LEVEL 4 / SYLLABUS

Level 4 Certificate in Travel and Tourism Management

Develop supervisory skills to manage travel services, support teams and improve commercial and customer-service performance.

Duration	Units	Assessment format
90 hours TQT	5	90 questions / 180 minutes

Who this programme is for

Experienced travel consultants, team leaders and aspiring supervisors with operational knowledge.

Duration and learning approach

Total Qualification Time (TQT): 80% structured learning through classroom teaching or the online materials; 20% additional self-study, independent practical work and assessment. The final examination is included once within the 20%, not added to the published total.

These are planned learning allocations, not page-reading estimates or a claim of Guided Learning Hours for unsupervised online study. Reading progress alone is not evidence of competence. Keep a learning log with dates, minutes, activity outputs, feedback and revisions. Break long sessions into manageable study periods; breaks are not counted.

Programme information and enrolment

Delivery, evidence and assessment

Independent online route

Work through the core readings, extended teaching sessions, worked examples, visual analyses and structured activities. Reproduce the reasoning before opening guidance. Use the additional independent-work allocation for your evidence portfolio and mock exam. Record actual study time and seek support when a concept remains unclear.

ATP route

The ATP can deliver the same structured sessions in class, blending explanation, demonstration, discussion and supervised practice. Use the same outcomes, cases and evidence criteria. Classroom time replaces the corresponding online session; it is not added again. The additional 20% remains independent work and assessment.

How to use the learning materials

Begin with the unit outcomes. Study the mapped explanations and worked examples, then produce the activity evidence before opening suggested answers. Record the source, calculation or reasoning behind each decision. Revise the output after feedback. A completed reading checklist does not by itself demonstrate that an outcome has been achieved.

Mock and final examinations

Multiple-choice examination: 90 questions, 180 minutes.

Mock examinations are formative practice. Use feedback to revisit the linked units; a mock score does not award a certificate. Final examinations assess the specified knowledge and applied decisions through the configured question format. Practical outputs develop skills that multiple-choice questions alone cannot directly demonstrate. Confirm the available final assessment, supervision, submission and scheduling arrangements in the learner portal or with WTTA/your ATP.

Evidence integrity and support

Use fictional customer details for practice. Identify your sources and distinguish supplied case assumptions from real operating rules. Submit your own work, keep a record of revisions, and request reasonable learning or assessment arrangements through the published learner-support procedures. Current supplier and official requirements take priority over training examples.

WTTA learner policies and support

Unit and duration map

Unit	TQT h	Structured h	Independent + assessment h	Mock questions	Final questions
1. Managing travel operations and service quality	20	16	4	3	20
2. Team supervision, coaching and performance	15	12	3	3	15
3. Travel product development and supplier relationships	20	16	4	3	20
4. Tourism marketing, distribution and customer retention	15	12	3	3	15
5. Budgeting, risk management and operational improvement	20	16	4	3	20

The final-exam allocation is included once within the independent/assessment column. The unit question counts form the assessment blueprint; they do not disclose examination questions.

International application

Activities use varied travel, destination and service contexts. Transfer the method rather than copying a fictional price or local assumption. Check geography, seasonality, traveller requirements, supplier conditions and source dates whenever the itinerary changes.

Resource access

Syllabuses are public. The linked teaching materials and practice environments require access to the corresponding programme. Keep the unit and outcome codes below in your learning log so feedback can be traced to the syllabus.

UNIT 1 / 20 HOURS

Managing travel operations and service quality

Learning outcomes

- U1.1 - Translate demand and service promises into an achievable daily operating plan.

- U1.2 - Interpret service indicators and investigate process failures.

- U1.3 - Implement and review a proportionate service improvement.

Content and scope

Read queues as a flow of unfinished work

Construct the ledger in intervals short enough to reveal the operational decision. Opening unfinished work plus arrivals minus completed cases equals closing unfinished work. Completions cannot exceed the available work. Carry the closing stock into the next interval; otherwise every row misleadingly begins with an empty queue. Distinguish a case waiting for customer approval from one ready for internal action, because different owners and interventions are needed.

