



# **NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports**

|                                 |                                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Verification group name:</b> | <b>Health and Food Technology</b> |
| <b>Levels</b>                   | <b>N3 – Higher</b>                |
| <b>Date published:</b>          | <b>October 2016</b>               |

**This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.**



## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Verification group name:                | Health and Food Technology |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event                      |
| Date published:                         | March 2016                 |

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H200 74/75/76 Contemporary Food Issues  
H1YT 73/74/75/76 Food for Health  
H1YX 74/75/76 Food Product Development

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All centres had used a valid approach to assessment, ie they had used the assessment materials from the relevant Unit assessment support packs (UASPs) from SQA's secure website or derived from these. Much of the evidence submitted used the Unit by Unit approach, although, there was also some evidence of the combined approach.

Centres are reminded that if they wish to use a centre-devised assessment approach, this should be prior-verified by SQA before using with candidates, to ensure that the assessment enables the candidates to fully meet the Assessment Standards.

Where a pro forma is designed to gather evidence from candidates, care must be taken that this does not mislead candidates. It must enable them to fully meet the Assessment Standard but not make them go beyond it.

## Assessment judgements

The majority of centres are assessing their candidates in line with national standards. There are, however, a number of recommendations that relate to the assessment judgements, as outlined below:

### Food for Health Unit

Outcome 1.1 — at Higher level, candidates are required to explain three benefits to health of a balanced and varied diet. This must go beyond a description or list of dietary diseases/conditions. Where candidates have chosen the impact on lifestyle and/or self-esteem, they must make clear in their explanation the role of specific nutrients and/or foods contained in a healthy balanced diet and their contribution to such eg *a balanced diet will not contain too many fat-rich foods such as pies, cakes and burgers which will reduce the risk of developing obesity. If you are at the correct weight for your height, this may help to raise your self-esteem, as you may feel better about yourself.*

Outcome 1.3 – at Higher level, candidates must make a comment about the contribution to diet made by food, eg *the chips may contain some Vitamin C, which is contributing to his low Vitamin C intake.* Many candidates suggested improvements to the meal; this is not required to meet the Assessment Standard.

At N5 level, candidates should explain the main effect on health of each nutrient, as well as providing the function of each nutrient.

Outcome 2.1 — at Higher level, candidates must explain in detail the dietary and health needs of the individual/group, eg *adequate intake of Vitamin C is known to ensure adequate absorption of iron. This will help prevent anaemia, which is common in teenagers.*

Outcome 2.2 — at all levels, it is essential that an Assessor Checklist and/or signed photographic evidence is included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made safely and hygienically, using the identified ingredients and cooking method.

### Food Product Development

Outcome 1.1 — at Higher level, candidates must ensure their answers include an explanation of the impact of the functional property on the food product development process.

### Contemporary Food Issues

Outcome 1.1 — at Higher level, candidates must justify why their chosen contemporary food issue is relevant to the brief/scenario. Care must be taken when selecting contemporary food issues, as a number of incorrect issues were identified by candidates, eg *vegetarians.*

Outcome 1.2 — at Higher level, candidates should carry out an investigation to find out information about their identified contemporary food issue. They should then use this to give two points of information — these must come from their research findings and must not contain new information.

Outcome 1.3 — at Higher level, candidates must use the findings from their investigations to explain two possible ways that the identified contemporary food issue might influence the food choices of consumers in the brief/scenario.

03

### Section 3: General comments

There was a very high standard of candidate evidence submitted, the majority of which had been correctly judged by assessors. Centres are reminded that live candidate evidence should be submitted for verification, not a photocopy. All assessment evidence at that point should be submitted for verification, not just those which are complete or which have met the Assessment Standards. A number of centres provided evidence for one or two complete Units for verification, which ensured that beneficial and supportive feedback could be provided. All centres are encouraged to follow this good practice if selected for verification.

