Tourism

2012 Chief Assessor's Report

Government
of South Australia

SACE
Board of SA

TOURISM

2012 CHIEF ASSESSOR’S REPORT

OVERVIEW

Chief Assessors’ reports give an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Tourism continued to be a popular subject in the second operational year of the changes made to assessment practices in SACE Stage 2.

Yet again, the design of assessment tasks was a significant factor in allowing students to demonstrate the subject’s performance standards at the highest levels. Well-focused and moderately scaffolded tasks were typically more useful in this regard than excessively complex and detailed tasks. In addition, the rigour of the assessment was sometimes compromised when clarifying questions were unnecessarily altered to suit tasks that were perhaps more appropriate in previous curricula; altering the tasks in this way also impeded students’ ability to demonstrate the performance standards at the highest level.

The word-count policy applies strictly to practical activities and investigations, and recommendations are made for the completion of folio tasks. Limiting the number of words per task ensures that all work is comparable, and that students’ workloads are manageable. This year saw very few instances of word-count breaches. Those who did go beyond the specified word-limits often did so by excessive use of tables that contained analysis. Students and teachers are reminded that, according to the subject outline, tables should be used for data and summaries, and any analysis (including tables, annotations, and footnotes) is included in the word-count. As the policy states that teachers are not to assess beyond the word-limit, some students’ ability to meet the knowledge and understanding, analysis and evaluation, and investigation and application assessment design criteria was compromised.

The subject outline currently allows for a ‘recommended’ word-length of 1000 words or time-limit of 6 minutes for folio tasks, providing a small measure of leniency for additional words or time. Teachers are advised to set tasks within this recommended word-length.

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT

Assessment Type 1: Folio

Folio assessment tasks predominantly assess students’ achievement against the knowledge and understanding, and analysis and evaluation assessment design criteria. To achieve at the highest possible standard in this component, students must be able to develop conclusions and recommendations from their research. While performance standards from the investigation and application, and communication criteria can also be incorporated into tasks, effective tasks focused on students' knowledge and understanding of tourism, concepts, and models, and demonstrated skills of interpretation, critical analysis, and evaluation.

The knowledge and understanding criterion was addressed through a range of tasks. Students were required to demonstrate an understanding of tourism knowledge such as trends in national and international travel, the laws and regulations that affect the industry, and the challenges of working in a culturally diverse industry. Effective task designs that specifically assessed the 'knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and models in different contexts — familiar and less familiar' (subject outline, page 37) challenged students to demonstrate their knowledge of these in relation to a specific example, site, or trend. A range of models was used by teachers including the multiplier effect, the three pillars of sustainability / triple bottom line, the Butler Sequence, family life cycle, Doxey's Irridex, Plog's psychographic typology, and the Ps of marketing, to name just a few identified at moderation. Likewise, concepts such as sustainability, tourist types, types of tourism (e.g. niche markets, mass tourism, ecotourism, and grief tourism), cultural diversity, and the interconnections that shape the industry appeared frequently in work submitted.

Clear boundaries in task design were a distinguishing feature of effective tasks in a number of areas. In supervised structured tasks, this was as straightforward as ensuring that source materials reflected the time allocated by the teacher. Effective collaborative tasks specified how the limits applied to the task. For example, it was clear what parts of the task were collaborative. Where the product or the assignment was collaborative, it was also clear how the conditions applied to each student. Task design that allowed students to achieve at a high standard in this assessment type also included specific features that assessed students' ability to critically analyse information. However, weak task design limited student achievement, as it only allowed for identification and description of information. Additionally, while it is important that all specific features must be assessed across a teaching program, it is not necessary to cover all of them in any one assignment. By reducing the number of specific features in a task, it was possible for students to target those skills and knowledge being assessed more effectively.

Effective task design that provided clear limits for students also occurred where models, concepts, and knowledge to be applied in the task were specified. Moderators observed that Part B of the examination provides teachers with insight into ways that various concepts and models can be incorporated into questions in such a way that students must apply the concept or model to a case study in order to achieve at a high standard. The format of the examination questions therefore may provide some guidance to teachers in developing more effective questions, particularly where they choose to include a supervised structured task as part of their assessment plan. These questions tend to be open-ended questions; thus specifying the concepts and models provides scope for students to demonstrate their ability to critically analyse their sources of information and develop well-supported conclusions or recommendations.

