

# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 1

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

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

#### National Courses/Units verified:

##### National 3, 4, 5 and Higher

Health and Food Technology: Food for Health

Health and Food Technology: Food Product Development

Health and Food Technology: Contemporary Food Issues

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

The majority of 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.

The most commonly used approach to assessment was the Unit by Unit approach; however, there was evidence submitted that used the portfolio approach or combined approach.

If a centre wishes to use a centre-devised assessment approach this should be prior verified by SQA before using with candidates to ensure that the assessment enables the candidates to fully meet the Assessment Standards. Centres are advised that, when devising or adapting assessment approaches, it is not appropriate to make the candidate go beyond the required standard for the level.

For centres delivering at Higher level, some candidates appear to have found it easier to provide evidence to meet the Assessment Standards by completing a simple pro forma, using the Assessment Standards from the Unit assessment support pack as headings.

## Assessment judgements

Overall, it was pleasing to see that the assessment judgements for Health and Food Technology were in line with national standards but there are a small number of recommendations that relate to the assessment judgements.

Centres should ensure that candidates are giving the correct depth of answer, eg in some Outcomes candidates had not explained in detail, as is required at Higher level.

### Specific advice about the command words used

**Describe** — where candidates are asked to describe, they should provide a statement of characteristics or features related to the Assessment Standard; it is more than an outline or a list.

**Explain** — where candidates are asked to explain, they should make a number of points that relate to the cause and effect and/or make the relationships clear in the context of the Assessment Standard.

**Evaluate** — where candidates are asked to evaluate, they should make a number of comments which make a judgement and determine the value of something based on the criteria provided in the Assessment Standard.

**Analyse** — where candidates are asked to analyse, they should make a number of comments related to the context of the Assessment Standard.

## Food for Health Unit

### Outcome 1.1

Higher level requires candidates to explain three benefits to health of a balanced and varied diet. However, a number of candidates had described or listed dietary diseases and conditions, which is not sufficient detail at this level. At National 5, candidates must describe three benefits to health of a balanced and varied diet. Again, a list of dietary diseases and conditions that are prevented by following a balanced and varied diet is insufficient detail to meet this Assessment Standard.

### Outcome 1.2

Higher requires candidates to explain in detail four pieces of current dietary advice and explain the effect on health of each piece of advice. The effect on health was missing in the work of a number of candidates.

### Outcome 1.3

At Higher level, candidates are required to make a comment about the contribution to diet made by food choice, eg 'the seasoned chips may be high in salt which will contribute to his sodium intake'. Candidates are not required to suggest how the meal could be amended. At all other levels candidates should explain/discuss/include the main effect on health of each nutrient, not simply state the function.

#### **Outcome 1.4**

At all levels, candidates are asked to explain/describe the effect on health of the dietary disease/conditions, not simply explain what causes the disease/conditions.

#### **Outcome 2.1**

At Higher level, candidates must explain in detail the dietary and health needs of the individual/group, eg adequate intake of vitamin C is known to ensure adequate absorption of iron. This will help prevent anaemia, which is common in teenagers.

#### **Outcome 2.2**

Higher level candidates must identify at least one appropriate ingredient or cooking method linked to each identified health need from 2.1 above, eg 'I will use blackberries in my fruity crumble bake to ensure there is a good source of vitamin C as this will help to reduce the risk of anaemia.' At all levels it is essential that an assessor checklist and/or signed photographic evidence is included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made safely and hygienically using the identified ingredients and cooking method.

#### **Outcome 2.3**

This is only required to be completed by Higher and N5 candidates. Centres that had used the Opinion, Fact, Consequence technique to evaluate found it easier to achieve this Assessment Standard. For example, at Higher level a suitable response might be:

- ◆ Opinion — Macaroni cheese is suitable for the teenage boy
- ◆ Fact — Cheese is a good source of calcium
- ◆ Consequence — As the teenage boy is still growing, he will need calcium to ensure he develops strong bones and teeth and this will help to prevent him from developing osteoporosis in later life

### **Food Product Development Unit**

#### **Outcome 1.1**

At N5/Higher, candidates are asked to describe/explain the functional property of three ingredients. Candidates must choose suitable ingredients such as flour, sugar and fat that have a recognised functional property and should name a product this would be used in as this helps ensure that the correct functional property is given. (This does not have to be the product that the candidate makes.) At Higher level, candidates must ensure their answer includes an explanation of the impact of the functional property on the food product development process.

