



# NQ Verification 2014–15 Key Messages Round 2

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Health and Food Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2015

### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H203 74 Health and Food Technology Assignment (National 4) Added Value Unit

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

All centres had used a valid approach to assessment for all candidates, ie they had used the assessment materials from the relevant Unit assessment support packs from SQA's secure website, or assessments derived from these.

### Assessment judgements

The majority of centres are assessing their candidates correctly in line with the national standards. However, there are a number of areas that require development. These are outlined below.

#### Assessment Standard 1.1

Most candidates identified the correct two issues from their chosen brief. However, some candidates did not identify the two issues correctly. Assessors should refer to the Added Value Unit assessment support pack and ensure that they assess candidates correctly using this guidance. Pages 3 and 4 outline the two key issues expected for each brief.

### **Assessment Standard 1.2**

Centres should encourage candidates to use a range of investigative techniques.

The investigations undertaken must be appropriate, ie they must enable the candidate to gather information that will help them to progress towards a product solution that meets the brief. For example, this could be a questionnaire to find out the likes and dislikes of secondary school pupils who use the school canteen. In a number of instances, candidates had completed inappropriate investigations that did not help them to move towards a product solution. Those candidates who carried out appropriate research tended to be more successful in achieving the Added Value Unit.

To meet this Assessment Standard, candidates are required to include a valid source for their investigations and record the results of their investigations. This was not completed by a number of candidates.

As well as providing research results, candidates must include a brief summary or selection as a summary of their findings. These summaries should lead candidates to their product solution, eg 'I found out that most teenagers prefer peas, so I will use peas in my dish'.

It is inappropriate for candidates to have decided on their solution before embarking on their investigations.

Finally, to meet this Assessment Standard, candidates must include a recipe, with ingredients and method, and a brief justification for their chosen recipe. This justification must be based on the evidence gathered in their investigations and must link to the brief, eg 'I used peas in the soup. I found out that teenagers liked peas, so they will eat this if sold in the school canteen'.

### **Assessment Standard 1.3**

To meet this Assessment Standard, it is essential that assessor comment is included confirming that the product has been made safely and hygienically using the identified ingredients and cooking method. A number of centres only commented on safety and hygiene.

### **Assessment Standard 1.4**

Candidates who carried out sensory testing found it easier to provide valid, reflective comments on the suitability of their product. If a sensory test is being used for reflective comments then a key must be included to enable the results to be correctly interpreted. All reflective comments must be based on evidence and should not be based on the candidate's opinion, eg 'My soup scored highly for taste so the teenagers in the school canteen will enjoy this' as opposed to 'I thought my soup was tasty and I think teenagers will like it'.

The reflective comments should be linked to the chosen brief.

## Section 3: General comments

The Added Value Unit has been designed to add value at the end of the Course. It was noted that, where candidates had carried out the three Units within the Course, they were found to be better prepared for the Added Value Unit.

It was encouraging to see that good use had been made of the candidate assessment records, showing clearly why the assessment judgements were made. All centres should follow this good practice.

The majority of centres had adopted a thorough approach to internal verification, which went beyond cross-marking. A number of 'Not Accepted' decisions were made for centres that had provided little or no evidence of internal verification, which may explain why there was a lack of consistency in judging evidence. Centres are required to adopt a rigorous process of internal verification that is supportive in identifying development issues with regards to assessment. Further advice and guidance on internal verification can be found in SQA's Internal Verification Toolkit: [www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit).

Some of the evidence provided for verification went beyond the standard required for National 4. Centres should not ask candidates to go beyond the requirements of the Assessment Standards.

The verification team has identified a number of pieces of candidate evidence for exemplification purposes that can be used in centres to provide further guidance, support and development. These will be made available on the Understanding Standards page of SQA's website.