NC (V) assessment requirements for the vocational subjects where 50% of the final mark comes from assessing the practical component. The research indicates that this is an area where greater co-operation between the stakeholders involved in this research could make a rapid and significant difference.

It is clear from the thinking represented in this research that the delivery of the qualification has not yet made the most of these possibilities, and that it would be to the benefit of the students, the colleges, the industry and the economy itself, if the potential in programmes such as these were to be systematically unlocked. In SLO’s terms, the areas requiring the most
urgent transformation are lecturers’ perception about and their capacities to deliver this new qualification. If this were to happen the “learning experiences as perceived by learners” would be radically altered, and what is learned would ensure highly competent thoughtful young practitioners ready for further education and training in the field. Such a success story would surely also begin to make colleges education institutions of choice for the many young people longing to do something worthwhile with their lives.

It would augur well for the future if a report such as this prompted all with a commitment to education as well as to South African tourism and hospitality to understand and grasp the unique opportunity for development represented by these NC (V) programmes.
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HOSPITALITY

Ms Karen Borain: Training & Development Manager: Tsogo Sun Hotels

Ms Karen Borain joined the hospitality industry 1979, studying at the Hotel School and then working in the industry as Manager in various positions. Ms Borain studied Human Resources and Training and has 25 years’ experience in Training and Development. She has been involved in many forums that have shaped training, development and education within the Hospitality Industry including standards and qualifications writing (SGBs).

Since 1989, Ms Borain has worked at Southern Sun Hotels and has trained and developed all levels of employees including Studentships.

In addition, Ms Borain is a board member at the School at Tourism and Hospitality at the University of Johannesburg. She is also a registered skills development facilitator, has been a moderator and assessor with THETA and is an accredited Life, Business, Executive and Team coach. Ms Borain is currently a Training and Development Manager at Tsogo Sun Hotels.

Ms Petra Burger: Hospitality Teacher, The Kings School and IEB exam Moderator

Ms Petra Burger obtained a BA from University of Stellenbosch (1978), a Higher Diploma in Education from University of Stellenbosch (1979), followed by an ACE: Hotel Keeping and Catering from University of Pretoria (2003). She successfully completed Diplomas in Food preparation and Service from City and Guild (2006), an Assessor’s Course (IEB) in 2000 and thereafter a Moderator’s Course (IEB) in 2011 of which the results are pending.

She taught Hotelkeeping and Catering between 1998 and 2007 and Hospitality Studies afterwards at The King’s School, Robin Hills in Randburg. She has been part of the examining panel for the IEB since 2001 in various positions, namely an internal moderator for Theory exam, an Internal portfolio moderator, a PAT moderator and she has set the Supplementary Gr. 12 paper for Hotel Keeping and Catering. During 2008 she was part of a team that compiled the SAG for Hospitality Studies.

Ms Lisa Gordon-Davis: Managing Director: Kundiza Training & Consulting

Ms Lisa Gordon-Davis is well known in the field of hospitality education. She has held the positions of National Training Manager for the Hospitality Industries Training Board, Hospitality Chamber Manager for THETA, and Executive Officer of the South African Tourism Institute (SATI). A former lecturer at the Cape Technikon Hotel School, she has written or contributed to over 20 textbooks for schools, colleges and higher education institutions.

Ms Gordon-Davis holds six different qualifications, starting with a National Diploma in Food Service Management, and ending with a Masters’ Degree in Human Resource Management from Wits Business School. She was on the ministerially-appointed writing team for the NCS Hospitality Studies, and has worked in teacher education for many years.

Ms Gordon-Davis is currently the Managing Director of her own business, Kundiza Training and Consulting, which specializes in Tourism and Hospitality education and training. She is simultaneously the national director of the Global Travel and Tourism Partnership South Africa (GTTTPSA), a programme that supports the subject of Tourism in high schools across South Africa.
Ms Annalee Howell-Williamson: CEO: Annacol Training Consultants

Ms Annalee Howell-Williamson has a Higher Diploma in Education and a BA Degree in English and Psychology. She has been in the Education and Training field for 30 years – working for 22 years for the Department of Education, teaching Hospitality in High Schools. Her last position was Deputy Principal at an FET College.