Separate task time from customer elapsed time

Use a common event sequence for the sample: request received, internally ready, supplier requested, supplier reply received, checked and sent. Touch time is the time actively spent preparing or checking the case. Waiting time is not automatically waste: a customer may legitimately need time to consider an offer. The management question is which waiting interval is avoidable and who can influence it without reducing choice or verification.

Create handovers that survive a shift change

Define a minimum handover record around the next decision: customer objective, confirmed facts, unresolved question, deadline, last contact and authorised next action. Avoid copying entire conversations when a short accurate summary and a reference to the record suffice. A receiving colleague must be able to identify what would happen if no action occurred. That makes urgency visible without turning every case into a claimed emergency.

Test a routing change without shifting the problem

Define eligible cases before allocating work. If specialists receive only simple requests after a change, their apparent speed cannot be compared with the earlier mixed workload. Keep a record of case complexity, supplier and deadline pressure so the comparison can be interpreted. When random allocation is impractical, matched periods or a staged introduction can still be informative if their limitations are explicit.

Operating evidence, queue control and a reversible improvement

Combine time-stamped demand, unfinished-work counts, service definitions and handover records into one daily control pack. Explain why spare capacity in a later interval cannot automatically repair a missed earlier supplier deadline. Establish a reversible pilot with a workload owner, customer outcome measure, balancing measure and review condition. Defend the proposed routine against an alternative and explain the limits of the evidence.

Unit 1 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 16 hours. Independent tasks: 3.33 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.67 hours.

Read queues as a flow of unfinished work - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U1.1, U1.2

Explain: Read queues as a flow of unfinished work (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between arrivals, active handling and unfinished work. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the time-bucket flow ledger (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, Work Processes, and consider process requirements and cycle time. Draw one case flow and identify a measurement that would reveal the actual bottleneck.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Rebuild the ledger with arrivals of 15, 7 and 5 and the same opening six and hourly capacity ten. Mark the earliest point at which a promise of no unfinished work by hour three becomes doubtful. Propose an action that respects a two-hour supplier deadline. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how uneven arrival and completion rates create a queue even when total daily capacity appears sufficient would behave in a different international destination.

Separate task time from customer elapsed time - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U1.2

Explain: Separate task time from customer elapsed time (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between productive touch time and total elapsed time. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the elapsed-time decomposition (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, Work Processes, paying attention to service design and cycle-time considerations. Annotate where a dependency map adds information that a daily productivity total cannot provide.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Map a case with 15 minutes preparation, two parallel supplier checks lasting 35 and 50 minutes, 10 minutes checking and 25 minutes dispatch wait. Compare a five-minute preparation saving with removing fifteen minutes of dispatch wait. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how waiting and handover delays can dominate customer elapsed time even when touch time is low would behave in a different international destination.

Create handovers that survive a shift change - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U1.1, U1.3

Explain: Create handovers that survive a shift change (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between sending information and accepting responsibility. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the handover acceptance protocol (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, Work Processes, and Results; compare a process-completion measure with an outcome measure. Define one handover process measure and one customer-outcome check.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Design a protocol for fifteen transfers, of which eleven are acknowledged and four are not. Two of the four have a twenty-minute deadline, one awaits a customer until tomorrow and one has no recorded deadline. Specify who owns each item and how uncertainty is resolved. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how explicit acceptance and exception routing prevent ownership gaps between shifts would behave in a different international destination.

Test a routing change without shifting the problem - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U1.2, U1.3

Explain: Test a routing change without shifting the problem (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a local efficiency gain and whole-process improvement. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the routing-pilot decision record (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, process improvement, and Results, product and process results. Identify why an implementation measure cannot alone establish a successful improvement.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Evaluate samples of 100 cases with on-time completions of 78 and 88, correction cases of 4 and 9, and total handling of 1,200 and 1,260 minutes. Recommend retain, revise or stop and justify a follow-up. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a change can reduce one queue while exporting work or risk to another stage would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Create a supervision pack for a fictional two-shift international booking centre. Introduce your own four-hour arrival profile, supplier deadline and staff-skill constraint, then test a routing intervention.

