



Course Report 2016

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 assessment. 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 documents and marking instructions.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Summary of the Course assessment

Component 1: Assignment

This year's briefs offered a diverse choice of topics and gave candidates scope for applying their knowledge, understanding and skills from across the three units of course content.

A slightly higher number of candidates chose to carry out the 'meals to be delivered to the elderly' option over the 'organic food product for sale at a music festival' option, but both, once again, produced assignments of varying quality and depth.

This year, many candidates performed significantly better in the assignment than in the question paper.

Component 2: Question paper

The question paper was accessible for all candidates and covered a good spread of course content from across all three units. The level of demand in question 5 was deemed to be marginally lower than in previous papers, which was taken into account when setting the grade boundaries.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Assignment

- 1(a) The majority of candidates could identify and explain the key issues of the brief, and achieved 4 marks.
- 2(a) Candidates who chose to give information on labelling and advertising mostly gave relevant points of information with detailed explanations relating to the key issues in the brief.
- 3(a) Most candidates identified and carried out a relevant sensory test. The results were mostly clearly displayed and easy to interpret with a detailed key. Conclusions were also well thought out.

Some candidates were unable to gain access to the full range of marks available as they had not identified three reasons why their chosen method of testing would provide relevant information. This was a change from previous years, and was clearly stated on the proforma.

- 4(a) Many candidates gave in-depth, evaluative conclusions of how their food product met the key issues in the brief.

Component 2: Question paper

The average mark was much improved this session; many candidates seemed better prepared for the examination. However, there were still those who struggled to give detail in their answers and did not correctly apply the command word in the question.

- 1(a)(i) Most candidates could explain the functions of sodium and vitamin D.
- 1(a)(ii) Food sources were correct for sodium; however, vitamin D was not well done.
- 1 (b) The majority of candidates were able to correctly identify a dietary disease caused by a diet high in sodium.
- 1(c) Candidates used a variety of sources of dietary advice to answer this question and identified the relevant piece successfully. The majority of candidates successfully described adaptations to the meal in relation to the dietary advice they had chosen.
- 2(c) Most candidates were able to explain why additives would be used in a food product. The most popular answers given were for flavourings and colourings.
- 3(a) Most candidates could correctly identify two stages in food product development.
- 3(b) Most candidates could describe advantages and disadvantages of organic produce to the consumer.
- 4(a) Most candidates could explain at least one reason why market research is carried out.
- 4(b) Most candidates could explain at least one reason why manufacturers carry out sensory testing.
- 4(c)(i) The majority of candidates were able to identify the correct choice of lunch product for a college canteen.
- 4(c) Most candidates correctly explained and linked at least two reasons for their choice.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Assignment

- 1(b) Some candidates did not give a valid source for their research. Candidates need to give valid web addresses and specify target groups. Markers noted that experts were often named, but there was often no detail given as to what made them an expert.

Information found must be suitably summarised; some candidates copied large amounts of text but did not summarise the main points, or explain why it was relevant. Information gained from an interview or questionnaire must be summarised. Also, a list of questions and answers is not detailed enough at this level.

Most candidates did not give descriptions of their three product ideas, so did not gain this mark.
- 1(c) The dish chosen in this section must come from the list of three ideas from the previous section.

Some candidates did not relate their reasons for choice of product back to both the key issues of the brief and to their research. Often candidates gave very minimal and/or vague responses. Candidates need to give more detailed explanations that refer to results of both pieces of research.

Many candidates used recipes from websites which had ingredients named in US terms and measurements. This is not good practice.

Some candidates used the term 'own recipe' in place of a substantial change. In particular, a number of candidates used a well-established recipe and claimed it to be their own, having made a small alteration, eg cottage pie, macaroni cheese, mini carrot cakes. This is not acceptable at this level and did not gain any marks.

- 2(a) Many candidates who chose to provide information about packaging showed weak knowledge and did not apply the points of information to the key issues in the brief. Nutritional analysis and costing often lacked a valid source and were incomplete.