During the past ten years she has headed up her own training company – Annacol Training Consultants, accredited with the ETDP SETA. Ms Howell-Williamson was the Chairperson of the Hospitality SGB for CATHSSETA for nine years and convened the Hospitality Curriculum team that wrote the NCS for Hospitality. She has published numerous hospitality, education and training-related books and learning materials including a comprehensive teacher’s guide for Hospitality.

She assists providers in obtaining accreditation and is an Assessor, Moderator and Verifier for a number of the SETAs. She was a National examiner for the Cookery Practical Theory paper for FET Colleges and has done verification for Umalusi, HW SETA and INSETA. Ms Howell-Williamson has run a number of National workshops for Hospitality facilitators to assist them in implementing the new qualifications/curriculum.

Mr Johannes Kaledi: MD: Tswellopele Hospitality Academy

Mr Johannes Kaledi is an experienced entrepreneur with an impressive track record and extensive experience within the tourism industry. He has worked with the Legacy Group as executive chef and as GM for the exclusive five- star Bush Lodge. He has also worked for Aventura as Group Executive Chef in charge of thirteen kitchens and later as Group Food and Beverage Manager for restaurants and retail stores.

He was employed at Pretoria Technikon as national training co-ordinator and consultant for a period of 2 years responsible for projects at the centre of excellence. Mr Kaledi is the former co-owner of Omaramba – a holiday resort in Buffelspoort dam and he started Tswellopele Hospitality Academy in 1999. In addition, Mr Kaledi has many accreditations from Confrerie Dela Chaine Des Rotisseurs, SA Chefs Association, National Training Development, World Association of Cooks Societies (WACS), Les Toques Branches, and International Club of Chefs. He was an executive member of Horizon 2000 Chefs Training and is a member of FEDHASA.

Mr Peter Kriel: Academic Head: Hospitality Management at the University of Johannesburg (UJ)

After qualifying with a National Diploma: Hotel Management in 1989, Mr Peter Kriel joined the hospitality industry as assistant Food and Beverage Manager with Southern Sun Hotels. He then joined City Lodge Hotels as Assistant General Manager for the opening team of City Lodge Bloemfontein. He later joined Sun International (Sun City) as Front Office Manager of The Cabanas, following which he was promoted to Rooms Division Manager: Cabanas, Front Office Manager: Sun City Hotel, Rooms Division Manager: The Cascades. Mr Kriel was involved in the pre-opening training of reception staff of The Palace Hotel.

Mr Kriel joined Higher Education at the Technikon Witwatersrand (TWR) where he completed his BTech in Post School Education, a master’s degree in Post School Education in the context of hospitality education and is currently busy with his PhD in Curriculum Studies, again focussing on hospitality education.
Mr Kriel holds the position of Academic Head: Hospitality Management at the University of Johannesburg (UJ) and was acting Director: UJ School of Tourism and Hospitality (STH) from January – November 2011.

Ms Beverley Muller: Training Manager Tsogo Sun Hotels

Ms Beverley Muller joined the Hospitality Industry directly from school in 1992 starting as a Trainee, and at the age of 21 was a Supervisor in Front Office, then Front Office Manager at two of the biggest Southern Sun hotels, Southern Sun OR Tambo and Garden Court Sandton City. Whilst working Ms Muller studied through Southern Sun Hotels obtaining her Hospitality qualification. As training was her passion Ms Muller left Operations in 2000 to become a Trainer so she could give back the knowledge and experience she had gained to the Industry. As a Training Consultant, she worked for Southern Sun Hotels and Q Competence providing assessment for the City Lodge and the Legacy Hotel Group. She has also worked for Emperors Palace (Peermont Group) as the NQ Manager.

Ms Muller was part of the SGB (Standards Generating Body) with THETA where she was involved in writing the Hospitality standards and qualifications which are being used by Industry today. She is also a registered Assessor and Moderator and has been running Studentships for nine years.

Ms Muller is currently a Training Manager at Tsogo Sun Hotels where her focus is Skills development for the Group.

Ms Yvonne Murray: Lecturer at the Tshwane North College

Ms Yvonne Murray obtained the B Home Economics (B Ed) at the University of Stellenbosch. After teaching for three years she joined the Maize Board as a Home Economist and later became Product Manager. During that time the recipe book PRIDE OF THE COB was published as well as many of her food articles in magazines.

