

## Principal Assessor Report 2003

**Assessment Panel:**

Hospitality

**Qualification area:**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
Included in this report**

Intermediate 2: General Operations

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	210
<b>Pre appeal</b>	

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	207
<b>Pre appeal</b>	

### General comments re entry numbers

It is disappointing that uptake numbers are similar to last year and there has been no growth in centres entering candidates.

## Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

Grade	Mark
Lower A	78
B	65
C	53

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). 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 senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- 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 are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry 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
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as syllabuses evolve and change

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries are the same as last year, which is consistent with the fact that the standard of exam is unchanged.

Grade boundaries have traditionally been set higher than standard 'a priori' scores (50%, 60%, 70%). This reflects the degree of difficulty of this course and the positive National Rating in comparison to other courses.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

The overall responses of candidates were average to poor with very few candidates achieving high marks. Some assignments were hard to read because of the poor standard of writing, spelling and grammar. More candidates however are word processing their assignments and producing assignments that are well presented.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Question 1	All candidates choose suitable venues
Question 2	Although some candidates had chosen fairly basic menus others had menus showing imagination and flair
Question 3	A few candidates gave some very good detailed time plans
Question 4	Most dining room plans were well thought out and were well presented.
Question 5	Most candidates scored high marks in this question, giving good equipment lists, although some did not relate quantities to their table plans.
Question 8	This question gave the candidates a chance to show some initiative and most candidates mentioned decorations and music. The answers were sometimes rather brief and could have been expanded.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Question 1	Most candidates did not give enough detailed reasons for the choice of their venue
Question 2	Some candidates failed to write their menu in a suitable layout and most forgot to include tea and coffee. This resulted in losing ½ - 1 mark.  Requirements of the guests and suitability for function were badly answered with few actual links to their menus. Candidates made statements such as 'my menu is suitable for a Valentine's meal' without explaining why it was suitable.  Balance of the menu was answered in a similar way with most candidates stating their menu was colourful, full of texture, etc without saying which individual dishes gave it colour, texture. In many cases the menus were in fact not colourful and did not have different textures. Most candidates failed to gain many marks in this question.

- Question 3 Although the question clearly states recipe references must be stated candidates either forgot to put any in or only mentioned some. Some mentioned an author but failed to give the title of the book. This resulted in them losing 1 mark. The question asked for ingredients, quantities and method but candidates would miss out some ingredients (although they mentioned them in the method) or copy the quantities wrongly. The teacher/candidate guidance notes state that menu recipes can be photocopied but few candidates actually do this. Also if ingredients are linked to other recipes, for examples lasagne requiring a béchamel sauce, then the recipe for béchamel sauce should also be included, but was often missed. When multiplying up the quantities to 24 portions candidates were careless, multiplying some ingredients correctly while others incorrectly. In some cases 4 marks were lost as a result of this.
- Question 4 Although plans seemed logical and well drawn out, reasons for the design were not mentioned by some candidates.
- Question 6 This question was answered very briefly with very little detail put into the answers.
- Question 7 While more candidates this year related the hygiene practices to their menu there are still many candidates who are not doing this and losing valuable marks. There were many variations on temperatures suitable for hot food which is disturbing as the legislation clearly states temperatures. The cleaning requirements part of the question was poorly answered with candidates making comments such as ‘suitable washing up liquid’ and ‘dishes should be correctly cleaned’. These statements show no clear understanding of current hygiene practices. Although question 7b asked for personal hygiene to be related to food service staff, a few candidates gave answers relating it to the kitchen staff.

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

It is apparent that some centres give little or no guidance to their candidates while others lead them in particular directions leaving no room for flair and imagination. For assessment purposes candidates can be given guidance, but the actual work must be that of the candidates concerned.

Some centres had rewritten the question paper for the candidates. This disadvantaged the candidates as it influenced their answers by the way the questions were rewritten. Centre produced proformas are **not** appropriate.

Some assignments were incomplete. Whether the candidates just gave up or simply forgot to answer some questions is not known but more guidance might benefit these candidates.

While assignments do not need to be word-processed the ones that were seemed to have a better layout. Some handwritten assignments had no obvious layout and were very badly presented. While no marks are given for presentation it is encouraging that some candidates are keen to complete a well-presented assignment.