

Tourism

2016 Chief Assessor’s Report

# Tourism

# 2016 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.

## School Assessment

Assessment Type 1: Folio

The majority of folios this year (maximum of 1000 words for a written text, 6 minutes for an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form per task) included two assessment tasks. Where a third task was included in this assessment type, it was often a supervised task with a specified time limit.

**The more successful responses**

* were built around concepts and models
* were reports or essays that included a wide range of appropriate tourism terminology to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and models
* clearly identified and analysed different stakeholders and their perspectives
* used graphics such as tables, diagrams, and images effectively in their work to support ideas rather than present analysis and evaluation
* came from tasks that supported achievement without being highly prescriptive.

**The less successful responses**

* used appendices to present data, analysis, or evaluation. Appendices as part of the assessment conflicts with the SACE Word-count Policy Procedure, which defines the words to be counted for assessment purposes as ‘all words that the assessor reads, from the beginning of the introduction to the end of the conclusion.’ Appendices should not be used in Tourism. If a student wishes to include, for example, a survey template, rather than putting it in an appendix, it might be included within the text as a diagram or figure
* were hindered by task design. That is, some tasks did not enable students to develop work that reflected the specifications of the A-grade band
* were prepared in response to tasks that included specific features that did not relate to the specifications of the task or gave students credit for demonstrating skills or knowledge not present in their work.

**General information**

Task design should reflect the specific features selected for assessment. Teachers should ensure that higher-order analysis and evaluation performance standards such as AE1 — ‘Interpretation and critical analysis of different perspectives on tourism trends, developments, and/or contemporary issues’ and AE4 — ‘Development of informed opinions, conclusions, and recommendations’ are included as part of the task design. Additionally, supervised tasks (usually in the form of a timed sources analysis) should allow sufficient time for students to complete the task, taking into account the amount of reading required. These tasks should also specify which specific features are being assessed, as they are not always explicit.

Assessment Type 2: Practical Activity

The majority of this year’s practical activities (maximum of 1000 words for a written text, 6 minutes for an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form per task) included two assessment tasks. Teachers are reminded that assessment tasks in this Assessment Type must include data collected using primary data collection methods. It was good to see that students participated in a range of data collection activities such as site visits, surveys, interviews, and documentation of observations using photographs and/or data collection tables.

**The more successful responses**

* were reports (or similar) that integrated analysis of their primary data at the forefront of the work using specific and detailed examples to support conclusions
* took full advantage of their local area for case studies that allowed students to build on their knowledge and understanding of tourism in this area
* related primary data to a tourism concept and/or model
* demonstrated breadth of knowledge and understanding of tourism concepts and models across both practical activity tasks
* demonstrated an ability to investigate using a range of different primary data collection methods across both practical activity tasks
* used a range of different types of secondary sources to help explain findings from primary data
* were prepared in response to assessment tasks that required students to make their own decisions about the types of primary data they would access.

**The less successful responses**

* were formulaic and highly reliant on activities provided by the teacher; for example, relying solely on quotes from a presentation
* prepared responses that did not clearly identify any primary data
* assessed the same types of primary source in both tasks; for example, only using interviews in both assessment tasks
* integrated the same concept or model in both assessment tasks.

**General information**

It is recommended that teachers ensure students have an opportunity to engage in a wide range of primary sources across assignments in this assessment type and to require students to make some decisions about which sources they will access. Similar to folio tasks, all analysis must occur within the body of the student’s work, rather than in appendices. Teachers are also reminded that highly formulaic responses (some classes’ responses were almost identical) remove opportunities for students to be creative or innovative. Finally, word count issues presented themselves when students made excessive use of tables or annotations that clearly contained instances of analysis. All analysis must be included in the word count.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

The majority of this year’s investigations (maximum of 1500 words for a written text, 10 minutes for an oral presentation, or the equivalent in multimodal form) were presented in written report format. Students investigated a range of trends, developments, and issues.

