



Course report 2019

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	Higher

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report 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.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any post-results services.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Question paper

The question paper covered a wide range of the course content, with many candidates performing well.

The question paper performed as expected with reports from markers and general feedback from centres highlighting that the paper was accessible to all candidates. The paper allowed candidates the opportunity to access marks through the normal style of questioning and good course coverage.

For some candidates timing appeared to be an issue. For the revised Higher course, an additional 10 marks have been added to the question paper with the time allocation being increased accordingly. Feedback was that, in some cases, candidates had not been given an opportunity to apply knowledge within timed conditions. As a result, candidates found the length of the question paper challenging.

It was evident that some candidates had been presented at the wrong level, given the lack of detail within some candidates' responses.

Assignment

Both briefs were well received by candidates this year. The most popular brief was the 'high protein snack for an athlete'.

Markers observed a wide range of marks and quality of responses from candidates across both briefs.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Question paper

Question 1(b)

Most candidates answered this question well. They demonstrated a good understanding of how food poisoning can be prevented at an after-school club.

Question 1(c)

Many candidates coped well with the Dietary Reference Value (DRV) question. Candidates effectively analysed the diet of the 11-year-old girl, using an appropriate technique to do so. Successful candidates showed a good understanding of the nutritional needs of the 11-year-old girl and the contribution the meal made to her diet.

Question 1(d)

The star profile question was answered well by many candidates. Evaluative responses were provided by these candidates, showing an understanding of each sensory attribute linked to the milkshake.

Question 2(a)

Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of cook-chill products and effectively evaluated them for use by students.

Assignment

Section 1(b): research

Some candidates provided quality research using appropriate techniques that were demonstrated correctly and provided a valid source. Presentation of research was also good with information being presented logically and clearly.

Section 3: product testing

Many candidates coped well with this section of the assignment, with many accessing more than half of the available marks. A sensory test and a further different test were carried out to a good standard, which therefore allowed the candidates to select three key pieces of information.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Question paper

Question 1(a)

In many cases, candidates did not apply their knowledge of obesity to children. Instead, they listed factors which may cause obesity without any link to children. Or candidates provided a statement about obesity and did not correctly answer the question by providing an explanation.

Question 2(b)

Candidates' knowledge of both dietary diseases lacked the depth required to successfully answer this question. In particular, knowledge of Type 2 diabetes was lacking.

In addition, many candidates did not evaluate the impact fruit and vegetables may have on each of the dietary diseases.

Question 2(c)

This question was answered poorly by many candidates. They were not able to demonstrate knowledge of factors which hinder calcium absorption.

Question 3(a)

In this question, candidates were able to explain the four stages of food product development however, they had not read the question carefully as they did not explain how each stage could be improved for the fish product.

Question 3(b)

In many cases candidate's knowledge of oily fish was very limited, resulting in them being unable to access the full range of marks. Candidates were unable to talk in any detail about the nutritional or dietary benefits of eating oily fish.

Question 3(c)

Candidates' knowledge of the role of an Environmental Health Officer in protecting a consumer when purchasing food was very poor. Many candidates were only able to access one mark out of the three.

Question 4(a)

This question was poorly answered by many candidates. Although they had the knowledge to evaluate the impact peer pressure may have on a consumer's choice of food, in many cases they did not have the depth of knowledge to evaluate how nutritional knowledge and available income could impact a consumer's choice of food.

Question 4(b)

Candidates did not have the knowledge of food additives to allow them to explain how these could benefit a consumer. Overall, knowledge was very limited, and many candidates could only provide one explanation.

Question 4(c)

Candidates' knowledge of the Advertising Standards Authority was very poor. The majority of candidates were unable to access the marks for this question.

Question 5(c)

The current dietary advice question was poorly answered by many candidates. Responses were not evaluative, and did not always refer to a piece of current dietary advice. It was also noted that some candidates did not even attempt to answer this question.

Assignment

Section 1(a): identifying a range of key issues from the brief

Many candidates did not fully justify the key issues which they identified. Although they were able to identify the key issues correctly, they were then not able to provide clear justifications of each issue, for example, high protein.

Section 2(a): the product

This section was not completed successfully by many candidates. Candidates did not provide the detail required for ingredients and method. As this is a product development task, candidates should provide ingredients and a method with sufficient detail to allow the product to be made successfully. Many candidates provided ingredients lists which did not give weights, and a method which lacked specific details of how the product would be made.

Section 2(b): justifying an appropriate food product based on information generated from the research and relevant to the brief

This section was not completed well by many candidates. Candidates provided justifications for features and ingredients that repeated a previous justification. Candidates must ensure that, for this section, justifications are not repetitive, and that they use a variety of information generated from their research to justify each feature/ingredient and cooking method.

