



## Course Report 2015

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	Higher (new)

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment and marking instructions for the examination.

## **Section 1: Comments on the Assessment**

### **Component 1: Question Paper**

The Higher Health and Food Technology question paper provided a wide variety of candidate responses, assessing candidate's ability to integrate and apply knowledge, understanding and skills from across the three Health and Food Technology Units.

Marker reports and feedback from centres indicated that the level of the demand of the paper and the coverage of the course was good with candidates able to access marks in all questions. However, there was feedback that question 2 (c) about consumer laws was not clearly specified in the Course Assessment Specification and as a result many candidates did not attempt this question. This was taken into consideration at grade boundary setting.

A small number of candidates chose not to answer question 3 or 4, confusing this question paper with the concurrent Higher Health and Food Technology course.

### **Component 2: Assignment**

The Higher Health and Food Technology Assignment was generally well received by centres. The two briefs provided gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their application of knowledge, understanding and skills from across the three Health and Food Technology Units.

A larger proportion of candidates chose the 'fast food outlet' brief over the 'ethical ingredients' brief. However, markers commented that candidate performance was similar in each, with a wide range of marks generated.

It was encouraging to see the variety of ways candidates presented their Assignments. While many centres/authorities produced pro formas for their candidates to complete the Assignment, there were many candidates who presented their work uniquely.

## **Section 2: Comments on candidate performance**

### **Component 1: Question Paper**

The majority of candidates performed well in the question paper.

Candidates demonstrated good application of their knowledge and understanding in most areas. The skill of analysis was assessed for the first time at this level, and candidates performed well in this question. New additions to the mandatory skills, knowledge and understanding from the concurrent Higher tended not to achieve as many marks, along with questions which needed candidates to integrate the knowledge across the three Health and Food Technology Units.

The question paper contained questions that allowed candidates to be awarded marks in a variety of ways. A significant number of candidates did not read the question properly or note

the number of marks available, so were unable to access all of the marks. Some of these candidates also did not give the detail required in answers at Higher level, indicating that they may have been presented at the wrong level and may have been better suited to National 5.

## **Component 2: Assignment**

The average mark in the Assignment was higher than the question paper.

Centres who gave candidates more scope for individual work, rather than a more teacher-led/directed approach, scored significantly more marks as candidates were able to come up with unique food products.

Candidates demonstrated the ability to carry out investigations and testing. However, there was variation in the depth and detail of responses provided by candidates. Many lacked sources to make them valid and often did not provide enough information to take the product forward.

A significant number of candidates failed to achieve marks in Section 2 (the product) as they had not followed the guidance and linked each feature/ingredient identified to the results of testing and the brief.

## **Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well**

### **Component 1: Question paper**

- 1 (a) The majority of candidates demonstrated understanding of the Environmental Health Department. However, not all answers linked to how they could support a care home.
- 1 (b) Candidates had excellent knowledge of current dietary advice with the majority using the Revised Dietary Goals for Scotland. To access the marks, candidates needed to give an example of a way the chef could help residents meet the advice, as stating the advice was not enough, eg the chef could serve carrot sticks as a snack.
- 1 (c) All candidates attempted this new analysis question, having been given confidence after completing a similar style of question in the Food for Health Unit assessment. Candidates demonstrated knowledge of the nutrients and could identify a potential consequence for health. Many candidates achieved full marks for this question.
- 1 (d) All candidates attempted this question and the majority demonstrated the ability to evaluate. As the key is now provided, candidates must ensure that they show understanding of what the rating indicates and not just repeat what was provided in the question.
- 2 (a) (i) Most candidates demonstrated knowledge of concept screening and product testing, and could explain how a food manufacturer could improve these stages.

- & (ii) However, there were some candidates who just stated what each stage was and hadn't read the wording of the question correctly.
- 3 (b) The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated good knowledge of how each factor could impact food choice in their evaluations.
- 4 (a) Candidates who attempted this question showed good knowledge of UHT and could make appropriate evaluative links to the nursery. However, a large number of candidates chose not to answer this question.
- 4 (b) (i) Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the inter-relationship between calcium, phosphorous and vitamin D.
- 4 (c) (i) Candidates could evaluate the link between breakfast cereals and osteoporosis.