**The more successful responses**

* focused on topics that were recent, such as new tourism infrastructure, whether or not a destination can cope with an influx of tourism, changes in types of tourists present at a location, challenges for specific destinations, impact of tourism in highly seasonal destinations, ways that a site caters for visitors from a range of cultural backgrounds or the needs of a specific group of tourists
* integrated primary and secondary data to analyse the selected topic; effective responses cross-referenced primary and secondary data
* used local area examples and case studies that allowed greater access to primary sources of information
* sought a wide range of stakeholders and perspectives to explore the selected topic more fully
* were developed in response to assessment tasks that emphasised higher-order skills of analysis and evaluation
* drew conclusions that reflected stakeholder perspectives and results from primary data
* used concepts and/or models to help explain findings and organise the response
* integrated images, models, and graphics effectively to support the text
* consistently and accurately utilised either Chicago or Harvard referencing systems.

**The less successful responses**

* made little or no use of primary sources
* were based on research questions that were too broad to be answered effectively within the word limit
* were descriptive in nature, thus limiting students’ opportunity to draw conclusions
* did not effectively evaluate sources for validity, bias, and accuracy, or did so rather formulaically
* were based on tourism destinations or events where access to primary sources was challenging; for example, relying on feedback from a single visitor to a destination or surveying a limited number of peers on whether or not an event has changed their decision to visit a tourism site.

**General information**

Students should incorporate both primary and secondary sources into their work to meet the specifications of this assessment type. While it is not necessary to assess all performance standards, it is vital that the selected specific features cover the requirements of the task. Students should demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate primary and secondary sources of information and make recommendations based on their findings.

## External Assessment

Assessment Type 4: Examination

Students undertake one 2-hour written examination on the published themes.

As has been the case in previous years, there was some disparity in marks achieved between Part A: Short Responses (average 66.4%) and Part B: Extended Responses (average 61.2%), with an overall average of 63.8%. This was also comparable to the past few years’ averages.

Students tended to find Questions 1, 3, and 5 easiest to deal with, while they found Questions 6, 7, and 8 challenging. Interestingly, Question 5 scored the highest average in the paper (75%), indicative that students were familiar with tourism models, especially Plog’s model of tourist types.

Fewer students than in previous years ran out of time in the extended response section, perhaps suggesting that students this year managed their time more effectively.

The marking panel highlighted several general features that contributed to the quality of student responses:

* Evidence of superior time management skills. Students who wrote more than the allocated spaces allowed for in Part A: Short Responses, or who wasted time rewriting the questions in Part B: Extended Responses, tended to run out of time towards the end of the examination, thus the quality of their responses deteriorated or answers were not provided. Teachers should give their students opportunities throughout the year to practise writing concise answers in supervised, timed conditions.
* Familiarity with command verbs such as ‘explain’ and ‘describe’, which call for detailed responses that are supported by evidence.
* Interpretation of and response to the required thematic or conceptual focus of particular questions (see discussion of Question 2, part (c), Question 4, part (c), and Questions 5 and 8 below).
* Supporting a discussion with evidence from the sources provided. That is, better responses did as questions directed by referring to specific sources.

Teachers and students should also be aware that the examination is built on the following Assessment Design Criteria, and Part B: Extended Responses has marks allocated explicitly to specific performance standards.

Assessment Design Criteria

*Knowledge and Understanding*

**The more successful responses** demonstrated:

* in-depth knowledge and understanding of a wide range of tourism concepts and models
* perceptive understanding of key concepts such as economic, environmental, and sociocultural impacts of tourism, responsible tourism, the role of various stakeholders (for example, government bodies and tourism businesses), sustainability, and diverse interpretations of tourism industry sectors
* a working knowledge and understanding of tourism models such as the Multiplier Effect, Doxey’s Irridex, Plog’s tourist personality types, and the Butler Sequence, as mentioned in the Tourism subject outline.

*Analysis and Evaluation*

**The more successful responses** demonstrated:

* astute interpretation and analysis of sources and tourism-related issues
* comprehensive interpretation of tables, diagrams, and graphs
* perceptive analysis and evaluation of the validity, accuracy, and bias associated with a range of perspectives on tourism trends and concerns
* a sound ability to explain and justify tourism management strategies.

*Investigation and Application*

**The more successful responses**

* applied their knowledge thoroughly when confronted with unfamiliar yet relevant contexts
* responded perceptively to Question 1, parts (b) and (c), Question 2, part (c), and Question 6, particularly in demonstration of the specific assessment features of IA2 and IA4.