The specific feature AE2, 'Evaluation of the validity, bias, and accuracy of sources of information', was identified by moderators as an area in which students did not consistently demonstrate achievement to a high standard. One method evident in some samples was to include a five-star rating of validity, bias, and accuracy of sources. While moderators felt this demonstrated an awareness of these aspects, where students had not given a reason for their ratings, there was insufficient evidence for high levels of achievement of this specific feature. A small number of samples demonstrated evaluation of sources through in-text language choice by linking two sources together with statements such as ‘Source 2 validates Source 6 in that …’

Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

Practical activity tasks challenge students to ‘develop and demonstrate practical tourism skills’ (subject outline*,* p 39) and should predominantly assess the knowledge and understanding, investigation and application, and communication criteria. Task design must focus on the implementation of practical skills and primary data. The subject outline provides clarification, stating that the practical activity ‘is an assessment that in most cases is undertaken beyond the classroom and involves primary sources of information about tourism … [and students use] … primary sources of information to explain and make connections between their findings and their knowledge of tourism concepts and models, and secondary sources of information about tourism’. Thus, primary data collected by students was the cornerstone of quality tasks submitted at moderation. Interviews, class visits, observations, and surveys tended to be the main forms of primary data methodologies. Student work that achieved highly drew on a number of primary sources and used secondary research to clarify findings. Samples that did not achieve well tended to rely on secondary research with primary sources included in a superficial manner. Moderators observed that tasks which directed students to assess the extent to which a site, trend, or business fitted a model or concept (‘assess the extent to which X is sustainable …’ or ‘use the Butler Sequence to establish …’ or ‘who are the more allocentric travellers, X or Y?’) tended to provide more support to students’ efforts to integrate secondary sources into their work without losing the focus on their primary findings. A note of caution was raised at moderation. The subject outline states that students may use ‘event planning and management, a public display, acting as a tour guide, an interpretative display, or an industry publication’. These are often tasks that students find engaging and rewarding experiences. It is important to ensure that these tasks still meet the requirements of the practical activity assessment type and the performance standards selected for assessment. For example, it is questionable whether or not a tour that has been developed solely from secondary sources of information meets the requirement of the assessment type.

Effective tasks presented at moderation were by definition achievable and shared a number of characteristics. These tasks tended to direct students towards specific areas that allowed them to look in depth at one aspect of a site, trend, or development, thus avoiding a scatter-gun approach where students have to cover many components within the one task. For example, visiting a site and assessing the extent to which that one site appeals to a particular type of visitor or the position of the site on the Butler Sequence tended to be handled better by students than tasks where students had to assess a range of factors for the site. Depth of study appeared to allow students greater ability to achieve at a high level than breadth of study.

Achievable tasks also tended to be structured in such a way that students had some control over their primary data collection. Some tasks required students to work in small groups to develop surveys that were then conducted during a class visit to a site. While on site, the students also participated in shared activities, such as a class presentation or tour, and had time to make their own observations. Other tasks made good use of the local area. It was evident in some work samples that students had visited a local area as a class and then had revisited the area in their own time to conduct additional primary data collection. In both of these examples, students were demonstrating the ability to apply a diverse range of practical tourism skills, manage their own investigation, and apply a systematic approach to their investigation; these skills are valued in the investigation and application assessment design criterion. The exemplars available on the SACE Board's website for the practical activities can be easily amended to suit local sites.

A highlight of effective, achievable tasks was how graphics were used in the text. Samples of work included annotated graphics to emphasise conclusions that were then used as an integral part of the discussion. For example, when discussing the impact of tourism on a site, students may include an image annotated to highlight changes in an area, and specifically refer to in their text, thus avoiding a graphic that looks attractive yet serves little purpose in the text.