She represented the Maize Board in the Horizons 2000 project run by the SA Chefs Association and acted as liaison for competitions sponsored by the Maize Board for the SA Chefs Association. She is presently a lecturer at the Tshwane North College. She lectured NSC, THETA Levels 3 and 4 as well as Diploma in Food Preparation. She is currently lecturing NC (V) Levels 3 and 4. Whilst being a lecturer she also did experiential training in the industry to keep up with new trends in the food industry. Ms Murray completed the Assessors Course (IEB) in 2003 and the moderators Course (IEB) in 2005. She is presently a moderator for Umalusi in the NC (V) subject Food Preparation.

Ms Miems Nel: Managing Principal of The International Hotel School’s Sandton Campus

Ms Miems Nel currently holds the title of Managing Principal of The International Hotel School’s Sandton Campus, a position that she has held for eight years.

Ms Nel completed her studies in Education at the Rand Afrikaans University in Auckland Park, (1978 – 1981), and began her teaching career at Forest High School as the Typing, Accountancy and Business Economics teacher for Grades 8 through to 12. She soon graduated to a more challenging teaching position at the Kelly-Greenoaks Secretarial & Business College in Johannesburg where she held the position of the Head of Department for Bookkeeping, Computer Skills and Office Procedures.
In 1997 Ms Nel joined The International Hotel School as lecturer in Computer Studies, Hospitality Supervision, Tourism & Hospitality and Training for the Hospitality Industry, and she hasn’t looked back. Her enthusiasm and passion for hospitality and people saw her rise quickly through the ranks, firstly as the School Administrator in 2001 and, following her success in the position, her promotion as Managing Principal in 2002.

In addition to shouldering all the responsibility associated with educating 530 students and managing 25 staff members, she also tends to the managerial and financial duties pertaining to the day-to-day running of a successful higher educational institution, registration of The International Hotel School with the Department of Education and Programme Accreditation with the Council on Higher Education (CHE).

Ms Nel still finds time to lecture various short courses for the hospitality industry at IHS and is a full member of the Faculty of the Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Lodging Association. She has also completed additional studies in Business Management Development at the Durban University of Technology to complement her position at IHS.

Mr Arthur Rogers: Group Training Officer: Peermont Group t/a Emperors Palace

Mr Arthur Rogers joined the industry in 1991 and moved through the various sectors within the Hospitality Industry. In 2008 Mr Rogers moved into the training field where he joined the Training Department as Group Training Officer for the Peermont Group. During this time Mr Rogers has been responsible for Studentships in conjunction with CATHSSETA that is hosted by Peermont Hotel Casino Convention Resorts and hosting of various other work placement programmes.

Ms Lientjie van Rensburg: National Talent Manager Compass Group (SA)

Ms Lientjie van Rensburg held the position of Director: Hospitality Centre of Excellence for 16 years at Tshwane University of Technology. She was involved with various community development projects and consulted to FET colleges, Government Institutions, corporate food and beverage companies and franchise groups.

Ms Van Rensburg holds six different qualifications, starting with a National Diploma in Food Service Management, and ending with a Masters’ Degree in Food & Beverage Management from Tshwane University of Technology. She is also a registered skills development facilitator, moderator and assessor with CATHSSETA.

She is currently the National Manager: Talent Development for Compass Group (SA) responsible for Talent Management, Employee Wellness, Global Best Practice and learning and development for all levels of employees, including studentships.

Dr Carina Vlachos: Unisa: Consumer Studies and Hospitality Studies subject didactics

Dr Carina Vlachos obtained a Baccalaureus in Home Economics from the University of Pretoria in 1981 and obtained a B Ed from the University of South Africa in 2000. In 2001 she completed her B Ed Endorsement. She then undertook and successfully completed master subjects in Consumer Science in 2003 at the University of Pretoria and a Magisters degree (M Ed) was obtained in 2007 from the University of South Africa. During 2009 Dr Vlachos received a Doctorate in Education from the University of South Africa.

Dr Vlachos has been teaching Consumer Studies and Hospitality Studies at school level for fourteen (14) years and was nominated for the National Teachers Award in 2004, 2005,
2007 and received this award at District level in 2008. She presented curriculum workshops to teachers in Gauteng, the Free State as well as the Eastern Cape. In July 2011 she was appointed as the team leader to assess the newly compiled Hospitality Studies text books written according to the CAPS curriculum.