*Communication*

**The more successful responses**

* used tourism terminology accurately and consistently across the examination
* employed concise and coherent writing, providing logically structured responses.

Part A: Short Responses

**Question 1**

1. **The more successful responses** identified the difference between the number of international visitors to Australia and domestic visitors within Australia, or the percentage growth of each. They also identified a difference between tourism expenditure for international and domestic visitors, or the percentage growth of each.

**The less successful responses** did not quote specific numbers, amounts, or percentage changes.

1. **The more successful** **responses** explained how a weaker Australian dollar would make travelling overseas more expensive, and thus increase the likelihood that Australians might travel domestically instead.

**The less successful responses** argued the opposite of the correct answer, or did not understand the intent of the question.

This was the most poorly answered question in the examination.

1. This question and the next required students to demonstrate their understanding of the role of the Australian Government in tourism.

**The more successful responses** stated the Australian Government’s interest in:

* revenue collection, as tourists inject money into the economy
* achieving a favourable balance of trade (international tourists are counted as an export, which makes money for Australia)
* employment figures raised by increased tourism activity
* a multiplier effect, as income is re-spent throughout the economy.
1. The majority of students were able to describe (with some explanation) two strategies that the Australian Government might implement to increase the number of international tourists to Australia.

**The more successful responses** included a discussion of:

* an advertising or marketing campaign to capture specific overseas markets
* creation of major events (e.g. sporting or cultural) to attract international tourists
* reducing taxes on tourism businesses, who could pass on the savings to consumers, stimulating tourism demand
* improving the safety or security of the country
* investing in attractions/infrastructure.

 **The less successful responses** showed a poor understanding of the role of the Australian Government, and discussed reducing prices on airfares, etc.

*The mean (average) mark for Question 1 in its entirety was 6.67 out of 10 (66.7%).*

**Question 2**

1. (i) **The more successful responses** focused on positive environmental impacts, such as:
* intentional site-hardening of some areas, which would lead to the protection of natural areas
* conservation of areas for species/habitat longevity
* education of tourists and locals, leading to the rejuvenation of the River Murray.

**The less successful responses** did not address the environmental focus of the question or they discussed impacts that were negative.

(ii) **The more successful responses** discussed:

* pollution: air, noise, water, etc., affecting the township and/or farms and/or the River Murray
* waste management problems
* unsustainable site-hardening or erosion
* destruction of flora/fauna/habitat when environmental carrying capacity is exceeded.

 **The less successful responses** did not address the environmental focus of the question or they discussed impacts that were positive.

1. The specific focus of this question was on sociocultural benefits to the Tailem Bend host community, thus **the more successful responses** described aspects such as:
* strengthening of community spirit or pride resulting from improved employment and/or infrastructure
* exchange of cultural ideas or values with visitors
* reference to Doxey’s Irridex, which begins with a host community’s experience of excitement that results from increased tourist activity.

**The less successful responses**

* merely stated a sociocultural benefit without adding a description of the benefit
* strayed from the intention of the question by discussing environmental or purely economic benefits, etc.
1. Occasionally an examination question will require students to support their understanding of a tourism concept or model by creating a diagram.

**The more successful responses**

* clearly defined an economic multiplier effect in terms of an injection of new money and subsequent re-spending or re-circulation throughout the local economy
* applied their understanding of an economic multiplier effect to the new context of a race track at Tailem Bend in sectors such as accommodation, food and hospitality, etc., developing local employment and infrastructure
* supported their written explanation with a well-constructed diagram, either in the form of a linear or web relationship between components.

**The less successful responses**

* neglected to define the multiplier effect
* did not explain with specific examples how the multiplier effect might operate in the Tailem Bend community
* constructed an unclear, vague, or irrelevant diagram.

*The mean mark for Question 2 in its entirety was 7.99 out of 13 (61.5%), which was the lowest mean mark for Part A.*

**Question 3**

1. Students were required to link information in the sign (Source D) to information from the responsible tourism website (Source C).

**The more successful responses** identified similarities such as the sign encouraging tourists to be responsible and ‘protect the environment’ by warning them to ‘keep noise and chemical solutions … to a minimum’.

**The less successful responses** did not refer to the sources at all or did not link the sources according to similarity of idea/concept.