Finally, effective practical activities presented at moderation were achievable within the constraints of the assessment type. Reiteration of the word-count policy is useful at this point. The subject outline specifies that each task in this assessment type be presented in a 'form that is a maximum of 1000 words for a written text or a maximum of 6 minutes for an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form'. The 'or' in this direction is significant. There were some tasks submitted where the task design did not conform to these directions and teachers had allowed presentation time in addition to 6 minutes or 1000 words of text. If both oral and written forms are being used to present findings, then a more appropriate approach is to adjust the combination of time-limit and word-length. This is critical when industry publications are used as a presentation format, as students can easily breach the word-limit required by this assessment type if consideration is not given in the task design.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

Moderators felt that the investigation assessment type was, by and large, appropriately assessed. Good samples of student work presented for moderation shared the following characteristics. Firstly, these samples incorporated both primary and secondary sources consistently throughout the text. Secondly, concepts and models were integrated into the discussion in such a way that judgments relating to them were clear. Importantly, these samples also had a strong tourism focus. For example, if discussing the impact of technology on tourism transport, the focus was on types of transport used by tourists rather than on transportation utilised by other industries.

As with the folio tasks and practical activities, the limits set in the task design helped to provide the structure needed. The subject outline indicates a limit of 1500 words for investigations. Effective tasks required students to take a narrow focus that would allow them sufficient depth of analysis and investigation within the word-limit. For example, 'Impact of terrorism on tourism' does not allow students to delve in any depth, as there are so many aspects to cover in order to draw conclusions and recommendations; however, 'The impact of online sales on work practices of travel agents' provides students with more opportunities to perform at all achievement levels. The subject outline also specifies that an investigation 'involves identifying, selecting, analysing, and evaluating primary and secondary sources of information', and goes on to identify a range of visual and graphical evidence that is relevant to this assessment type. Careful selection of specific features will ensure that the limits established in the assessment type are assessed in student work.

EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

Assessment Type 4: Examination

Teachers are reminded that the examination focuses directly and specifically on the *interpretation* and *analysis* of sources, as well as the *application* of students' learning from the four tourism themes studied throughout the year. This focus should be quite apparent from an observation of the 2010 sample paper in conjunction with the 2011 and 2012 examinations. This year's marking team made a similar summary reflection to the 2011 team, reporting that the overwhelming majority of students found the examination accessible, yet it also allowed the more capable students ample opportunities to excel, especially in Part B: Extended Responses.

Students attained at a wide range of achievement levels, against the designated performance standards. Better papers showed obvious signs of effective time management. Those who tried to write in too much detail, beyond the space allocated in Part A: Short Responses, were often left short of time to complete the examination, and this sometimes compromised the quality of their responses to Part B: Extended Responses. Teachers are encouraged to give their students opportunities throughout the year to write concisely in timed conditions. This does not need to be in summative assessment tasks; formative practice tests, or even a selection of examination-type questions, can be particularly useful in this regard.

Another factor that discriminated between students' achievement levels was the ability to comprehend the intention of the questions, and thus the capacity to answer those questions accurately. Markers observed that some responses did not address the requirements of questions (see discussion of Questions 5(b) and 8 below). Finally, and this is especially relevant for Part B of the examination, responses that made clear reference to the specific sources provided, as students were directed to do, typically achieved higher marks than those whose answers were dominated by unsubstantiated generalisations.

Teachers are also reminded that, while all assessment design criteria strategically underpin the construction of the examination, some themes might receive a greater focus than others, as was the case in the 2010 sample paper and the 2011 and 2012 examinations.

Assessment Design Criteria

This section of the report discusses the examination in relation to the four assessment design criteria listed in the subject outline.

Knowledge and Understanding

This year's examination focused particularly on the environmental, economic, and sociocultural impacts of tourism activities, and the interaction between tourists and host communities. Nevertheless, those students who performed at a high level exhibited an in-depth knowledge and understanding of all thematic aspects of the course, as well as a wide range of relevant tourism models.

It is important that students learn to interpret, analyse, and evaluate a range of tourism models in different contexts. A model is a visual or graphical representation of a concept or idea, demonstrating the structure of or relationship between components, and showing how the concept or idea might apply in a real-world situation. Some well-known tourism models include (but are not restricted to) Plog's model of tourist types, Doxey's Irridex, the Butler Sequence of destination development, the triple bottom line approach to sustainability, the multiplier effect, and so forth.