Many candidates did not produce a product that used a cooking method. For example, some candidates identified a cooking method as 'no bake method'. This is not a method of cooking food. To allow candidates to access all possible marks, an appropriate cooking method must be identified and justified, which links to the research.

Many candidates also provided a feature/ingredient and method of cooking but could not justify these, as they did not link to any of the research. It is essential that a candidate can link each feature/ingredient and cooking method to the research.

Section 4(a): evaluating the food product based on the results of testing

In some cases, candidates found it difficult to access all six available marks for this section, as they either provided comments that were not evaluative or they did not provide enough evaluative comments for each test. For each test, three evaluative responses should be provided from candidates.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper

Candidates should be given an opportunity to practice sitting an examination paper of this length in the correct time allocation.

Centres must use the mandatory skills, knowledge and understanding information within the course specification to prepare candidates for the question paper. This document identifies the content to be covered across the course. It is advisable to use this as a planning tool when developing a Higher course.

From this year's question paper, evidence suggests that knowledge was exceptionally poor in some areas, including consumer organisations, technological developments — food additives, diet-related diseases, and specific details of some nutrients, for example calcium. Candidates must ensure that they revise all aspects of the course content in preparation for the question paper.

Centres should prepare candidates to apply their knowledge to a variety of contexts or scenarios. For example, 'explain four factors which may contribute to childhood obesity'. Many candidates were unable to make the connection to children and instead provided a generalised explanation of obesity.

Candidates should be encouraged to note the number of marks allocated to each question. They should also ensure that they identify the command word used within each question. By doing this, candidates should be able to access all available marks provided they have the depth of knowledge required.

Centres should use marking schemes to illustrate to candidates the different ways in which marks can be accessed. Candidates should be prepared to provide developed responses in the appropriate questions as this will help them to access more marks and also demonstrate depth of knowledge.

In the Dietary Reference Value (DRV) question, candidates should be taught to correctly analyse the diet of the individual mentioned in the question. Candidates should not simply identify a function of a nutrient identified within the table. They must provide a clear impact of the nutrient intake on the individual mentioned in the question and the relevance to his/her age/stage. Candidates should not offer a suggestion of an alternative food item; they must make direct reference to the foods included in the meal. It is important that candidates only analyse three nutrients. Some candidates attempted to provide more than three analyses. In these cases, candidates did not perform well.

Assignment

Assignments must be completed using the pro forma provided by SQA and should not be completed in any other format.

Three photographs must be provided with each candidate's work, to allow them to access all the available marks. This year, many candidates' assignments were sent in with one or more

photographs missing. It is mandatory to include photos therefore it is the responsibility of the candidate and the centre to ensure that these are sent to SQA with the assignment.

Unfortunately, it was noted again this year that many assignments were sent to SQA incomplete or with missing pages. Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. If pages and photos are missing, candidates may be unable to access all of the marks. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure all work is included.

It is not good practice to allow candidates in the same centre to carry out almost identical research. Although candidates may select the same research technique, they should produce different results by conducting the research differently, for example questions within a questionnaire or interview should be different.

Research should not be teacher-led and must be individual to each candidate, allowing them to progress and develop an individual product.

Candidates should use appendix 3 of the course specification to seek clarity over carrying out research.

For Section 2(a): the product, the recipe must be written to include metric measurements. All ingredients must be included in the recipe. Recipe methods should be very clear, allowing the product to be produced with identical results. Portion sizes and cooking methods/times should be included.

For sensory testing, it is unacceptable for candidates to use a centre-devised pro forma. Each candidate produces an individual product therefore, each product should have unique sensory attributes.

Centres should note that a star diagram is not a sensory test; it is simply a method of presenting results and is therefore not recommended.

Testing results should be presented to show individual results and not simply presented as averages.

Assignments should not be stapled together but inserted into the clear-faced flyleaf provided by SQA.

Each assignment must have a completed flyleaf at the front, and it is essential that it is signed by the candidate.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2018	1375
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2019	1191
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of course awards	Percentage	Cumulative %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark				
A	10.7%	10.7%	127	79
B	21.7%	32.4%	259	67
C	27.7%	60.1%	330	55
D	22.5%	82.6%	268	43
No award	17.4%	-	207	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

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.

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary)
- ◆ 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.

Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting every year for each subject at each level to bring together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The principal assessor and SQA qualifications manager meet with the relevant SQA head of service and statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. Members of the SQA management team chair these meetings. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper has been more, or less, challenging than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper is more challenging than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year to year. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for question papers set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the question papers that they set themselves.