1. **The more successful responses** listed aspects such as:
* experience of local language or dialect
* insight into local belief systems/values
* fishing or food collection skills
* history and culture of the community
* sustainable or responsible use of the environment.

**The less successful responses** gave only one answer, or were vague or irrelevant.

1. Reponses to this question were remarkably polarised.

**The more successful responses**

* were impressive and demonstrated a sound ability to apply tourism knowledge to new contexts
* clearly explained how tourism-related employment might benefit Indigenous communities by preserving culture, injecting money into the economy, creating facilities and infrastructure, and so on.

**The less successful responses**

* struggled to explain how employment might benefit the community
* did not follow the directive of the question to ‘explain’, and merely stated a benefit without explanatory details.
1. This question required students to demonstrate their understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of site-hardening at tourism sites.

**The more successful responses**

* understood the difference between an advantage (protection of natural environment by sacrificing a small area; regulating tourist movement through vulnerable areas; increasing the site’s carrying capacity) and a disadvantage (destruction of flora/fauna/habitat; spoiling of aesthetic appeal or authenticity of the site) of site-hardening
* related their general knowledge specifically to Kayangan Lake, although they were not required to do so.

**The less successful responses**

* did not distinguish between advantages and disadvantages, and only discussed one or the other
* showed little understanding of the meaning of site-hardening
* assumed site-hardening was only a negative term.

*The mean mark for Question 3 in its entirety was 10.33 out of 14 (73.8%), the most successfully answered question in Part A.*

**Question 4**

1. This question was a surprising gift for students this far into the examination, and almost every response articulated the difference between a factor that might attract tourists to Kati Thanda – Lake Eyre (e.g. increased birdlife, vibrant and running waterways) or might deter tourists (lack of mobile phone coverage or deficiencies in infrastructure).
2. Students were not required to relate their response to Kati Thanda – Lake Eyre, but markers found that the best responses did so.

**The more successful responses** followed the directive of the question and:

* explained in some detail how periods of heavy rain might affect natural sites
* discussed specific tourism sectors that might be affected, such as transportation, accommodation, food/hospitality, etc.
* mentioned positive and negative impacts.

 **The less successful responses** did not mention specific tourism sectors.

1. As per previous examinations, this question type required students to recommend tourism-related strategies.

**The more successful responses**

* demonstrated an understanding of environmental carrying capacity
* understood the role of government bodies
* related their discussion specifically to Kati Thanda – Lake Eyre
* explained in some detail how environmental carrying capacity might be increased (e.g. intentional site-hardening to protect vulnerable sites, limiting access to vulnerable sites by capping tourist numbers or hours of operation, or providing guides to educate tourists on sustainable practices).

**The less successful responses**

* were unable to demonstrate an adequate understanding of environmental carrying capacity, or how to increase it
* did not explain in any detail or with reference to Kati Thanda – Lake Eyre
* explained how to increase tourist numbers without reference to environmental carrying capacity
* clearly did not understand the role of government bodies.
1. The complexity of this question proved to be an effective discriminator in the examination. Students were required to explain how tourism businesses in Australian outback destinations might achieve a balance between minimising environmental impacts whilst simultaneously maximising economic benefits. Achieving this balance is an integral part of sustainable tourism.

**The more successful responses**

* discussed the role of tourism businesses in achieving this balance
* demonstrated an understanding of ways that businesses could both maximise economic impacts and minimise environmental impacts (e.g. education and training in sustainable tourism practices, niche environmental marketing that minimised economic leakages, collaboration between a range of stakeholders, etc.).

**The less successful responses** only proposed methods of either maximising economic impacts or minimising environmental impacts (rather than achieving a balance between both).

*The mean mark for Question 4 in its entirety was 8.25 out of 13 (63.5%).*

**Part B: Extended Responses**

Given the amount of reading and the higher-order cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation required in Part B, teachers are reminded to give their students plenty of practice in completing extended responses under timed conditions. The Communication assessment design criterion receives special attention in this section of the examination, thus students are encouraged to write well-structured and fluent paragraphs, to refer to specific sources when directed, and to use relevant and accurate tourism terminology.