In 2010 she was appointed as a part time lecturer at the University of South Africa (UNISA) and is responsible for Consumer Studies subject didactics, Hospitality Studies subject didactics, teacher workshop planning and presenting as well as administering an educational website.

Ms Annelie Weideman: Subject Advisor: Hospitality Studies & Consumer Studies: Tshwane South (D4)

Ms Annelie Weideman qualified with a BSc (Home Economics) degree and is currently a Subject Advisor (SES) at Tshwane South district for the Gauteng Department of Education where she is responsible for Consumer Studies and Hospitality Studies. She participated in the training of the National Training Team for CAPS for Consumer Studies and Hospitality Studies. Ms Weideman is also the Provincial Moderator for Gauteng Department of Education for both the subjects, she trained subject advisors and teachers in different concepts related to the above mention subjects and are the internal Moderator for Gauteng Department of Education for Grade 12 NSC examination.

She was the Subject Advisor for Tourism for eight years and previously the Senior Lecturer in Natural Science at Pretoria Onderwyskollege. Prior to this she was a Senior Lecturer at the Transvaal College of Education for Food and Nutrition and Clothing and Acting Head of Department: Natural Science for the last two years at the college.

Additional to the above mentioned, she has run her own Catering business for about 10 years and is the head of the Quick Frozen Project at the CSIR.

TOURISM

Ms Erica Cornelius: Head of Academy and training facilitator for the Gauteng Travel Academy

Ms Erica Cornelius started off in the Travel Industry in 1986 of which she consulted in Airlines Companies as well as Travel Agencies.

After numerous years in the Travel Industry, Ms Cornelius joined the Travel with Flair team in 2004 and became the Afterhours Consultant and Training Manager. In 2007 Ms Cornelius was approached by the Directors of Travel with Flair to start up the Gauteng Travel Academy. Her passion for training has been put to very good use as she assists Travel with Flair in all their staff’s skills training as well as the Companies Workskills plan. She has also developed training material and facilitated the Customer Care course for Travel with Flair.

Ms Cornelius has developed the QMS System for GTA and also facilitates the following courses: Domestic Fares & Ticketing course as well as the Galileo reservations course. She also oversees the development of the training material for the National Certificate in General Travel. She is a registered assessor and is also an active participant in the studentship programme for GTA and Travel with Flair.
**Mr Gabriel Dichabe: Deputy Director Tourist Guiding at the National Department of Tourism (NDT)**

Mr Gabriel Dichabe was till 1998 a site tourist guide at the SABC where he guided tours of the SABC Radio Park and Television centre facilities. In 1999, he was promoted to the position of Tours Coordinator and VIP Tourist Guide responsible for managing the Tours Department of the SABC. In 2002 he obtained his BA (Communications) Degree from the then Rand Afrikaans University (UJ). In 2004 he moved to a similar position of Tours Coordinator at the Freedom Park, a national heritage site in Pretoria. He helped establish a tours department at Freedom Park and he was also responsible for conducting tours of high level delegations.

During this tenure at Freedom Park, among other high level visits, he coordinated and conducted tours of the international Prime Ministers and South African Presidents such former Presidents Mbeki, Mandela and the current president Zuma in 2005 while he was still Deputy President. Mr Dichabe coordinated tours of diplomats, academics from South Africa and abroad. In his career in tourist guiding, he has conducted countless tours of schools, Universities, business executives, government departments, civic organisations among others.

He obtained his Honours degree in Heritage and Cultural Tourism at the University of Pretoria. In his honours studies, he also included all modules related to the Museum Studies diploma as electives towards this degree. In 2010 he moved to the Department of Tourism as Deputy Director Tourist Guiding. In this position, among other things, he is responsible for facilitating the implementation of the tourism legislations and policy within the tourism industry. This is the position that he still holds to date.

**Ms Elsabe Engelbrecht: Provincial Subject Coordinator for Tourism, Northern Cape Department of Education**

Ms Elsabe Engelbrecht became a teacher after completion of her studies at the Bloemfontein Teacher’s Training College and the University of the Free State and started teaching in 1982. In 2007 she furthered her studies in Tourism through UNISA. Apart from teaching English to Grade 12 students for 25 years, she taught Tourism for 11 years before becoming the Provincial Subject Coordinator for Tourism at the Northern Cape Department of Education in 2007.

