



External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	Hospitality General Operations
Level	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

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 question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Once again the practical assignment was completed to a good standard. However, the standard of the written assignment was varied. A few candidates made an excellent attempt and answered all the questions thoroughly but many candidates still do not answer all the questions — Question 8 is often missed. Also, some candidates do not read the questions carefully and therefore do not answer what is asked.

A few candidates specified a particular type of sports award and this seemed to help them when planning the menu, identifying requirements of guests, stating nutritional needs, and giving additional information in Question 8.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Question 1 — This question was answered well with key points being identified.

Question 2 — Menu format improved with tea and coffee included. On the whole, menus were better, more creative and more suited to the scenario.

Question 3 (a) — Most candidates are now including recipe references.

Question 6 — Some candidates answered this well, stating realistic timings.

Question 7 (a) and (b) — These questions were answered better than in previous years, but still some candidates are not relating temperature controls and handling of foods to their menus.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Question 2 — Requirements of guests and suitability for function were often ignored and the balance of the menu was not detailed enough. More nutritional information needs to be stated.

Question 3 (b) — Some candidates carelessly missed out ingredients or multiplied quantities wrongly; they should be able to calculate quantities that are used in industry.

Question 3 (c) — The integrated plan of work was a challenge for many candidates and in many cases it was poorly answered/not realistic.

Question 4 — Some candidates did not state how many covers were at each table and their reasons for choice of plan was not made clear.

Question 5 — Although the Question Paper specifies approximately 40 people will attend, some candidates were careless with quantities of equipment and often missed essential equipment, for example teaspoons.

Question 7 (c) — The question asked for personal hygiene practices related to food service staff, but some candidates stated practices for food production staff.

Question 8 — As in previous years, many candidates did not attempt to answer this question.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

General

Continue to support candidates throughout the assignment and give more guidance to candidates to help them with the timed integrated plan of work in Question 3.

Encourage candidates to complete all questions, particularly Question 8, which is often unanswered.

Ensure that candidates are aware of the challenge in undertaking an external assessment. Some candidates' work was very poor and showed little knowledge and understanding of the subject.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	71
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2011	80
------------------------------------	----

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	16.3%	16.3%	13	77
B	51.3%	67.5%	41	64
C	16.3%	83.8%	13	52
D	2.5%	86.3%	2	46
No award	13.8%	100.0%	11	-

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, therefore, SQA 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 Head of Service 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.