

Chief Moderator's Report June 2006

Introduction

This report summarises the findings of the moderation team for the summer series 2006 for VCE Hospitality and Catering. The majority of the participating centres have completed ten rounds of moderation, taking into account the November and summer series of events. The format for these awards has been assimilated in the majority of the Further Education and Schools Centres, showing an understanding of the award and assessment requirements.

As with previous years outcomes have continued to improve, especially where centres have shown evidence of using the published Centre guidance documentation.

Key issues arising from the moderation process

1. Assessment Portfolios:

1.1 Assessment evidence

Overall work was found to be of a good standard for this final year; candidates undertook effective research and completed relevant and interesting assessment tasks that enabled them to demonstrate a good level of understanding. Portfolios of evidence were usually well managed, once again best practice was seen where work was page numbered, headings were used and information gathered using tables and graphs to compare and contrast results.

There was once again some poor interpretation of the Merit and Distinction grade criteria relating to "critical analysis" and "evaluation".

1.2 Assessment administration

A very small number of centre assessors continued to have difficulty dealing with the administration of the assessment process; poor assignment structure had an impact on the coverage of the banner criteria and did not direct the learner to produce sufficient evidence to cover the grade criteria. (Assessors did not always adhere to the published structure of the award; this error was the most common fault in the construction of assignment briefs.) The work produced by candidates continued to lack depth where banner statements were omitted from the assessment process.

1.3 Internal moderation processes

The issues noted above in sections 1.1 and 1.2 are centre internal quality issues and must be addressed through internal moderation procedures. *Centre moderation should focus on the auditing of assignment briefs, prior to issue, using the published unit specifications as a quality check to ensure that the assignment brief is fit for purpose, covering banner statements and with the potential to cover all the grade criteria.* Internal moderators must continue to be vigilant about plagiarism, particularly where work has been produced using computer software and the Internet, or photocopied materials are included.

1.4 Tracking assessment evidence.

In general evidence was annotated against the grade criteria claimed. Some assessors annotated the learner work using the margin, some used unit assessment

marking and tracking sheets linked to page numbers. These processes made the location of the evidence a more transparent process.

Many candidates included an appendix of additional materials that they had gathered e.g. photocopies or internet material, or bibliographies. *It should be noted that despite continued feedback by moderators, some candidates are still not justifying the contents of their appendix and/or bibliography, or making reference to the items in the body of their evidence.*

The failure to reference additional materials was a common cause for the downward adjustment of grades and point scores by moderators.

1.5 Diverse evidence.

Witness testimony where used was an effective way to confirm learner performance, assessors are advised to clearly relate the statement about performance to the specific grade criteria, also to qualify exactly the situation or experience being endorsed.

Where a presentation was required there needed to be more clear evidence of the quality and success of the presentation as well as the direct link to the unit content; this is essential for the achievement of the merit and distinction grades.

Assessors are advised to make an overt statement where candidates have had access to learning support to complete the assessments.

There were no examples of statements for compensation being produced by the assessors, to support grades.

1.6 External Moderation processes.

A very small number of centres in this final sample have not met the deadline for summer series sampling.

2. Detailed feedback about VCE Units

The notes that follow identify the evidence that was found to be consistently missing when moderating the units.

X302P Food & Drink Operations

Beverages were often not covered in sufficient detail.
Staff skills and qualifications were not always covered.

X303P Accommodation & Front Office Operations

Many candidates continued to fail to address the impact on *staff roles* of environmental and technological change.

X304P Customer Service

There was little evidence of consumer needs analysis for the main types of guest.
Photographic evidence was not always labelled or validated.

X309P On-licensed -trade Operations

Cellar procedures were not always covered

X321P Career Development.

In general the candidates provided evidence that they had carried out a skills analysis, researched *two* career development opportunities, complete the required *two* application forms and provided tangible and explicit *evidence* of a real or

simulated *interview*. Some candidates were not given effective career advice from assessors, managerial position applications were not realistic at this stage of a learner career, trainee manager positions would be more appropriate for distinction level candidates.

Internet resources when included were not properly justified, analysed or clearly referenced. There was little evidence of a log (a C grade criterion) or *critical* evaluation of a career development plan (an A grade criterion). In some instances unrealistic career choices were not corrected by the assessor.

Overall, VCE centres performed very well this series with xxx of centres' assessment found to be in tolerance.

Margaret Rankine 26.06.06