During her years as a Tourism teacher at Duineveld High School in Upington, this school became the first school in the country with a fully equipped Tourism research and media centre. She undertook a number of overseas trips with her students to expose them to the real world of Tourism. She also attended two International Tourism Student Conferences in 2000 and 2002 in Hungary and France respectively. In 2005, Ms Engelbrecht was one of ten Tourism teachers in South Africa to receive the prestigious “American Express Fellows Award”, awarded by the American Express Foundation in New York, for excellence in Tourism Education. During a break in her education career, Ms Engelbrecht worked as rental sales manager for AVIS and BUDGET car rental, and front office manager for a leading (then) Southern Sun hotel.

Ms Engelbrecht is a member of the National Examiners Panel and the National Training Team for CAPS for the Department of Basic Education. She had been appointed the writer and translator of the Tourism CAPS and has published three Tourism textbooks. A brand new South African Tourism dictionary/encyclopaedia is nearing completion, a project she has been working on for the past three years. Ms Engelbrecht has been the internal moderator for the Northern Cape Department of Education Examinations and Assessment Unit since 2002. In 2009 she presented the Study Mate program for Tourism on SABC 1.
**Ms Linda Greenberg: H.O.D. Travel & Tourism Department of Boston City Campus & Business College**

After completing matric, Ms Linda Greenberg was employed by American Express, working in their International Tours, Corporate Accounts and Wholesale Tour Department processing package tours. She also worked as travel co-ordinator for the Edgars Group, managed an “in-house” office at 3M for Rennies Travel and also worked as a Sales Executive for United Airlines. During this period she completed many travel and airline qualifications including the IATA/UFTAA – both Preliminary and Advanced Professional Training Diplomas, Amadeus and Galileo.

However, education was her first love, and she began to work as a facilitator in the Travel & Tourism Department, first at Rapid Results College and, subsequently, at Boston City Campus & Business College. During this time she completed a BA degree majoring in Education and Psychology (with Communication as a sub-major). She is registered as an Assessor and Moderator with the ETDP SETA, Services SETA and CATHSSETA, and has completed various “train-the trainer” courses. At the beginning of this year, she registered for an honours degree in Adult Education with UNISA.

As HOD of the Travel & Tourism Department at Boston City Campus & Business College she is responsible for co-ordinating and facilitating lectures, organizing guest speakers from the industry, and field trips for the students to relevant tourist destinations, as well as ensuring that the content of the courses presented to the students is relevant to the industry.

**Ms Michelle Moss: Travel and Tourism Lecturer: Damelin (Freelance)**

Ms Michelle Moss has been actively involved in the travel and tourism industry since 1996. Driven to afford students the best possible training Ms Moss has continued to develop her skills and knowledge with a lifelong personal learning strategy, acquiring many travel specific qualifications in the process. Student achievement and preparation for industry and the workplace is a priority for Ms Moss, and individual assessment and growth strategies form part of each student’s development programme.

Continued monitoring of students in the workplace affords Ms Moss insight into the relevance of the training methodologies instituted and the opportunity to improve the facilitation process.

Ms Moss also has developed associated learning materials and student guides to enhance student knowledge. With her attention to detail these resources has become an invaluable part of the overall student experience.

**Ms Anita Nieuwoudt: Head of Department of NATED: Hospitality and Tourism at Tshwane North College for FET, Pretoria**

Ms Anita Nieuwoudt studied Heritage and Cultural Tourism at the University of Pretoria, completed an Honours degree in Heritage and Museum studies as well as an education qualification. She sees herself as a life-long student, currently doing her Master’s degree in Education Management and Leadership.

She worked as a consultant and tour guide for local and international tour operator companies and worked at various museums, as she believes that museums are great tools for teaching. Ms Nieuwoudt taught Travel and Tourism at different schools (Waterkloof, Hendrik Verwoerd and Hercules High schools) before moving to FET Colleges in 2005. She trained
CATHSSETA courses, specialized in Tourism Guiding and Event Management. Facilitate City and Guilds – International certificate and Diploma courses. She taught National Certificate Vocation tourism for five years. Ms Nieuwoudt is the external Chief Examiner for NCV Tourism Operations as well as the examiner for the ISAT. In 2012 she started teaching Tourism (N4-N6) at Tshwane North College. Besides being a UNISA mentor for Tourism College lecturers who further their studies, she has a keen interest in professional educator training, especially for FET College Lecturers.

