



## External Assessment Report 2012

Subject(s)	Hospitality General Operations
Level(s)	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**

The quality of responses from most candidates was, in general, very similar to, or slightly better than in previous years. However, the majority of candidates do not relate their answers to the case study, and more than a few do not answer some questions.

As in previous years, the majority of candidates presented better answers to the food production element of the paper than to the food service element.

## **Areas in which candidates performed well**

There were no questions in which candidates performed especially well.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

Question 3 (part 1): The majority of candidates found the section on an 'integrated plan of work' demanding. The 'integrated plan of work' is intended to enable the candidate to demonstrate their understanding of the operation of a professional kitchen and their ability to plan effectively for the production of a meal. Many scripts had no reference to timing, and where this was presented, it was often unrealistic.

Question 3 (part 2): More than a few students had made use of recipes, often from web sites, which would not produce acceptable dishes, in most cases due to the inappropriate quantities identified for ingredients.

Questions 4, 5, and 6: This section of the paper is devoted to the food service element of the course (and the hospitality industry) and as in previous years, the majority of students do not access marks either through lack of detail in their answers or by omitting questions entirely.

Question 7: More than a few candidates did not relate the hygiene practices to the menu

Question 8: Most candidates had not answered this question.

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

Candidates should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive and integrated work plan, combining the activities of the kitchen into a single, timed work plan rather than repeating the method of production from the recipe for each dish, which is part of another question.

Candidates should be encouraged to consider the food service element of the course and exam in the same depth as the food production element.

Candidates should be encouraged to ensure that they fully answer the questions presented, and ensure they relate these answers to the case study.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

### Intermediate 2

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

Number of resulted entries in 2012	77
------------------------------------	----

## 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	35.1%	35.1%	27	77
B	29.9%	64.9%	23	64
C	14.3%	79.2%	11	52
D	3.9%	83.1%	3	46
No award	16.9%	100.0%	13	-

## 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.