**Question 5**

This question required students to use the sources to distinguish between ‘allocentric’ and ‘psychocentric’ tourists, and how tourism activities at Queenstown, New Zealand, cater for both tourist types. The overwhelming majority of students had little difficulty distinguishing between the two categories, evident in the fact that this question scored the highest average mark for the entire paper.

**The more successful responses**

* defined allocentric as adventurous and psychocentric as conservative or non-adventurous, as outlined in Source 1
* referred to at least three sources as evidence for their answer
* discussed how Queenstown provides for both allocentric and psychocentric tourists
* provided evidence of language and activities in various sources that related to adventurous pursuits (e.g. ‘adrenalin’ pumping activities such as skiing, snowboarding, jetboating, bungy-jumping and so on) as well as more ‘sedate’ or conservative activities (e.g. hiking, wineries, viewing ‘stunning scenery’, visiting places to ‘relax’, and a trip on a historic paddle steamer)
* demonstrated an understanding of how the written sources, such as the travel agent’s information guide in Source 2, were supported by visual sources, such as the photographs in Sources 4 and 5
* summed up the balance of activities by referring to Source 3’s claim that Queenstown has ‘the perfect combination of adventure and relaxation for all visitors’. The best responses, therefore, referred to the ‘mid-centric’ label on Plog’s model (Source 1), arguing that many tourists are not just one or the other category, but a mixture of both allocentric and psychocentric
* communicated clearly and concisely, accurately using tourism terminology.

**The less successful responses**

* did not refer to specific sources as evidence
* neglected to refer to a range of sources, as directed by the question; many referred only to Source 2, or perhaps only to two sources rather than three or four
* did not define ‘allocentric’ or ‘psychocentric’.

*The mean mark for Question 5 was 4.5 out of 6 (75%), the highest average score for the entire examination.*

**Question 6**

This question targeted students’ ability to assess the limitations of a specific tourism model as presented in Source 1, generally relating to the second Analysis and Evaluation specific feature AE2 — ‘Evaluation of the validity, bias, and accuracy of sources of information.’ Many students struggled to articulate at least two relevant limitations of applying Plog’s model of tourist types to the Queenstown context.

**The more successful responses** discussed the following limitations:

* the currency of the model, in terms of the relevance of a model created in 1974 to our understanding of psychology and tourism in 2016
* the reliability of the labels ‘adventurous’ and ‘conservative’, which might differ between individuals and might change for tourists over time. Specific examples from the Queenstown context were given as evidence. For example, while visiting scenery and wineries might for many be considered ‘psychocentric’, the very act of travelling overseas to a new destination with new people and experiences by definition is ‘allocentric’ or adventurous
* the validity of applying the model to all tourists, given that the experience of one tourist is not generalisable to all tourists. Some students noted the difficulty of applying a Eurocentric framework to non-European belief systems.

**The less successful responses**

* only discussed one limitation
* did not specifically apply Plog’s model to the Queenstown context (the question did not, however, require them to quote from the sources)
* did not effectively use tourism terminology to assess the model.

*The mean mark for Question 6 in its entirety was 3.13 out of 6 (52.2%), which was the lowest average score in the examination.* This indicates that students need more practice throughout the year in evaluating tourism models and concepts.

**Question 7**

Similar to Question 6, this question targeted students’ ability to evaluate specific tourism sources (Source 2 and Source 5) for accuracy, bias, and validity, explicitly connecting to the specific feature AE2 — ‘Evaluation of the validity, bias, and accuracy of sources of information.’ Interestingly, regardless of the level of success students experienced with this question, the overwhelming majority of students used the term ‘bias’ incorrectly. For future reference, a source contains bias, or it is biased. A source is not bias and is definitely not ‘biast’.

**The more successful responses**

* articulated the bias inherent in Source 2 (we would expect a travel agent’s information guide only to include positive aspects of Queenstown) as well as Source 5 (while overall Source 5 was less biased because it discussed a negative and a positive experience, each blog was still biased, either negatively or positively)
* discussed how the sources’ level of bias also affected their degree of accuracy and validity. For example, Source 2 and the positive blog in Source 5 might omit aspects of Queenstown that are negative, thus reducing the sources’ accuracy and validity (credibility/verifiability)
* recognised the validity of a travel agent’s information, given that they are experts or professionals who are paid to give an accurate, thus valid, representation of destinations
* recognised the validity of two contrasting perceptions in Source 5. Given that the two blogs are simply contrasting perspectives of individual tourists, there is no reason to question their accuracy or credibility, especially since both included photographic evidence to support their opinions. However, lack of names and dates could arguably diminish the blogs’ level of validity.