- Reconciled hourly flow ledger and a dependency map.

- Handover form, acceptance rule and absence exception.

- Pilot decision record including baseline, customer outcome, balancing measure and rollback.

Review criteria

- Work totals reconcile and dependencies are represented accurately.

- Ownership remains identifiable during an exception.

- The improvement recommendation considers adverse effects and evidence limits.

Mapped learning resources

Turn demand into a workable operating plan

Build a service dashboard that reveals causes

Improve a process and verify the result

Unit 1 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Supervising a busy shift with a capacity and quality plan

Case laboratory · Supervising a busy shift with a capacity and quality plan

Unit 1 learning map

Read queues as a flow of unfinished work

Separate task time from customer elapsed time

Create handovers that survive a shift change

Test a routing change without shifting the problem

Unit 1 independent evidence brief

ISO: Quality management principles

UNIT 2 / 15 HOURS

Team supervision, coaching and performance

Learning outcomes

- U2.1 - Allocate responsibilities and communicate clear service expectations.

- U2.2 - Diagnose a performance gap and conduct a supportive coaching conversation.

- U2.3 - Create and review a development plan that considers team workload and wellbeing.

Content and scope

Use a competence matrix without reducing people to scores

Break broad roles into observable tasks. “Good at bookings” is too broad to allocate a complex international change. Distinguish explaining a process, completing a fictional example, performing under supervision and acting independently within authority. State the evidence needed at each stage and date it. Capability can decay when a task is infrequent or a system changes, so an old successful observation may need refreshing.

Calibrate feedback using the same work sample

Use a short rubric whose criteria describe evidence. For an itinerary update, criteria might concern accuracy, next action and deadline clarity. Define an example of complete, partly complete and missing evidence. Do not combine all three into an unexplained impression. Separate seriousness from frequency: one omission affecting a critical connection may require a different response from several cosmetic formatting inconsistencies.

Build practice that progresses to independent performance

Start with a fully explained example that exposes the decision points, not just the sequence of clicks. Then remove part of the support: ask the learner to choose the next step or justify a supplier escalation. Use a new case with one changed condition before adding several exceptions together. This makes an error informative because the supervisor can identify which added demand caused difficulty.

Protect learning time and verify that development is feasible

Translate learning commitments into time unavailable for normal work, including preparation and feedback. If both coach and learner attend, the capacity cost includes both people’s time. That does not make coaching undesirable; it makes the investment visible. Choose a period and task mix that preserve essential cover. Promising training during quiet moments without defining what happens when demand increases often leads to repeated cancellation.

Capability, feedback and sustained transfer into work

Integrate a competence matrix, calibrated work-sample judgement, coached practice and a protected review schedule. Allocate operational responsibilities using demonstrated capability rather than confidence or tenure alone. Explain how learning time affects cover and how the team will handle a difficult case before competence is demonstrated. Evaluate transfer using fresh work samples and recognise when a workflow defect needs management action instead of additional coaching.

Unit 2 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 12 hours. Independent tasks: 2.5 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.5 hours.

Use a competence matrix without reducing people to scores - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U2.1, U2.3

Explain: Use a competence matrix without reducing people to scores (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between familiarity, supervised capability and independent authority. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the task-level competence matrix (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read CIPD Performance management, Defining and measuring performance, and Objective setting. Separate a task result, an observable behaviour and an inference about attitude.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Create a matrix for four fictional employees across standard quotation, checking, complex change and reconciliation. Give two tasks only one independent operator and plan development for one absence next month. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how specific evidence of task capability supports better allocation than tenure or self-confidence alone would behave in a different international destination.