Analysis and Evaluation

The interpretation and analysis of tourism-related sources and issues is a major focus of the examination. Markers noted that students who scored in the higher grade bands were better able to interpret graphs, tables, and diagrams, and were able to distinguish perceptively between various individuals' and groups' perspectives on tourism issues. Likewise, better answers moved beyond a basic knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and models, and were able to provide astute and supported conclusions and recommendations based on thorough analysis. On the other hand, those who scored in the lower grade bands demonstrated a superficial understanding of sources in terms of validity, bias and accuracy (especially for Question 8).

Investigation and Application

The application of tourism knowledge in a range of contexts (specific features IA2 and IA4) was another primary focus of the examination. Markers commented often that a factor which discriminated between the quality of student responses was the ability to apply a concept (e.g. sustainability, management strategies) to a given, often new, situation or context.

Communication

This assessment design criterion was a key discriminating factor of student achievement in Part B: Extended Responses, in which marks were specifically allocated to effective communication and appropriate use of tourism terminology. By way of example, responses that communicated coherently and concisely, and accurately used a wide range of tourism terminology scored highly. Markers shared some consternation at the number of students who could not spell (or use correctly) key tourism terms.

Examination Questions

The overall standard of answers from this year's cohort was similar to that of last year's. Students found Questions 3, 8, 9, and 10 challenging, but the other questions were answered quite well.

Part A: Short Responses

Question 1(a)

Almost all responses showed an accurate interpretation of the tourism data, and could identify trends such as a steady decrease in the number of international and domestic visitors, or their associated expenditure.

Question 1(b)

The Global Financial Crisis (GFC) and the strong Australian dollar were the most popular reasons given for the decline in international tourist numbers, while the strength of the Australian dollar (making it cheaper to travel overseas) and poor marketing were frequent responses for domestic tourism decline. Markers noted that a surprising number of students misinterpreted ‘Indigenous tourism’ in the question as meaning tourists who are Indigenous rather than tourists who visit Indigenous sites and activities.

Question 1(c)

Awareness of tourism-related skills varied significantly. While most students were able to list skills such as cultural sensitivity, multilingual or communication skills, and skills associated with working with the natural environment, the question asked students to *describe,* (not just list) the skills, and marks varied accordingly.

Question 2(a)

Very few students had difficulty in identifying one relevant detail from the sources, such as the Treehotel being ‘designed with sustainable materials’, or constructed with ‘no chemicals [being] used at all’.

Question 2(b)

Only a small proportion of students seemed to understand the difference between the concepts of niche and mass tourism. Better responses showed an understanding of niche tourism as being more specialised than chain hotels (mass tourism), catering for smaller numbers, or usually with a unique (sometimes remote) experience.

Question 2(c)

For 4 marks, students were required to describe two strategies that might create positive links between businesses (such as Treehotel) and the host community. Better responses did not just list but described how Treehotel might employ locals, use locally made products, accommodate the needs and culture of the local community, and so on.

Question 3(a)

This question was well answered by students who understood the notion of profit leakage to major businesses and international companies.

Question 3(b)

Students generally answered this question well. ‘Providing jobs’ was an unacceptable response (given the question), but benefits such as injection of economic revenue, multiplier effects leading to improved infrastructure, and positive exchange of culture and ideas were some of the popular responses.

Question 3(c)

This question proved to be a discriminator amongst students and contributed towards the low mean score for Question 3 overall. Better responses understood the likely perspective of the Kenyan Government as being pleased with increased economic revenue and positive cultural exchange, yet concerned about the possible negative influence of Western culture. They similarly understood the perspective of responsible international tourists to include being pleased with cultural exchange and learning, and excited at being able to contribute to the host community, as well as being fearful of damaging the local environment or culture. Only students who directly compared the perspectives of the Kenyan Government and responsible international tourists (as directed by the question) received full marks.

Question 4(a)

Most students were able to draw conclusions from the sources, pointing to a significant increase in the number of Chinese tourists visiting Australia (up 19.4%), the rise of the Chinese middle class, or China being Australia's most valuable tourism market ($3.5 billion revenue).

Question 4(b)

Traditional inbound markets (that experienced a decline) were generally understood to be the UK, USA, and Japan. Most students were able to cite Japan's tsunami, the UK's Olympics, or the USA's weakened economy (as well as the GFC or the strong Australian dollar) as valid factors causing this decline in 2011.