#### **Outcome 2.1**

N5/Higher level requires candidates to provide detailed and relevant information gathered from investigations. At Higher level, conclusions from each investigation must be provided and these must show how this leads towards a product solution. This was not apparent in the evidence from a number of candidates.

#### **Outcome 2.4**

Higher level requires candidates to evaluate the product prototype and explain three ways that the prototype meets the specified needs identified in their investigations. Please note that where candidates use a Rating Test, scores do not need to be averaged but must be shown for each tester and a detailed key must be provided. Candidates who had used the Opinion, Fact, Consequence technique to evaluate their product found it easier to meet this Assessment Standard.

### **Contemporary Food Issues Unit**

#### **Outcome 1.1**

At Higher level, several candidates had not justified why their chosen contemporary food issue was relevant to the brief/scenario. This information must be provided in order to meet this Assessment Standard at Higher level.

#### **Outcome 1.3**

At Higher level, care must be taken to ensure that candidates use the findings from their investigations to explain two possible ways that the identified contemporary food issue might influence the food choices of consumers in the brief/scenario. At N5 level, candidates are required to select a suitable technological development such as UHT or MAP; however, some candidates chose incorrect issues.

#### **Outcome 1.5**

At N5 level, several candidates had not explained how information on food labels helps consumers make informed choices.

#### **Outcome 1.4**

The original N5 Unit assessment support pack incorrectly names the consumer organisations but this was amended and communicated to all centres last year. Centres must ensure that they use the most up-to-date Unit assessment support pack (currently version 1.2 issued January 2014).

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

It was encouraging to see a very high standard of candidate evidence which had been correctly judged by assessors in the majority of centres. It was also pleasing to note that there was a good amount of evidence provided for verification as by the beginning of January it would be hoped that at least one full Unit would have been completed in most centres. Whilst it is permissible to submit one Assessment Standard as the minimum for verification, much more useful and supportive feedback can be provided to centres where complete Units (Unit by Unit) or several Outcomes from at least two Units (portfolio and combined approach) are provided for verification.

When preparing materials for verification, all centres are reminded to include an accurately completed Verification Sample Form listing candidates in alphabetical order, grouping together candidates in the same level, where appropriate.

Excellent use had been made by many centres of the Candidate Assessment Record (or similar) to clearly show why the assessment judgements had been made. All centres should follow this good practice if selected for verification.

For each candidate, centres should make very clear at what point the assessment judgment has been made, ie with a tick, commentary or stamp. If teachers do not wish to write on a candidate's work then they should add a commentary or 'post-it note' that clearly shows why the candidate has passed or failed and make a specific note relating to the candidate's work, eg 'Higher Food for Health Outcome 1.1 — the candidate has not achieved this Outcome as there are only two acceptable answers: the benefits to health for saturated fat and TCC are detailed and correct, but the explanation for sugar is insufficient at Higher level'.

It is important to include an accurately completed Flyleaf with verification materials for each candidate clearly showing which assessment approach has been used and the assessor's decision on whether the candidate has passed or failed to meet the Assessment Standard (even for interim evidence).

Centres should ensure that levels entered on the Verification Sample Form, Flyleaf and Candidate Assessment Records match up.

The majority of centres had adopted a thorough approach to internal verification, which went beyond cross-marking. A significant number of centres had provided little or no evidence of internal verification, which may explain why there was a lack of consistency in judging evidence across all levels. Centres are required to adopt a rigorous process of internal verification which is supportive in identifying development issues with regards to assessment. Further advice and guidance on internal verification can be found in the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit which is available at [www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit).

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