Calibrate feedback using the same work sample - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U2.2

Explain: Calibrate feedback using the same work sample (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a work-sample observation and a personal judgement. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the calibrated feedback record (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read What are coaching and mentoring? and developing a coaching culture; focus on the purpose and conditions of feedback. Explain when a demonstration is more useful than an open coaching question.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Write a three-criterion rubric, score two supplied fictional updates of your own, and explain a plausible reviewer disagreement. Specify a new sample needed to test whether the criterion is clearer. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how shared criteria and explicit examples reduce inconsistent interpretation of performance would behave in a different international destination.

Build practice that progresses to independent performance - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U2.2, U2.3

Explain: Build practice that progresses to independent performance (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between repeating a demonstrated answer and transferring a method. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the progressive practice sequence (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read coaching approaches and evaluating coaching; relate support to a defined work purpose. Write one observable transfer check that goes beyond satisfaction with a training session.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Design four practice stages for a revised supplier escalation process. Include a worked example, a partly supported attempt, an unfamiliar exception and a delayed review. Specify stop-and-seek-help criteria. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how variation and feedback expose the limits of a learned routine before unsupported live use would behave in a different international destination.

Protect learning time and verify that development is feasible - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U2.1, U2.3

Explain: Protect learning time and verify that development is feasible (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between scheduled attendance and available productive cover. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the development-and-cover plan (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read Stages of workforce planning and Implementing workforce planning, especially action plans and evaluation. Show one connection between a skills gap, protected practice and an operating-cover decision.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Plan three learners receiving two 40-minute sessions each with one coach. Available spare capacity is 300 staff-minutes this week and 240 next week. Allocate the programme and keep a review interval. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how unfunded learning commitments compete with service capacity and can make development fail would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Develop an evidence-based learning plan for a fictional international service team introducing a revised supplier process.

- Task-level matrix with dated fictional evidence and authority boundaries.
- Calibrated rubric, sample feedback and four-stage practice sequence.
- Capacity-costed development schedule with cover and delayed transfer check.

Review criteria

- Capability is evidenced for specific tasks rather than inferred from identity or tenure.
- Feedback distinguishes a learning gap from a workflow obstacle.
- The plan accounts for coach time, service cover and later independent performance.

Mapped learning resources

Set clear roles and run useful briefings

Diagnose a gap before choosing coaching

Turn development into sustained performance

Unit 2 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · A coaching plan based on observed behaviour

Case laboratory · A coaching plan based on observed behaviour

Unit 2 learning map

Use a competence matrix without reducing people to scores

Calibrate feedback using the same work sample

Build practice that progresses to independent performance

Protect learning time and verify that development is feasible

Unit 2 independent evidence brief

CIPD: Performance management - an introduction

CIPD: Coaching and mentoring

UNIT 3 / 20 HOURS

Travel product development and supplier relationships

Learning outcomes

- U3.1 - Develop a feasible travel-product brief for a defined customer group.

- U3.2 - Compare suppliers using transparent quality and commercial criteria.

- U3.3 - Manage service expectations, supplier reviews and corrective action.

Content and scope

Convert customer needs into acceptance criteria

Begin with the customer's intended experience and constraints, then identify the service conditions required. A relaxed arrival could require a realistic transfer interval, a place to wait and accurate check-in information. Do not prescribe an expensive solution before understanding the need. Several supplier arrangements may satisfy the same condition, allowing competition without weakening the promise.

Compare whole-product cost and minimum viable numbers

Identify which costs change with passenger count and which are committed for the departure. A guide fee may remain constant for eight or twelve travellers; meals may be per person. Mixed terms need explicit treatment, such as a minimum restaurant bill plus additional covers. Keep payment timing separate from cost recognition so a deposit is not counted twice.

Use a supplier scorecard with non-negotiable gates

Apply mandatory gates first: verified capacity, required service features and an acceptable ability to deliver. Then compare eligible suppliers on transparent criteria such as reliability evidence, flexibility, communication and total cost. Explain the scale so a score of four has a meaning other reviewers can recognise. Avoid scoring the same advantage twice under different names.