Question 4(c)

Better responses not only made the connection between Chinese tourists' love of gambling and Packer's ownership of casinos, but also mentioned Packer's most likely bias.

Question 4(d)

Markers noted that a surprising number of students did not attempt this question, while those who scored full marks mentioned an implication such as Chinese language in schools (to benefit employees who deal with Chinese tourists) or developing Chinese cultural awareness in business training for specialised tourist services.

Question 5(a)

Students tended to quote lengthy sections of the source rather than synthesise the information provided. Higher-scoring students referred to the 'economic benefit' gained when purchasing local products, which would generate a multiplier effect throughout the state, as well as describing how attendees to the Convention Centre would also purchase accommodation, use transport, visit attractions, and so on.

Question 5(b)

This was a challenging question for many students. While most were able to identify three sectors and explain how they might contribute to a conference, few were able to describe how these sectors might 'collaborate' with each other or work together.

Question 6(a)

Students tended to find this question straightforward and were able to explain a social cost (such as undesirable change in local customs, overcrowding, and local resentment) and an economic cost (such as dependency upon tourism, high demand leading to inflation, or increased taxes to provide infrastructure). Those who did not score well did not seem certain of the meaning of the word ‘cost’, or misclassified economic and social factors.

Question 6(b)

This question was well answered, and most students were able to articulate environmental costs such as unplanned site hardening, an increase in noise/air/water pollution, destruction of endangered species (e.g. the sea turtle), and placing a strain on waste disposal systems. Those who scored poorly sometimes discussed irrelevant factors such as economic or social costs.

Question 6(c)

Similar to Question 5(b), students were required to discuss ways in which tourism businesses and the local government might *collaborate* with each other or work together to ensure the carrying capacity of Paradise Sands is not exceeded. While many responses were able to describe strategies of tourism businesses or local government separately, few focused on collaborative strategies such as placing limits on the number of tourists allowed to visit fragile areas, controlling the size of developments, limiting trading hours, or creating sustainable tourism events. Teachers might like to address the notion of collaboration specifically throughout the year to assist students’ understanding and success in answering this type of question in future examinations.

Question 6(d)

Many students chose not to answer this question at all, while those who did demonstrated a sound understanding of ways in which any tourism model has limitations in real-world applications. Specifically, the Butler Sequence is limited in that: it is perhaps an outdated model (1980), the experience of individual destinations varies widely, not all levels might be experienced, the labels are difficult to define, and there might be mitigating factors against decline.

Part B: Extended Responses

Generally speaking, this section of the examination was not answered as well as Part A, and numerous students did not complete all questions. Even so, there was a slight improvement on last year’s mean for this section, resulting from improved examination design (fewer sources, thus it was less time-consuming to read), and from students’ formative practice in completing extended responses in timed conditions.

Question 7

The overwhelming majority of students answered this question well, and were able to explain the economic benefits that Kokoda Track trekkers could bring host communities. Both sources mention employment of locals, purchasing local products and using local businesses; Source 4 adds the detail of improvements to local amenities with huts being built along the Track. Better responses were able to move beyond merely quoting at length from the sources, and were able to articulate a perceptive understanding of concepts such as multiplier effects despite possible profit leakage (from buying soft drinks).

Question 8

Most students demonstrated at least a basic understanding of the important concepts of validity, bias, and accuracy, yet very few excelled in this question.

In terms of Source 3, only a small number of students exhibited a sophisticated understanding of the purpose of the cartoon. The author clearly exaggerated the entertainment or theme park aspects of the imaginary Kokodaland to satirise or humorously criticise potential misuse of the Track. Despite the exaggeration (thus reduced accuracy), the cartoon makes a valid criticism of the commodification or ‘Disney-fication’ of the Kokoda Track. More able students were able to discuss the slight bias of the source against overdevelopment by those tourism businesses who might seek to take advantage of the Kokoda Track for profit.

Source 5, on the other hand, was more clearly understood. Better responses recognised the bias of the source: we would reasonably expect a website belonging to a tourism business to put a positive spin on their sustainable use of the host community. Additionally, more able students recognised the difficulty of determining the source’s accuracy (thus validity), although the most astute students noted that Source 5’s agreement with Source 4 increased its reliability and validity.