Ms Lynne Phipson: General Manager – Human Resources and Training – Thompsons Travel Group

Ms Lynne Phipson joined the travel industry in 1989, after studying with and then working for Thomas Cook before joining Thompsons Tours in 1992 where she has held various Consulting, Marketing and Training Management positions. Ms Phipson has a natural passion for people development and people relations. She holds a qualification in Human Resources and Training Development (WITS), has 20 years travel industry experience, 10 years of this being directly involved in Training and Development of skills required in the tour operating industry.

Ms Phipson holds an accredited “Train the Trainer” certificate completed at the Cape Peninsular University of Technology.

Dr Ludwig Punt: Senior Curriculum Planner for Tourism in the WCED

Dr Punt studied at the University of Stellenbosch where he completed his BA degree in 1981, BA Honours in 1982, H.E.D. diploma in 1983 and M.A. in History in 1990. In 1988 he started his teaching career at Cathcart High School in the Eastern Cape. From 1998 to 2001 he taught at Tygerberg High School in Parow. Dr Punt joined the WCED in 2001 as Assessment Co-ordinator at the Metro-North Education District. In 2009 he was appointed to the position of Senior Curriculum Planner for Tourism in the WCED. Dr Punt is a member of the CAPS National training team and an external moderator for Umalusi.

The subject of Dr Punt’s DEd thesis is internal school moderation and quality assurance of assessment. Research has shown that there is a significant percentage of educators and school management teams who do not apply internal moderation of assessment as a quality assurance process in the Western Cape Schools. A key result of his doctoral work is the development of a Quality Assurance Monitoring programme, which aims at simplifying the examination system for educators and school management teams, as required by the NCS and Umalusi.

Dr Joseph Raputsoe: Director: Planning and Development Sedibeng Bed and Breakfast

Dr Raputsoe holds a PhD in Human Resources Management and an Associate Degree in Draughting. He held positions at Datsun Nissan Motor Assembly at Rosslyn in South Africa, United Breweries and Continental Circuits Corp (Phoenix, Arizona USA). He also held positions as Director: National ManPower Development Secretariat and Principal Secretary: Public Service for the government of Lesotho. He also fulfilled duties for the Institute of Management Development (IDM) for Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland.

From 2000 to 2011, Dr Raputsoe filled posts in the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism in South Africa in the following portfolios: Director Quality Assurance, National Registrar of Tourist Guides, Director: Consumer Protector in Tourism for the National Department of Tourism. He is a member of the South African Board of People Practices (SABPP), Institute of People Management (IPM), and the Three Rivers Rotary Club International. His expertise
includes the formulation of the Regulatory Framework for the Tourist Guiding Sector (Tourism Second Amendment Act, 2000).

Dr Raputsoe is an Honorary member of the Field Guide Association of South Africa (FGASA). He has served on various tourism forums representing the National Department of Tourism.

Prof Elmarie Slabbert: Associate professor and programme leader for Tourism Management at North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus)

Prof Elmarie Slabbert is an associate professor and programme leader for Tourism Management at North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus). She specializes in the social impact of tourism, tourism marketing, communication, event management and tourism management.

Prof Slabbert is a board member of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists, vice-chairman of Tourism Educators of South Africa and serves as referee for the National Research Foundation (NRF) and various accredited journals. She also serves on the Education Committee as well as the Research Committee of the Faculty of Economic and Business Sciences. She received an Excellence in Teaching Award in 2003 and 2007. After the completion of her PhD she focused on acquiring research funds awarded to her by the National Research Foundation for analysing the social impacts of events in South Africa (2007-2011). After this she received funding from the National Research Foundation to continue her research on the tangible and intangible benefits of tourism to communities (2012-2014).

Prof Slabbert has authored and co-authored fourteen accredited articles and six accredited conference proceedings. Since 2005 21 Masters students and four Doctorate students completed their studies with success under her guidance. At international level she has presented 26 papers at conferences.