Manage substitutions and supplier corrective action

Compare the replacement against the acceptance specification, not merely its category or advertised price. A hotel of the same rating may be farther from the activity or lack an agreed feature. Identify the changed condition, affected customers and decision deadline. Confirm approval through the appropriate route before updating the itinerary and supplier instructions.

From a customer promise to a deliverable supplier network

Develop a travel product through a traceable specification, a capacity and timing check, a transparent supplier comparison and a controlled review of changes. Explain the commercial effect of minimum numbers and release conditions without hiding the customer's service needs. Establish what evidence would justify approval, provisional approval or rejection, and how a supplier exception changes the final customer proposition.

Unit 3 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 16 hours. Independent tasks: 3.33 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.67 hours.

Convert customer needs into acceptance criteria - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U3.1

Explain: Convert customer needs into acceptance criteria (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a marketing adjective and a verifiable service condition. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the product acceptance specification (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Work Processes, product and service design, in the NIST commentary. Translate one broad customer expectation into an observable supplier acceptance condition.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Specify five acceptance criteria for a twelve-person arrival programme, including capacity, waiting arrangements and mobility information. Compare a 220 CU twelve-place vehicle with a 260 CU sixteen-place vehicle when two places may be unavailable for equipment. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how observable acceptance criteria prevent different suppliers from interpreting the same promise incompatibly would behave in a different international destination.

Compare whole-product cost and minimum viable numbers - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U3.1, U3.2

Explain: Compare whole-product cost and minimum viable numbers (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between fixed departure cost and variable customer cost. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the departure-size cost model (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Manage your finances, cost-benefit analysis, and distinguish recurring and non-recurring costs. Identify one cost whose classification changes the departure decision.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Recalculate with fixed commitments of 840 CU, variable cost 50 CU and price 140 CU. Compare eight, ten and twelve travellers and state the minimum whole-person count that covers the stated costs. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how fixed supplier commitments raise per-person cost when participation falls would behave in a different international destination.

Use a supplier scorecard with non-negotiable gates - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U3.2

Explain: Use a supplier scorecard with non-negotiable gates (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between an eligibility condition and a weighted preference.

Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the gated supplier comparison (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, Supply networks, and consider how supplier capability supports process requirements. List one supplier gate, one scored preference and the evidence appropriate to each.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Create the two weighted score tables, explain the reversal and identify one piece of supplier evidence that would resolve the most important uncertainty. Add a third supplier that fails a mandatory gate. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how mandatory gates prevent attractive commercial scores from offsetting an essential service failure would behave in a different international destination.

Manage substitutions and supplier corrective action - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U3.3

Explain: Manage substitutions and supplier corrective action (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a replacement available for purchase and an acceptable replacement. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the supplier-change and corrective-action record (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Operations, supply networks and process improvement. Distinguish one action that contains today's failure from one that tests prevention of recurrence.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Evaluate a replacement hotel that saves 20 CU per traveller but adds 45 minutes to the morning journey and removes a promised quiet waiting room. Prepare an acceptance decision and a corrective-action request for the original allocation failure. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a substitution must be checked against the original customer promise before it is treated as equivalent would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Develop a small-group international product using three fictional suppliers and a variable departure size.

- Customer brief and mandatory acceptance specification.

- Cost model for three group sizes and a gated supplier scorecard.

- Substitution decision and supplier corrective-action review.

Review criteria

- The proposal can be delivered at the stated capacity and timing.

- Cost and supplier comparisons use equivalent scope and transparent assumptions.

- Changes protect the customer promise and include a verified review.

