



Course Report 2015

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 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: Assignment

The choice of briefs this year offered challenge and gave scope for candidates to develop a wide range of ideas, and demonstrate skills and techniques effectively.

A slightly higher number chose the themed savoury food product for the children's party range over the product for a supermarket range to reduce anaemia. However, both produced assignments of a wide range of quality and marks.

Once again, many candidates performed significantly better in the assignment than in the question paper.

Component 2: Question paper

In the question paper there was a good balance of questions covering a wide spread of course content. The level of demand was on par with last year, and was as expected from this level of course.

Markers commented that most candidates had made a good attempt at all questions and there were very few 'no responses' this year.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Assignment

Candidates who followed the candidate guidance and worked through it systematically performed well in this component.

On the whole, performance was improved in all sections of the assignment, though many candidates failed to gain marks by not providing a valid source for their research, and by not reflecting back to either the brief or their research in their evaluations.

Once again, 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 was improved this session, which showed that many candidates had been better prepared for the examination and had been given guidance on how to answer questions. Most candidates could demonstrate and apply subject knowledge — markers specifically commended nutritional knowledge — and there were some excellent responses.

Markers also commented that it was less evident that candidates had been presented at the wrong level. There were still some who struggled and may have found this level too challenging.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Assignment

Section

- 1 (a) Most candidates could identify and explain the key issues of the brief and achieved 4 marks.
- 2 (a) Most candidates who chose to give information on labelling, advertising or packaging provided relevant information and gave detailed explanations that were related back to the key issues in the brief. Some, however, failed to gain the second 3 marks through lack of a relevant link.
- 3 (a) Most candidates identified a test, and carried out and recorded the sensory testing of their product. Most results were clear and easy to interpret. Some refining of conclusions is needed, however.

Component 2: Question paper

Question

- 1 (a) (i) Almost all candidates made the correct choice.
and (ii) Most candidates knew how to link their reasons for choice back to the case study.
- 1 (b) Most candidates demonstrated good nutritional knowledge.
- 2 (b) Most candidates could link the correct reasons for drinking enough water to the gymnast.
- 2 (c) Most candidates could explain in detail how both peer pressure and religion can affect teenager's food choice.
- 3 (a) Most candidates could give an advantage of market research.
- 3 (b) Most candidates could explain the importance of both stages of product development.
- 3 (d) Most candidates identified a method of incorporating air into a food product.
- 4 (c) Most candidates showed good knowledge of food product labelling and could

explain why it is important to a consumer.

- 4 (d) Most candidates could name two organisations which help to protect the consumer.
- 5 (b) Most candidates could give two reasons why manufacturers package food; many of these answers were well written and detailed.

Section 4: Areas in which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Assignment

Section

- 1 (b) Research Some candidates did not give a valid source for the research, and therefore did not achieve marks for at least one of the investigations.
- 1 (c) Product idea Some candidates did not relate their reasons for choice of product back to the key issues of the brief, or to their research. Most candidates did not give substantial changes to their recipe.
- 2 (a) the product Candidates who chose the nutritional analysis often did not give conclusions to their findings, or did not relate them to the key issues of the brief.
- 4 (a) evaluation Many candidates did not follow the instructions for each section and gave statements that were not related to the key issues, research or testing.

Component 2: Question paper

Question

- 1 (c) Some candidates had difficulty interpreting the term 'benefit to health', and did not explain how total complex carbohydrates are beneficial to health, instead giving function and facts about them.
- 2 (a) Some candidates did not indicate how each nutrient specifically met/did not meet the individual needs of a 13 year-old female gymnast, instead choosing to give answers that were vague and could relate to anyone — 'she' is not enough detail for this level.
- 3 (a) Many candidates had difficulty giving a disadvantage of market research.
- 3 (c) Many candidates showed a clear lack of knowledge of the purpose of strong bread flour.
- 3 (e) Many candidates did not evaluate the suitability of the sandwich and did not

link answers to the supermarket. Instead, they made statements that were not linked to the case study.

- 4 (a) Most candidates could name at least one sensory test correctly. However, they had difficulty giving reasons why the company would carry them out. Many candidates still name 'star profile' as an actual test.
- 4 (b) Many candidates gave a description of 'fair trade' rather than giving reasons why a consumer would choose the products. Many answers were vague.
- 5 (a) Many candidates did not evaluate/relate answers to the case study, thus denying themselves access to marks. Some candidates who did evaluate had difficulty with the term 'bio-degradable'.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Assignment

- ◆ Centres should check that they are using the most up-to-date pro forma and candidate instructions. The pdf version can be downloaded and printed and used for hand written work, the word document can be typed in. Extra pages, diagrams, pictures etc can be added as necessary. This can be found on the SQA's secure site, which is accessible by your SQA Co-ordinator.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. This session, several candidates had pages missing and were therefore unable to access all the marks. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that all work to be marked is included.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that they keep up-to-date with any changes and updates made over the year to ensure they are aware of the current requirements.
- ◆ Sensory testing — candidates should be aware that a star diagram is a method of displaying results and is not the name of the actual test.
- ◆ Centres should try to give candidates more scope for showing personalisation and choice when developing their ideas. This should allow for more originality and give candidates a better chance of accessing marks for making substantial changes to current recipes, or developing their own original recipe.
- ◆ If centres are allowing candidates to use a pro forma or chart for any part of the assignment, they should ensure that they do not deny their candidates marks by providing them with too much information, eg in the sensory testing section, they should not give the name of the test or a key on the pro forma. Candidates should come up with their own.

- ◆ Recipes included should be in realistic proportions and always use metric measurements.

Component 2: Question paper

- ◆ Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the different command words and can use them appropriately in each question — explain, evaluate, describe, identify.
- ◆ Candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully and to identify the number of marks allocated for each one. Some questions have unstructured answers where there are a number of marks available, so it is advisable for candidates to give the number of points for which there are marks.
- ◆ In the DRV question, it may be useful for candidates to underline the key issues about the individual and state one of these issues in the response to each nutrient chosen from the table. It is not good practice to use vague terms such as 'he' or 'she'. It may also be useful for candidates to use bullet points to separate each part of their answer to enable them to be clear.
- ◆ Also in the DRV question, it is essential that candidates are familiar with the way in which marks are allocated to ensure that they access all available marks, as it is different from other types of question.
- ◆ Centres should use the Course Assessment Specification (CAS) to ensure that they cover all areas of course content so that candidates are able to fully access the paper. This year, functional properties of foods and contemporary food issues were areas in which candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge.
- ◆ Centres should ensure that their candidates are taught evaluation techniques, as there are a large number of marks available for this type of response. Candidates should always reflect back to the actual question and use the scenario to formulate their answers. A common approach to this is to use the formula FOC — fact, opinion, consequence — as this allows the candidates to use the fact given in the question. However, it is not mandatory to use this approach.

Statistical information: update on Courses

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

Number of resulted entries in 2015	1963
------------------------------------	------

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	21.9%	21.9%	429	70
B	30.2%	52.1%	593	60
C	25.0%	77.1%	491	50
D	8.4%	85.5%	165	45
No award	14.5%	-	285	-

The adjustment made last year across all grade boundaries was reversed as the issue arising last year was addressed.