Mr Tom Swart: Educational Consultant & Internal Moderator for the IEB Grade 12 Tourism examination

After teaching English and then training educators for over 14 years, Mr Swart started his own educational consultancy in 1992.

Mr Swart’s involvement with Tourism since then includes facilitating workshops in tourism development in Local Councils for local councillors, the private sector and communities, developing activities for tourism awareness for different grades and doing training for teachers, facilitators and government departments. He also developed tourism routes with local community members in Soweto, Kagiso, Sharpeville and Boipatong (1999). Mr Swart is the author of the Tourism textbook for Via Afrika Nasou for NC (V) Level 2: Client Services and Human Relations for FET Colleges (2006). Besides training, he is also involved in curriculum development for Grades 10 – 12 in the FET NCS for Tourism on behalf of the National Business Initiative and the South African Tourism Institute through all nine provinces of South Africa (2005 – 2007). Mr Swart’s involvement in the tourism industry also includes writing the Nyandeni Tourism Development Plan for submission to the Local Economic Development Fund: community and heritage tourism development in the villages between Umtata and Port St. Johns (2000).

Besides his involvement in tourism as a subject and the tourism industry itself, Mr Swart gained experience in adult education by writing the assessment sections for a series of books for adult students in Travel and Tourism, published by Juta (1999). He honoured a contract with Reach and Teach in 1998/99, to develop the Travel and Tourism Programme for adults into
a SAQA-recognised Certificate and to develop the outcomes-based assessment of the students in the Programme. Mr Swart is currently appointed as internal Moderator for the IEB Grade 12 Tourism examination – a position he has held since 2007.

Ms Samantha van der Berg: Head of the Bidtravel Studentship Department

Ms Samantha van der Berg has been in the Travel and Tourism industry since 1989. She is Head of the Bidtravel Studentship Department (an accredited training provider) which trains students in a Certificate in General Travel Qualification (SAQA ID 14119).

Ms Van der Berg is an accredited assessor, moderator and facilitator registered with CATHSSETA.

Mr Sarel Visagie: Consultant: Stentor Consulting

Mr Sarel Visagie obtained a B.Com from University of the Free State (1983), a BCom (Hons) from Rand Afrikaans University (1991), followed by an MCom (Strategic Management) from Rand Afrikaans University (1995). He successfully completed an ETDP Seta Assessor’s Course in 2004. Mr Visagie has been lecturing in Finance, Accounting and Economics for the past ten years at a number of business schools transferring knowledge to many new and middle management candidates. He also taught Accounting at the Swiss Hotel School from 2010-2011.

Mr Visagie is consulting in the fleet and transport management industry where he also provides educational services and short skills programmes. In addition, he is appointed as Education Consultant to the Southern African Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association (SAVRALA) where he was instrumental in establishing a short skills programme for chauffeurs prior to the 2010 FIFA World Cup.

CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR

Ms Vanessa Andreou: Consumer Studies Teacher at Northlands Girls High School, Kwa-Zulu Natal Department of Education

Ms Vanessa Andreou started her teaching career as a Home Economics teacher after completing a Higher Degree of Education: Home Economics. Time and experience overseas meant that she was exposed to various ideas regarding curriculum e.g. Food and Textiles Technology, gaining huge experience and insight when it came to discipline and school inspection- OFSTED (Intensive school investigations), socio-economic conditions relating to behaviour and learning. She also had an opportunity to start learning about managing people in a middle management role. The change from Home Economics to Consumer Studies in South Africa took place during her absence. On her return she had to come to grips with the new policy documents to teach Consumer Studies. She is currently acting HOD Consumer Studies and Technology and Head of Grade 9.

Dr Gerrie E. du Rand: Head of the Foods and Nutrition Section: Department of Consumer Science, University of Pretoria

Dr Gerrie du Rand is a Senior Lecturer and the Head of the Foods and Nutrition Section: Department of Consumer Science, University of Pretoria. Prior to this appointment, she also taught a wide range of subjects covering Food, Nutrition, Recipe and Product Development on both undergraduate and post-graduate level at Medunsa, Pretoria College, and the University of Pretoria.
Dr Du Rand has authored numerous articles in accredited journals, presented research at international and national conferences and has supervised a number of post graduate students both PhD’s and masters students. Her speciality area is Food Tourism and the use of Local foods in culinary mapping and consumer behaviour in the food service and hospitality management disciplines. Dr Du Rand taught cookery classes and catering abroad in Japan, Greece, Italy and the USA.

