



Course Report 2014

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	National 5

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 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: Assignment

The National 5 Health and Food Technology Assignment was generally well received by centres. The two briefs allowed candidates the opportunity to choose the topic best suited to their needs.

A larger proportion of candidates chose the 'Sports Centre Café' themed brief over the 'Farmers Market' theme. However, markers commented that candidate performance was similar in each, with a wide range of marks generated.

In this first year of running, there were three different proforma available for centres. The proforma chosen in some cases influenced the amount of work submitted by candidates for some sections of their assignment. Candidates were not disadvantaged by this.

Candidate performance in the assignment for some was significantly better than in the examination.

Component 2: Question Paper

The examination paper produced a good spread of marks and elicited a wide variety of candidate responses. Marker reports and feedback from centres indicated that the level of demand of the paper and the coverage of the course was good and as expected by most at this level.

It was also noted by markers that 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 National 5 level, indicating that they may have been presented at the wrong level and may have been better suited to National 4.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Assignment

The majority of candidates performed well in the assignment, with the average mark being 30/50.

Almost all candidates completed the whole proforma, adding in extra pages where necessary. However, there was a small minority who had significant gaps and incomplete work. It is essential that the proforma is checked for completion — markers' comments suggested that some candidates had indicated that extra pages were used or that work was on another page, but these had not been included in the submission.

A significant number of candidates failed to achieve marks because they did not indicate the sources of information used or identify who they had interviewed.

Centres who gave candidates more scope for individual work, rather than a more teacher-led/directed approach, scored significantly more marks as candidates were more inventive and had more scope for evaluation.

Component 2: Question paper

The average mark in the examination was lower than the assignment, at 24/50. There was a wide variety of candidate performance, however, with a significant number of candidates who were perhaps presented at the wrong level.

There were a few areas in the examination which candidates left blank, and the grade boundary was set taking this into account.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Assignment

Section 1A - Exploring the brief	Most candidates were able to accurately identify and explain two key issues from the brief as they used the wording in the brief and related their explanation to this.
Section 2	Candidates who chose to provide information about labelling, advertising and packaging generally gave detailed and accurate information and scored full marks in this section. Candidates who used a nutrition program for nutritional analysis and gave detailed explanations of the results, rather than just a copy of them, also scored highly here.
Section 3	The majority of candidates used a ratings test and gave accurate and detailed feedback on the results.

Component 2: Question paper

Q1(a)	Most candidates could identify at least one nutrient and give an accurate function.
Q1(b)	The majority of candidates could state two practical ways to increase consumption of fish.
Q1(c)	The majority of candidates gave at least one accurate explanation of how the stated dish could contribute to healthier eating.
Q3(a)	All candidates made the correct choice of picnic bag and could justify their choice.

Q3(b)	The majority of candidates gave at least one detailed function of dietary fibre. However, a significant number lost a mark by giving two different bowel disorders as separate answers.
Q4(a)	The majority of candidates gave good descriptions of concept generation for one mark. However, many mixed up first production run with prototype production.
Q4(b)	The majority of candidates showed a good knowledge of why the faults occurred in the baking of the scones, but many did not look at the mark allocation therefore did not write enough for full marks.
Q4(c)	The majority of candidates gave at least one accurate rule for following when carrying out sensory testing.
Q4(d)	This question was particularly well done, with many candidates accessing full marks for their knowledge of the benefits to the consumer of the labelling on the package.
Q5(a)	Many candidates took advantage of the amount of information in the stem of the question and made good evaluative comments about the suitability of shopping at a farmers market for an elderly couple.
Q5(b)	This question was well answered by the majority of candidates — in particular on the effect of budget on consumer choice of food.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Assignment

Section 1b - research information	<p>Candidates did not gain marks in this section for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Many candidates did not give sources for information they had found — accurate URL of websites, full name of book/leaflet used are essential as are names and positions of those interviewed. ◆ Some candidates lifted information straight from a book/website without an explanation of its significance to the brief. ◆ Many candidates used sample sizes for questionnaires that were too small to give enough information to move forward. At this level a sample size of at least 10 is required. ◆ It is good practice to include a summary of results found as this shows clearly how information found will help the assignment to move forward. It is not necessary to include all completed questionnaires. <p>Individual rather than collective research is required.</p>
Section 1b - food product	In this section, marks were not accessed because candidates often missed out the description of each idea and/or did not relate the food products to