Excellent use had been made by many centres of the Candidate Assessment Record (or similar), to clearly show why assessment judgements have been made. For each candidate, centres should make very clear at what point the assessment judgment has been made, ie with a tick, commentary or stamp. If assessors do not wish to write on a candidate's work, then they should add a brief commentary or sticky note that clearly shows why the candidate has met or not met the Assessment Standard.

Centres are encouraged to make full use of column 4 of the judging evidence tables in the UASPs, together with the exemplified materials on SQA's secure site, to support them when making assessment judgements.

Many centres had adopted a thorough approach to internal verification which went beyond cross-marking, eg notes of meetings to discuss approaches to assessment, minutes of meetings where candidates' work was discussed in detail. Where an assessor feels the candidate has not met an Assessment Standard, this should be internally verified before the re-assessment activity, to ensure the judgement is in line with national standards. Further advice and guidance on IV can be found in the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit which is available on the SQA website at [www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit).

The verification team has identified a number of pieces of candidate evidence for exemplification purposes, which can be accessed and used in centres to provide further guidance and support. These will be made available on the Understanding Standards page of SQA's secure site.



## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Verification group name:                | Health and Food Technology |
| Verification event/visiting information | Event                      |
| Date published:                         | June 2016                  |

#### National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H203 74 National 4 Added value unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All centres applied a valid approach to assessment for all candidates, using the relevant unit assessment support packs from SQA's secure website. Many centres had used a brief based on the National 5 assignment briefs, which is acceptable.

#### Assessment judgements

The vast majority of centres are assessing their candidates correctly in line with the national standards. However, there are a small number of areas that require attention which are outlined below.

#### Assessment standard 1.2

To allow for personalisation and choice, centres should encourage candidates to use a range of investigative techniques. The investigations undertaken must be appropriate: they must enable the candidate to gather information that will help them to progress towards a product solution that meets the needs in the brief, eg a questionnaire to find out the likes and dislikes of teenagers. Candidates should include a valid source for their investigation, eg appropriate web addresses. Candidates must record the results of their investigations, not make a straight

copy of information from the internet or any other material. An amended added value unit assessment support pack was published in September 2015. Candidates do not need to summarise/select information from their research findings. Centres must ensure they are using the most up-to-date unit assessment support pack when assessing their candidates.

It is inappropriate for candidates to have decided on their product solution before embarking on their investigations.

Candidates must include a recipe (with ingredients and method) and a brief justification for their chosen recipe. This justification must be based on the evidence gathered in their investigations and must link to the brief, eg *'I used carrots in the soup. I found out that carrots were liked by teenagers so they will eat this type of soup if sold in the school canteen.'*

### **Assessment standard 1.3**

An assessor comment must be included to confirm that the product has been made safely and hygienically, using the identified ingredients and cooking method. This was not provided by a number of centres.

### **Assessment standard 1.4**

Candidates who carried out a basic sensory test found it easier to provide valid, reflective comments on the suitability of their product. If a sensory test is being used for reflective comments then a key must be included to enable the results to be correctly interpreted. All reflective comments must be based on evidence and should not be based on the candidate's opinion, eg *'My soup scored 5, which equals 'like a lot for taste', so the teenagers will enjoy this',* as opposed to *'I thought my soup was tasty and I think the teenagers will like it.'*

The reflective comments should be linked to the chosen brief.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Most centres had adopted an appropriate approach to internal verification, which went beyond cross-marking. A number of 'not accepted' decisions were given at centres that had provided little or no evidence of internal verification, which may explain why there was a lack of consistency in judging evidence. Centres are required to adopt a rigorous process of internal verification. Further guidance on internal verification can be found in the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit which is available at [www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit).

A significant number of candidates had gone well beyond the standard required for National 4. Centres should not ask candidates to go beyond the requirements of the assessment standards of the level they are providing evidence for.

The Verification Team identified candidate evidence for exemplification purposes, which can be accessed and used in centres to provide further guidance, support and development. These will be made available on the Understanding Standards page of SQA's website.