## Component 2: Assignment

### Section

#### 1 planning (a)

##### **(i) Key issues which reflect all aspects of the brief**

The majority of candidates gained full marks for this section. However, a large number of candidates identified key points as per the concurrent Higher. Candidates still accessed these marks as often the key issue could be identified within the explanation.

##### **(ii) Justification of why the key issue is being taken forward**

The majority of candidates were able to justify the key issues they had selected. However, some candidates did not give any new information but instead gave a repeat of the key issue.

#### 1 planning (b)

All candidates completed three investigations. However, there was variation in the quality, with some candidates who completed three excellent investigations and accessing full marks while others lacked the depth and detail required at Higher level.

The majority of candidates identified the link/progression between each investigation.

#### 3 product testing

All candidates completed a sensory test and one other using their product.

#### 4 (ii) improving/ adapting product

The majority of candidates identified a range of improvements, adaptations and variations to their product. This allowed them to explain links made to either investigations or tests.

## Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

### Component 1: Question Paper

#### Question

- 1 (c) Candidates did not always reach a conclusion about the contribution made by the lunch choice to the food intake, as candidates did not specify where the nutrient was coming from linked to the lunch. In particular, when candidates were linking energy to the lunch, the answers did not show knowledge that the energy in the pasta would come from carbohydrate. Very often short statements were provided.
- 2 (a) (iii) Many candidates made the mistake of confusing First Production Run with Launch. Candidates who had the knowledge of first production run were not able to make the link with the improvement.
- 2 (b) The response to this question was mixed, with some candidates giving excellent answers. Candidates often did not provide enough depth to their explanations to show understanding of why each step ensured food safety. Most candidates attempted all four parts of this question, with more candidates not attempting part (iv), stock rotation, than the other step.
- 2 (c) Many candidates were not able to make the link with consumer laws and purchasing food products, and chose not to answer this question. Little knowledge of consumer laws was demonstrated by candidates. However, a small number of candidates gave excellent responses and were awarded full marks.
- 3 (a) Candidates often gave answers about nutrition that were incorrect, eg butter changed to margarine is lower in fat — this is not the case as both contain similar amounts of total fat.
- 3 (b) This question carried 6 marks, but many candidates did not provide enough points of information to obtain maximum marks. This was often as a result of candidates only providing one evaluation for each factor.
- 4 (b) (ii) The majority of candidates provided incorrect responses and did not recognise the role of folic acid when iron is absent in the diet.
- Again, candidates often did not provide enough points to get the 4 marks available as they provided just one explanation for each inter-relationship.
- 4 (c) (ii) Candidates demonstrated little knowledge of Type 2 diabetes and as a result were unable to evaluate the impact breakfast cereals have on this dietary disease.
- Again, candidates often did not provide enough points to get the 3 marks available as they provided just one evaluation for each dietary disease, therefore were unable to access all marks available.

## Component 2: Assignment

### Section

#### 1 planning (b)

Candidates often did not correctly source their investigations; they need to provide valid web addresses, named person being interviewed, specified target group. This information allows the investigation to be replicated and therefore makes it valid.

Candidates often made reference to popularity of ingredients/products when carrying out internet research into availability. This only shows how common ingredients/products are, so candidates were not awarded the mark.

While candidates summarised the information being investigated, there was often no link to develop the product.

#### 2 the product

Candidates did not always select a product that came clearly from their investigations and as a result they found it more difficult to justify the choice of recipe.

While candidates correctly identified ingredients and features of their product, they did not make links to their investigation and the brief, which were both needed to be awarded the mark. Candidates often gave justifications with new information or knowledge and while not incorrect, it was not what they were asked for in this section.

#### 3 product testing

##### Sensory Test

Some candidates did not identify who the target group was that tasted the product. Candidates did not always provide a key for their sensory test. Some candidates changed the wording used in their key when they selected the two key pieces of information derived from the results of sensory testing, which resulted in the information being inaccurate.

##### Different Test

Most candidates who completed nutritional analysis and costing did not provide information for each ingredient used, and instead provided a summary.

#### 4 (i) evaluation

While all candidates completed the evaluation and the majority gave four evaluations, marks were often not awarded. Candidates had to link to both the brief and the results of testing while being evaluative. Candidates tended to be awarded the marks when they used the four points from the summary of the results of testing, and linked to whether their product was suitable for the brief.

## Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

### Component 1: Question Paper

- ◆ There are no optional questions — candidates should attempt all questions in the exam.
- ◆ Candidates should look at mark allocation and ensure they have given enough description/explanations/ evaluations/analysis for the marks allocated. Marking instructions for this paper and the exemplar paper will clarify how marks are allocated to each question. Marks can be awarded in a variety of ways to allow candidates flexibility in their answers.
- ◆ Practise analysis questions, similar to Question 1 (c) and Food for Health Unit assessment, by adding an example of a lunch/part of daily intake to past papers from concurrent Higher. This will ensure candidates make clear links between the examples of food and the nutrients.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that they refer to the mandatory skills, knowledge and understanding in the Course Assessment Specification. While consumer laws are not specifically mentioned, they should be covered:
  - ◆ Learners must be able to demonstrate knowledge of food contamination sources and conditions for bacterial growth, and apply this knowledge to food production.
  - ◆ Learners must be able to explain how a range of contemporary food issues affect consumer choice of foods, including environmental and ethical issues, the media, food packaging and labelling.
  - ◆ Learners must be able to source information and advice about food issues, and explain how organisations protect the consumer.
- ◆ Practical work is an excellent vehicle for candidates to make the links to food production. Centres should ensure that during practical work carried out in the course there are clear links to what they are doing in the classroom to food production, which will encompass a number of consumer laws.
- ◆ Type 2 Diabetes is a new dietary disease topic at Higher level. Centres should ensure candidates understand the link to diet.
- ◆ Candidates often demonstrated good knowledge but often lost marks as they had not made clear links in their evaluation to the wording of the question. Centres should ensure that to step up from National 5 to Higher, candidates are given the opportunity to use the knowledge gained and apply to a variety of situations, eg Care Home, food manufacturer, nursery, consumer etc.

## Component 2: Assignment

- ◆ Centres should ensure that they are using the briefs published by SQA on the secure site.
- ◆ Many centres/authorities produced pro formas for candidates to complete their Assignment on. This is good practice but, when using a pro forma, centres should ensure candidates have space to add in all information required of them, for example, progression in the investigations, opportunity to add in additional key issues, features etc.
- ◆ When candidates choose to present their work in their own format, they should ensure they provide headings to their work to ensure they cover all areas.
- ◆ All pages of the Assignment should be numbered (this does not have to be typed but could be hand written) especially if the Assignment is printed back-to-back.
- ◆ Assignments should not be stapled but put in the clear face pocket provided by SQA, with the completed fly leaf at the front.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged to complete their Assignment as individually as possible. Where group interviews have to be done for the research, it is essential that each candidate makes their own conclusions and writes up their own work.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that candidates are no longer providing key points, as in the concurrent Higher Technological project, and are providing key issues, which show their understanding of the brief.
- ◆ Centres should refer to the updated Higher Health and Food Technology Course and Unit Support Notes (May 2015). The appendix has been updated and has guidance on how to carry out investigations during Unit assessments. Candidates should have had practice of a variety of investigative techniques prior to and during Unit assessments. When they start on their Assignment, they should know how to carry out, source and present investigations at Higher level.
- ◆ Candidates should avoid finding out in investigations what they have already learned in the three Units. Instead, they should use this knowledge to ask relevant interview questions/compile questionnaires or surveys on food products.
- ◆ Candidates should not plan all three investigations at the start but, to gain the maximum mark allocation, they should finalise each investigation after they have completed the previous one. When carrying out sensory testing, candidates should ensure they identify their source and a valid key, which they then refer to in their key pieces of information.
- ◆ Candidates should ensure evaluations refer clearly to the results of testing and link to the brief.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	0
------------------------------------	---

Number of resulted entries in 2015	943
------------------------------------	-----

## Statistical information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 100				
A	21.1%	21.1%	199	69
B	23.5%	44.6%	222	59
C	27.1%	71.8%	256	49
D	11.5%	83.2%	108	44
No award	16.8%	-	158	0

Question 2(a) iii was intended to be accessible to all candidates; however, due to wording, it proved more difficult than intended. This affected all candidates and, as a result, the grade boundaries were decreased from the intended by 1 at both A and C Grades.

## General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related, as they do not contain identical questions.
- ◆ SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.