Mapped learning resources

Translate a customer need into a product brief

Compare supplier offers on an equivalent basis

Manage supplier promises and review performance

Unit 3 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Supplier selection with equivalent costs and enforceable handovers

Case laboratory · Supplier selection with equivalent costs and enforceable handovers

Unit 3 learning map

Convert customer needs into acceptance criteria

Compare whole-product cost and minimum viable numbers

Use a supplier scorecard with non-negotiable gates

Manage substitutions and supplier corrective action

Unit 3 independent evidence brief

ISO: Quality management principles

UNIT 4 / 15 HOURS

Tourism marketing, distribution and customer retention

Learning outcomes

- U4.1 - Choose a target segment and a clear product proposition.

- U4.2 - Compare distribution channels using customer fit and contribution.

- U4.3 - Plan a measurable campaign and proportionate customer-retention activity.

Content and scope

Find the customer’s unresolved decision

Research the decision customers are trying to make: how much planning is required, which elements are dependable and what happens if plans change. Ask about recent behaviour and concrete alternatives rather than inviting agreement with your proposed product. A respondent saying an idea sounds attractive is weaker evidence than explaining what they chose, paid for and rejected.

Measure the whole booking funnel

Define each stage and the date on which it is observed. Enquiry-to-booking conversion differs from visitor-to-enquiry response. Use the previous stage as denominator when measuring stage conversion and the original eligible population for the whole-funnel rate. State the treatment of cancellations and duplicate contacts so the same person is not accidentally counted as several customers.

Compare channel contribution after service cost

Create a common definition of contribution for the comparison. Deduct the costs that change because the booking is obtained and fulfilled through that channel, including commission, payment fees and identifiable extra service. Do not allocate a fixed office cost arbitrarily to one channel while leaving it out of another. State which shared costs remain outside the model.

Plan retention around relevance and measurable value

Define an eligible cohort using a relevant completed experience and appropriate contact permission. A previous customer’s needs may change, so avoid assuming that the next trip will resemble the last. Useful service follow-up can clarify unresolved issues before a new offer is made. Repeated promotion to dissatisfied customers can damage trust and obscure a service problem that deserves attention first.

A proposition carried consistently from enquiry to repeat purchase

Connect a defined customer need with a supported proposition, a suitable channel, a realistic fulfilment path and a measurable retention activity. Distinguish response, conversion, completion and incremental value. Use cohort evidence and channel contribution to make a proportionate budget decision, then specify how customer feedback and cancellations will change the plan rather than reporting only the most attractive headline metric.

Unit 4 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 12 hours. Independent tasks: 2.5 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.5 hours.

Find the customer's unresolved decision - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U4.1

Explain: Find the customer's unresolved decision (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a broad audience label and a shared purchasing problem. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the decision-led segment brief (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read market research and competitive analysis, focusing on demand, alternatives and direct customer research. Write one research question that could disprove the proposed segment hypothesis.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Draft a segment brief for a three-night city break and write six neutral interview prompts. Include a competing alternative and two pieces of operational proof for the chosen promise. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a proposition is stronger when it resolves a specific customer uncertainty with credible evidence would behave in a different international destination.

Measure the whole booking funnel - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U4.2, U4.3

Explain: Measure the whole booking funnel (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a reservation and a fulfilled customer trip. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the completed-trip funnel (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read Marketing and sales, marketing plan and measuring return on investment. Identify a marketing measure whose interpretation changes when cancelled bookings are excluded.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Compare a second campaign reaching 800 people, producing 120 enquiries, 36 bookings and 18 completed trips. Explain which stages improved and which decision deserves investigation. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how losses after initial conversion can reverse an apparent marketing gain would behave in a different international destination.

Compare channel contribution after service cost - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U4.2

Explain: Compare channel contribution after service cost (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between gross selling price and retained contribution. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the channel contribution comparison (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read Marketing and sales, sales methods, pricing and return on investment. Explain one cost that should be included consistently in a channel comparison.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Compare direct contribution with acquisition/support of 50 CU and intermediary commission of 12% plus 8 CU support, keeping the 400 CU price and 280 CU fulfilment cost. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how commission, acquisition and servicing costs can change a channel ranking would behave in a different international destination.