Besides being an external examiner for Durban University of Technology and the University of Technology Mauritius, she also served on the Standards Generating Body and was instrumental in developing many of the unit standards for the Hospitality Management training. She is an author of Focus school text books for Hospitality Studies Grades 10-12.

Ms Karen Kleintjies: Senior Curriculum Planner: FET Colleges in the Western Cape, offering support to the NC (V) programmes: Hospitality, Tourism and Education and Development

Ms Karen Kleintjies started her career as a lecturer and progressed to being a Programme Manager in the Hospitality departments at two FET Colleges over a period of 16 years. As a curriculum planner her duties include support to the six Colleges in the Western Cape in implementation of curriculum policy, capacity building of staff through assessment development, improvement of teaching and learning and problem solving in the classroom. She has forged links with the Department of Economic Development and Tourism in the Western Cape to strengthen partnerships with the Hospitality and Tourism industry, which enables her to assist Colleges with student work placement.

Ms Kleintjies is the coordinator of the Hospitality and Tourism focus group in the Western Cape, established as a community of practice to promote the sharing of best practice and standardization.

Ms Adri Koekemoer: Lecturer: Didactics of Technology & Consumer studies, Faculty of Educational Sciences at the North West University, Potchefstroom Campus

Ms Adri Koekemoer taught Home Economics, Food Technology, Textiles Technology and Consumer Studies up to Grade 12 / AS level [United Kingdom] for a number of years. She is an examiner for the Consumer Studies Olympiad paper and an external moderator for subjects at the University of Johannesburg as well as University of Pretoria.

As a qualified South African tour guide, Ms Koekemoer has extensive experience in the local hospitality trade and industry. This subject group has always been close to her heart and she strives to continue to do meaningful research to help support teachers and the teaching of these subjects.

Ms Phillippa Lewis: Consumer Studies Educator, Durban Girl’s College Grade and Independent Examination Boards (IEB) National Examiner – Grade 12 Consumer Studies

Ms Phillippa Lewis has taught Home Economics and then Consumer Studies at Grade 12 level for a number of years. Prior to teaching Consumer Studies and after teaching Home Economics she lectured at the Durban University of Technology in a range of Hospitality related subjects.

Other career opportunities she has had, have included running her own catering business and lecturing on the NSC programme: Food Service Management. She is currently the IEB National Examiner for Consumer Studies and will continue with this commitment until 2014.
**Mrs Rina Schubotz: Deputy Director: Services subjects, Department of Basic Education**

Mrs Rina Schubotz is based in Pretoria in the offices of the National Department of Basic Education in the Directorate Curriculum Implementation and Quality Improvement. She coordinates curriculum policy and related issues for the services subjects Hospitality Studies, Consumer Studies and Tourism in Grade 10 – 12.

Before her appointment at the National Department in 2006, Ms Schubotz was employed by the North West Provincial Department of Education. She was Subject Advisor for the three services subjects, for five years for schools in the Vryburg district and another five years for schools in the Rustenburg district.

**Ms Heather Swanepoel: Textiles Tuition and Training (Tex Tu Train)**

Ms Heather Swanepoel is currently a consultant in the field of Skills Development Facilitation. She has run her consulting company known as Textiles Tuition and Training (Tex Tu Train) since 1998, the focus of which is services related to skills development and training, including: Developing training material; Curriculum Development and quality assurance (for CTFL SETA QCTO qualifications); Accreditation and Studentship management; Skills Development Facilitation and Facilitating training courses. Ms Swanepoel taught Home Economics and Needlework, after which she lectured at the Cape Technikon where she taught Home Economics Teachers, as well as Food and Clothing Technology students.

Ms Swanepoel also lectured Textiles to the Fashion Design and Clothing Production Management students. More recently, she has worked in association with Kundiza Training Consultancy and Tshwane University of Technology in developing and presenting a 5-day workshop for educators of Consumer Studies for the Mpumalanga Department of Education. Ms Swanepoel currently serves on the Clothing and Textile Advisory Committee of CPUT (Bellville Campus).