Component 2: Question paper

- 1(d) Many candidates did not give the full name of the organisation and either gave a shortened answer or used incorrect wording, eg Trading Standards or Environmental Health Agency.
- 2(a) This question was, on the whole, completed much more accurately than in previous years. However, many candidates still had difficulty applying their nutritional knowledge to the case study and did not gain all the marks available because there was no relevant link. Answers were often vague and used 'she' rather than referring to a pregnant woman. Many candidates also answered the question as if the ankle was broken rather than strained.
- 2(b) Many candidates did not answer the question properly and gave advantages/disadvantages of online shopping and advertising rather than explaining how each influenced food choice.
- 3(c) Many candidates had difficulty linking and evaluating. They referred instead to a 'consumer' and did not fully explain the consequences.
- 4(d) Many candidates had difficulty explaining methods the college canteen could use to promote food products on their menu instead only giving brief descriptions of methods of sales promotion.
- 5(a) Most candidates could identify ways of reducing fat in the diet, however, they did not explain how this was done. Some also had difficulty with the term 'saturated fat', using examples of foods which did not contain saturated fat.
- 5(c) Candidates knowledge of modified atmosphere packaging was weak, with many giving inaccurate information or leaving no response. Very few candidates were awarded both marks for this question.

Section 3: Advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Assignment

Centres should check that they are using the most up-to-date proforma and candidate instructions. Out-of-date versions do not have the most recent amendments and could result in candidates not being able to access all the available marks. The pdf version can be downloaded and printed and used for hand written work, and the word document can be typed on. Extra pages, diagrams, pictures, etc, may be added as necessary. This can be found on the SQA's secure site, which is accessible through your SQA co-ordinator.

Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that all work to be marked is included. It is helpful to number pages, as it will help to ensure that they are all there prior to sending, and allows the marker to know in what order to read them. They should not be stapled.

Centres should try to give candidates more scope for showing personalisation and choice when developing their ideas, rather than taking a more directed approach. 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. The General Assessment Information document for National 5 Health and Food Technology gives guidance on assessment conditions and what reasonable assistance can be given to candidates.

Candidates should not choose their product before they embark on research.

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 the candidates the opportunity to gain 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.

When candidates are using the internet to search for a recipe, it is recommended that they are directed to use UK-based websites, as they are more relevant. Recipes included should be in realistic proportions, and always use metric measurements and British ingredient terminology.

Centres should ensure that, if a candidate indicates that changes to the product are highlighted in a specific colour, they are not disadvantaged by printing in black and white. A highlighter could be used after printing to ensure the candidate is able to access the marks.

Nutritional analysis must have a source for the information found to ensure that it is valid. Candidates must ensure that they carry out a full analysis using a program or tables to ensure that it is accurate. It is not acceptable to just give a list of nutrients contained in the product.

When making conclusions or evaluating the results of the sensory testing, candidates should ensure that they use the same terminology as they did in the key. It is also good practice, although not mandatory, to seek comments from testers, as these can then give the candidate more scope for their evaluations/changes to the product in section 4.

Component 2: Question paper

Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the different command words and can use them appropriately in each question. In particular, candidates should understand the difference between 'explain' and 'describe' — many candidates did not achieve marks in the paper as they gave brief descriptions rather than full explanations. There is guidance on the command words in the Marking Instructions in the section 'General Marking Principles for National 5 Health and Food Technology'.

Candidates should be encouraged to read each question carefully and identify how many marks are available. Some questions will require unstructured responses where the candidate should give a number of points relating to the case study. It is good practice for the candidate to give the same number of responses as there are marks.

In questions where one function of a nutrient or one food source is asked for, candidates should be taught to give one answer. Candidates should not provide a list.

Where candidates choose to use Dietary Targets and/or Dietary Goals as answers to current dietary advice questions, they must give the Dietary Target or Dietary Goal in full with correct amounts in order to be awarded the marks. Other sources of dietary advice, eg The Eatwell Plate and 8 Tips for Healthy Eating are also acceptable.

In the Dietary Reference Value (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. Marking instructions for this and previous papers will clarify how marks are awarded for this 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. They should also ensure that they are aware of any updates that may be made throughout the session.

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 on 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 and therefore get the link. It is not mandatory to use this approach.

Grade Boundary and Statistical information:

Statistical information: update on Courses

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

Number of resulted entries in 2016	1904
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark -				
A	30.4%	30.4%	579	71
B	30.5%	30.9%	581	60
C	21.5%	82.5%	410	50
D	7.0%	89.4%	133	45
No award	10.6%	-	201	-

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.