Plan retention around relevance and measurable value - 180 minutes

Outcomes: U4.3

Explain: Plan retention around relevance and measurable value (41 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between repeat purchase observed after contact and repeat purchase caused by contact. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the retention cohort plan (28 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (28 min): Read Marketing and sales, customer relationships and measuring return on investment. Specify one customer-welfare measure to accompany a repeat-purchase measure.

Apply and defend the decision (55 min): Evaluate cohorts of 150 each with 15 and 9 completed repeats, 60 CU contribution per extra trip and 420 CU contact/offer cost. Include a review of opt-out feedback. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (28 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how relevant support and a credible comparison reveal whether retention spending creates additional value would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Prepare a campaign and retention proposal for a fictional international city-break operator with a constrained budget.

- Evidence-led segment and supported proposition.

- Comparable funnel and channel-contribution tables.

- Retention test with eligible cohort, costs, outcomes and review decision.

Review criteria

- The proposition addresses a specific decision and can be delivered.

- Calculations use matching populations and full stated incremental cost.

- Evaluation distinguishes observed response from additional completed value.

Mapped learning resources

Choose a segment and write a credible proposition

Choose channels by customer fit and net contribution

Measure campaigns and earn repeat business

Unit 4 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Marketing a service promise the operation can fulfil

Case laboratory · Marketing a service promise the operation can fulfil

Unit 4 learning map

Find the customer’s unresolved decision

Measure the whole booking funnel

Compare channel contribution after service cost

Plan retention around relevance and measurable value

Unit 4 independent evidence brief

U.S. Small Business Administration: Marketing and sales

UNIT 5 / 20 HOURS

Budgeting, risk management and operational improvement

Learning outcomes

- U5.1 - Prepare an operating budget and explain variances using relevant assumptions.

- U5.2 - Maintain a risk register with owners, controls and contingencies.

- U5.3 - Justify an operational improvement using costs, benefits and review evidence.

Content and scope

Explain variances at the actual activity level

Identify the cost driver for each line. Per-traveller meals may vary with passengers, whereas an agreed office charge remains fixed within the relevant range. Recalculate the variable budget at actual activity while retaining the appropriate fixed amount. This flexible budget is a comparison tool; it does not retroactively authorise every additional purchase or erase a failure to forecast demand.

Schedule cash around commitments rather than revenue labels

Place receipts and payments in the period when cash is expected to move. Record opening cash, each movement and closing cash, then carry the balance forward. Customer deposits are not a second sale when the final balance arrives. A supplier deposit likewise forms part of the eventual payment unless the case explicitly says otherwise. Double counting either produces a misleading forecast.

Connect each risk to a working control

Write the event, cause and consequence separately. “Supplier risk” is too vague; a missed release deadline may cancel reserved capacity and force expensive replacement. Identify the observable condition that warns of the event. Then specify a preventive control, a detection check and a response if prevention fails. One action may perform more than one function, but its purpose should be clear.

Value an improvement without counting imaginary savings

Define the current process and the change in resource use. If software saves two minutes per booking, calculate the time released at a realistic eligible volume. Exclude cases that cannot use the tool. Then explain what happens to that capacity: reduced overtime, more work completed with the same team, or better checking. Do not count all three unless separate evidence supports each.

A budget, risk and investment decision that can be reviewed

Prepare a flexible operating comparison, identify the important cash dates, link risks to controls and evaluate a small improvement using realistic benefit assumptions. Explain the difference between an activity-driven variance and an efficiency change. Recommend a decision with an owner and review threshold, including the circumstances in which apparently favourable savings would harm service or merely move cost to another period.

Unit 5 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 16 hours. Independent tasks: 3.33 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.67 hours.

Explain variances at the actual activity level - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U5.1

Explain: Explain variances at the actual activity level (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a volume variance and a spending variance. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the flexible-budget variance bridge (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Manage your finances, accounting for revenue and expenses and separating business segments. Explain why a budget comparison needs a stated activity level and cost classification.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Use 80 planned travellers, 25 CU variable cost and 900 CU fixed cost. Actual volume is 100 and actual cost 3,550. Build the three-column bridge and propose two possible reasons for the remaining spending difference. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how volume changes must be separated from rate or efficiency changes would behave in a different international destination.