ideas	the research.
Section 1c - The Product Idea	<p>Markers noted that some candidates chose a completely different product from the ones in the range of ideas. It quite clearly states in the instructions that candidates should choose one from the range they have already given. Reasons for choice should be linked back to the research and brief.</p> <p>The recipe provided by the candidate should include accurate, metric weights of ingredients used, and should be able to be reproduced with good results.</p> <p>In this section, candidates should also describe at least one substantial variation to the ingredients or method. Many candidates took a recipe from a book or website and made little or no change to it. If the candidate has come up with their own recipe then this should also be stated here.</p>
Section 2 - The Product	<p>Many candidates who chose to complete a costing exercise in this section did not gain marks as they did not give either unit costs or sources for the prices. They also did not acknowledge that this was not the true cost of producing the item, failing to mention energy or labour cost and, where applicable, cost of packaging.</p> <p>Some candidates chose to describe the nutritional content of their dish without completing a nutritional analysis using either nutrition tables or a computer program. This should be avoided as it is not accurate and cannot be proven.</p>
Section 3	Ensure that the conclusions stated can be proven from the results of the testing.
Section 4 - Evaluation	<p>Candidates should ensure that they read the instructions given in the proforma carefully. Many candidates failed to evaluate their product against the given criteria, instead writing short statements.</p> <p>In this section, candidates should use evaluative statements including an evaluative word, eg so, therefore, as, because. Although this is not essential at this level, it is recommended that candidates evaluate using the Opinion Fact Conclusion (OFC) method.</p>

Component 2: Question paper

Q2(a)	<p>The responses to this question were very mixed. Some candidates gave excellent responses and accessed full marks.</p> <p>Candidates showed good knowledge of nutrition however, they often did not relate their answer directly to the active three year-old boy and his needs. Many candidates also did not properly evaluate, instead giving short</p>
-------	---

	statements.
Q3(c)	Some candidates found difficulty with this question and gave short statements about the advantages of using aluminium. However, they did not evaluate the use of aluminium for the drinks industry.
Q3(d)	Many candidates did not recognise the label and left this blank or related their answer to the previous part of the question and explained the recycling label.
Q5(c)	Many candidates made the mistake of mixing up the Trading Standards Officer with an Environmental Health Officer.
Q5(d)	Again, many candidates did not accurately read the question and gave a description of the process of Ultra Heat Treatments rather than evaluating the suitability of products for the consumer.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Assignment

- ◆ Centres should ensure that they are using the most up-to-date version of the proforma.
- ◆ Candidates should ensure that they have carefully read the instructions at the top of each page and that they have completed the work accordingly — additional pages may be added in if required.
- ◆ Candidates should ensure that each piece of work they have completed for each section is included/ attached before the work is sent for marking.
- ◆ Key issues should be lifted from the wording in the brief.
- ◆ Research — all sources should be clearly stated, and the name and position of any expert interviewed should be given.
- ◆ If a candidate chooses to carry out a questionnaire, it is preferable if at least 10 respondents are used and a clear summary of results and conclusions is given. It is not necessary to include every completed questionnaire.
- ◆ If a candidate does not have enough room to write all their findings and conclusions, extra sheets may be added in to the assignment.
- ◆ Recipes should be metric, use realistic proportions, show clearly where substantial changes have been made or, indicate that the recipe has been developed by the candidate themselves.

- ◆ If a computer program is used to generate costing or nutritional analysis for section 2, the source of the information should be provided and the findings explained. It is not enough just to attach the print-outs.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged to work 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.
- ◆ When completing section 3, Sensory testing, candidates should give the full results from the testing and not just an average score.
- ◆ In section 4, candidates are required to evaluate the suitability of their product for the brief based on given criteria. It is essential that correct evaluative technique is used and that candidates read the instructions carefully to ensure that they give the correct information.

Component 2: Question Paper

- ◆ Candidates should ensure that they read each question carefully and take into consideration the mark allocation.
- ◆ Centres should try to create a well-balanced prelim that meets the correct paper specification. This will prepare the candidates well for the written examination. This evidence can also be used to generate evidence in the event there are extenuating circumstances affecting candidate performance
- ◆ Candidates should be taught evaluation techniques and should apply them consistently across the paper. In these questions, the context of the question is important, so candidates should link their answer back to the scenario to ensure all available marks are accessed.
- ◆ Centres should carefully examine the marking instructions from this paper and the specimen paper to help clarify how the marks are allocated to each question. For example, the Dietary Reference Value question (2a), marks can be awarded in a variety of ways to allow candidates more flexibility in their answers.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with all aspects of the course in enough detail at this level to ensure that they can access marks from every question in the paper.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	0
------------------------------------	---

Number of resulted entries in 2014	1763
------------------------------------	------

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	14.9%	14.9%	263	69
B	26.7%	41.6%	470	58
C	26.7%	68.2%	470	48
D	9.9%	78.2%	175	43
No award	21.8%	-	385	-