Finally, markers noted the number of students who did not seem to understand what the terms ‘validity’, ‘bias’, and ‘accuracy’ of sources mean, and were disappointed by the even larger number of students who incorrectly used the words ‘bias’ or ‘biased’.

Question 9

This question required students to engage in a cost–benefit analysis of building more memorials along the Kokoda Track. Most students were able to refer specifically to sources’ concern for the ‘environmental stress’, and how building more memorials could damage the ‘fragile environment … and untamed wilderness’. Likewise, most responses mentioned that Source 2 argued that one cost of building more memorials is the financial cost of having to build more infrastructure to cater for the larger number of tourists.

In terms of benefits, fewer students than anticipated discussed the cultural benefits that Source 1 mentions, in that ‘respecting wartime history’ can increase ‘cultural sensitivity’ by building a cultural interpretive centre. Very few students discussed the implied benefits to the local economy, which they could have done by briefly reiterating aspects of their response to Question 7.

Markers noted that some students did not seem to understand what was required of a cost–benefit analysis, thus they wrote very little in response to the question. Markers also commented on the poorer responses’ lack of reference to specific sources as evidence.

Question 10

As expected, this question was by far the most significant discriminator of student achievement in the examination. While this was a challenging question (requiring students to apply their tourism knowledge to a new context), those who attempted and completed the question in good time generally scored highly. Responses that scored 7 marks or more out of 10 tended to use the scaffolding provided and made recommendations in terms of environmental, economic, social, and cultural impacts. Those who combined social and cultural impacts were not penalised. Additionally, those who developed well-supported recommendations by referring to specific sources (as the question directed) tended to score more highly, as did those who communicated formally, accurately, and using a wide range of relevant tourism terminology.

Some examples of useful recommendations (mainly based on protecting against rapid expansion that could exceed the Track's carrying capacity) were:

- limiting the number of tourists accessing the Track, keeping within the carrying capacity, thus protecting the environment
- increasing the cost of using the Track, and making sure money is injected into the local economy, consequently improving local infrastructure
- registering operators, ensuring they are operating according to principles that promote sustainability
- maintaining cultural heritage by protecting cultural integrity and authenticity
- involving local communities in management decisions and processes
- monitoring the ongoing impacts of tourists' use of the Track.

The most astute responses also argued that the long-term sustainability of the Track needs to protect against downturns (as visualised in Source 6) caused by events such as the GFC. Those responses recommended government-sponsored marketing and grants to stimulate demand, thus strengthening economic sustainability.

OPERATIONAL ADVICE

Moderators noted that, where teachers had included all documentation required as part of the moderation process, it was much easier to understand the assessment decisions made by the teacher. This documentation includes an up-to-date learning and assessment plan, copies of task sheets and, where relevant, an addendum documenting changes and a Variation — Moderation Materials form. The moderation team strongly encouraged teachers to ensure that, where source material was provided to students as part of an assignment, these are included as part of the task sheets submitted at moderation. Some teachers also included a spreadsheet of student results by task, which was useful. Finally, teachers who assess their students via an oral presentation must ensure that adequate evidence is provided to moderators of how assessment decisions are made. This does not necessarily mean students must be recorded (audio or visual recording), but it certainly does mean teachers need to include evidence such as palm cards, scripts, and a printout of any graphical representations such as PowerPoint slides.

Schools that combined classes to form one assessment group did so with varying degrees of consistency of assessment standards. The moderation panel noted that schools with assessments showing a common interpretation and application of performance standards appeared to have combined classes early in the school year and had programs with some common assessments. It was often quite difficult to confirm teachers' marking standards when combined classes did not use similar tasks or showed no evidence of collaborative marking.

It was pleasing to see the number of teachers who used or adapted available support materials. Those who did so were able to design effective assessment tasks and develop accurate marking standards, which benefited their students at the confirming or moderation phase of assessment. The Tourism minisite on the SACE website contains numerous support materials, including learning and assessment plans, subject advice, and strategies, as well as exemplars of various assessment tasks and student responses. Teachers are also encouraged to attend clarifying forums, where subject experts provide advice and information for teachers. Another way that teachers can develop in their expertise is to participate in assessment panels. Teachers are encouraged to express interest to be examination markers or to be on the end-of-year moderation panel.

Chief Assessor
Tourism