

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

Hospitality

Qualification area

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

Hospitality – General Operations Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	210
----------------------------------	-----

Number of entries in 2004	178
----------------------------------	-----

General comments re entry numbers

Numbers are down from 2003 with fewer centres participating. 12 centres participated compared to 17 in 2003. However 3 new centres entered candidates. Of the centres that did not participate this year, 5 were colleges and 2 were schools.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards

A	25.3%
B	22.0%
C	3.3%
D	0.5%
No award	48.9%

Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

25.3% of candidates received A passes this year compared to 30.4% in 2003. B passes were 22.0% compared to 54.1% C passes were 3.3% compared to 11.6% and 48.9% received no award compared to 2.4% in 2003.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	25.3	25.3	45	78
B	22.0	47.3	39	65
C	3.3	50.6	6	53
D	0.5	51.1	1	
No award	48.9	100.0	87	

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 arrangements evolve and change.

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries are consistent with 2003. As the project specification does not change it is expected the boundaries would remain similar.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The responses of candidates this year were better with more candidates achieving higher marks.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Question 1 All candidates choose suitable venues

Question 2 Most menus were acceptable and some were created with imagination using the Halloween theme to rename dishes.

Question 4 Most dining room plans were well thought out and were well presented.

Question 5 Most candidates scored full marks in this question

Question 8 This question gave the candidates a chance to show some initiative and some candidates mentioned decorations and music. However this was not answered as well as last year with some candidates failing to answer it at all.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Question 2 Some candidates failed to include tea and coffee in their menu although it states it in the question. This resulted in losing ½ mark. Requirements of the guests and suitability for function were badly answered with few actual links to their menus. Candidates made statements such as ‘I have included a vegetarian choice for my guests’ but this was specified in the actual question and so no marks could be awarded. The balance of the menu was answered in a similar way with some candidates stating their menu was colourful, full of texture, nutritional etc without saying which individual dishes gave it colour, texture. They did not gain any marks unless individual foods were mentioned. Overall most candidates failed to gain many marks in this question.

Question 3 The question asked for ingredients, method and quantities for 24 but candidates would miss out ingredients or copy the quantities wrongly. The guidance notes state that menu recipes can be photocopied but few candidates actually do this. When multiplying up the quantities to 24 portions candidates were careless, multiplying some ingredients correctly while others incorrectly. Simple plans of work for each dish were rarely attempted.

Question 4 Some candidates failed to state reasons for the design of the dining plan.

Question 6 Some candidates answered this briefly and without much thought.

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.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

It is encouraging to see most candidates making a good effort at this assignment. Many assignments were word-processed and although marks are not allocated for presentation many candidates made an effort to produce well laid out assignments. Some centres presented candidates who achieved very good marks. More guidance could be given in some centres and care taken to ensure candidates read the questions thoroughly and answer all the questions. Some candidates still do not relate the hygiene question to their menu and answer the question on the balance of the menu very generally thus losing marks.