**The less successful responses**

* neglected to define bias, accuracy, or validity, or showed very little understanding of the terms
* used general terms with no reference to Sources 2 or 5, or evaluation was restricted to Source 2 alone
* were usually able to discuss the bias that characterised the sources, but struggled to evaluate the sources’ degree of accuracy or validity in any detail
* found it difficult to communicate clearly and concisely, using appropriate tourism terminology.

*The mean mark for Question 7 in its entirety was 4.74 out of 8 (59.3%).*

**Question 8**

Following the pattern established in previous years, the number of marks allocated to the final question makes it one of the most significant discriminators of student grades in the examination. The highest standard deviation in Part B is evidence of a wide range of marks allocated to student answers.

**The more successful responses**

* followed the guidelines set by the question, which required students to refer to a range of sources as well as to their own knowledge and understanding of the tourism industry, and to justify their strategies with detailed explanations
* used appropriate formal communication, which students reinforced by employing relevant and accurate tourism terminology
* referred to the range of photos (Sources 4 and 5) and descriptions of activities (Sources 2, 3, and 5) to support their recommendations
* argued for a marketing/advertising campaign (e.g. via Destination Queenstown, the official marketing website, as indicated in Source 3) that might showcase Queenstown as having both adventurous and conservative activities for tourists
* recommended collaboration between government bodies and tourism businesses to develop a festival or event that appeals to a wide range of visitor types; for example, a cultural festival on a ski slope (adventurous; Sources 2 and 4) might also highlight the history, food, and wine of the region (relaxing; Sources 2 and 5)
* encouraged wholesalers to develop holiday packages that deliberately combine both adventure and relaxation, including accommodation that is a mixture of mass and niche experiences
* contended that governments and businesses might also collaborate to invest in various aspects of infrastructure (lacking according to Source 5) such as roads and accommodation, to alleviate this exceeding of the town’s carrying capacity
* elaborated on other tourism models — such as the Butler Sequence and models relating to sustainability — to reinforce their argument
* related these strategies to the ‘midcentric’ category in Source 1, arguing that most tourists enjoy both adventurous and conservative tourism activities.

**The less successful responses**

* showed evidence of students running out of time and hurriedly scribbling down unsubstantiated dot points. Students should be given ample practice during the year in this aspect of time management
* discussed a narrow range of strategies (e.g. all relating to advertising/marketing)
* were overly descriptive and lacked reference to specific sources
* did not articulate which stakeholder (either tourism business or government body, or a combination of both) was responsible for their designated strategies
* were clearly rote lists of strategies, and did not explicitly discuss strategies in relation to the Queenstown tourism context.

*The mean mark for Question 8 was only 5.85 out of 10 (58.5%), which was the second-lowest mean for an individual question in the examination.*

## Operational Advice

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. Teachers’ assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. Teacher grades/marks should be evident on all student school assessment work. Some general operational advice:

* modifications made to the Learning and Assessment Plan during the course of the program must be documented in the LAP addendum
* please ensure documentation such as assessment coversheets and rubrics are securely attached to student work
* the number of assessment tasks both overall and within each assessment type must conform to the specifications of the subject outline
* variations to the moderation sample (e.g. work missing or not submitted) must be documented on a Variations — Moderation Materials form
* there should be a clear relationship between teacher grades on assessment tasks and the grade allocated for the assessment type
* word counts and/or time limits specified on tasks sheets must conform to the specifications of the assessment type.

## General Comments

Teachers are encouraged to attend clarifying forums that are provided by the SACE Board and subject experts. This year’s clarifying forums for Tourism focused specifically on the development of good primary data collection methodology, presentation, and interpretation of visual and graphic information, and connecting primary and secondary sources of information.

Another way of developing expertise is for teachers to participate in examination and moderation assessment panels, for which teachers can express interest via the online link on the SACE website.
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