Schedule cash around commitments rather than revenue labels - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U5.1

Explain: Schedule cash around commitments rather than revenue labels (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between profit contribution and available cash on a date. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the dated cash-commitment schedule (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Manage your finances, cash versus accrual accounting and available cash. Create one example where a profitable sale and the cash receipt occur in different periods.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Recalculate if 600 CU of week-two receipts arrive in week three and opening cash is 1,800. Determine both weekly balances and the maximum shortfall against a 1,000 reserve. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how

the timing of deposits and supplier payments determines whether a viable activity can be financed would behave in a different international destination.

Connect each risk to a working control - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U5.2

Explain: Connect each risk to a working control (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a risk description and evidence that a control works. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the risk-control assurance record (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read the UNDRR guidance sections on understanding the business and identifying risks and critical activities. Trace one control from failure mechanism to practical evidence of operation.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Draft a register entry for a guide absence before a timed departure. Include prevention, detection, response, owner and a sample test, then introduce the condition that the backup guide uses the same disrupted route. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a named control must act on a plausible failure mechanism and be checked in operation would behave in a different international destination.

Value an improvement without counting imaginary savings - 240 minutes

Outcomes: U5.3

Explain: Value an improvement without counting imaginary savings (55 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between minutes released, additional output and cash saved. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the benefit-realisation case (37 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (37 min): Read Manage your finances, cost-benefit analysis and recurring/non-recurring costs. Identify one benefit that should be reported without converting it into a cash saving.

Apply and defend the decision (74 min): Evaluate a tool releasing three minutes on 400 monthly cases, costing 120 CU monthly and 300 CU setup. Only twelve overtime hours at 20 CU can actually be avoided. Calculate monthly net cash benefit and simple setup recovery time. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (37 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how released capacity becomes financial benefit only through an explicit and feasible use would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Prepare a monthly operating decision pack for a fictional travel company considering a workflow investment under uncertain demand.

- Flexible-budget bridge and dated cash forecast.

- Risk register with three tested control designs and a shared-dependency check.

- Improvement case distinguishing capacity, service and cash benefits.

Review criteria

- Volume, spending and timing effects are separated.

- Controls have practical owners, evidence and response conditions.

- Benefits are feasible, non-duplicated and reviewed against actual outcomes.

Mapped learning resources

Build a budget and interpret a variance

Use a risk register to prepare practical responses

Make an improvement proposal worth funding

Unit 5 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Funding an operational improvement with a risk-aware business case

Case laboratory · Funding an operational improvement with a risk-aware business case

Unit 5 learning map

Explain variances at the actual activity level

Schedule cash around commitments rather than revenue labels

Connect each risk to a working control

Value an improvement without counting imaginary savings

Unit 5 independent evidence brief

U.S. Small Business Administration: Break-even point

UNDRR: Strengthening disaster resilience of SMEs through business continuity planning

Learning log and review

Use one entry per learning block. Classroom and online versions of the same structured session are alternatives, not additional hours. Record actual time and discuss substantial differences from the plan with WTTA or your ATP.

Record	What to include
Date and unit	Unit number and outcome code(s)
Learning route	Online material-led session or ATP classroom session
Time	Start/end or actual minutes; exclude breaks
Activity evidence	Calculation, decision note, source review, presentation or practical output
Review	What was correct, what changed after guidance, and unresolved questions
Next action	Specific revision, further practice or request for support

Before final assessment

- Check that every outcome has at least one evidence item in your portfolio.

- Revisit errors from the course-specific mock; explain why alternatives were unsuitable.

- Check your enrolment, examination availability and scheduled arrangements in the learner portal.

- Confirm any agreed accessibility arrangements before the assessment date.