



## Course Report 2019

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	National 5

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**

## **Summary of the course assessment**

### **Question paper**

The question paper performed as expected. It gave candidates the opportunity to display a range of skills, and to show and apply their knowledge and understanding of course content.

Feedback from marker reports, teachers, and lecturers indicated that the question paper was fair, with a good balance of accessible questions that the majority of candidates were able to attempt.

### **Assignment**

The most popular brief this session was the 'protein snack for an athlete' however, both briefs gave candidates an opportunity to demonstrate application of knowledge and skills from across the course.

Candidate performance in the assignment was again improved from last session, with evidence of more personalisation and choice and individual working.

## Section 2: comments on candidate performance

### Areas that candidates performed well in

#### Question paper

- 1(b) Most candidates could name and give functions of nutrients found in oily fish.
- 2(a) Most candidates made a very good attempt at this question, correctly linking the nutrients in the dietary analysis to the teenage female ice skater. Many candidates gave developed answers for some of the nutrients. It should be noted that candidates will only be awarded marks for evaluating a maximum of four nutrients.
- 2(b) Most candidates could explain how peer pressure and advertising could influence a teenagers' choice of food.
- 2(c) Most candidates could state a function and food source of vitamin B.
- 3(a) Most candidates gave two valid reasons for carrying out market research.
- 3(b) Most candidates could describe different reasons for the problems with a pastry product.
- 3(d) Most candidates could explain the importance of the labels to the consumer.
- 4(c) Many candidates explained how sweeteners and flavourings benefit the consumer however, a significant number only described the function of each.
- 5(a) Most candidates could identify two steps in the product development process. Many could also explain how each step contributes to the development of the product however, a significant number only described the step.
- 5(b) Most candidates explained ways budget affects consumers' choice of food.
- 5(c) Most candidates evaluated this well and achieved full marks. A small minority did not attempt it.
- 6(a) Most candidates could describe three changes that could be made to the panini to meet current dietary advice however, most did not explain how this change met the advice, and instead merely quoted the dietary goals.

## Assignment

- 1(a)  
Exploring the brief
- Most candidates could identify and explain the importance of three key issues in the brief and achieved full marks for this section.
- 1(b)  
Carrying out research
- Most candidates carried out three pieces of research well however, some candidates did not give a valid source or use the correct number of relevant questions in questionnaires.
- Most candidates selected and summarised the main points of information that could be used to develop a product in a clear and easy to read format however, some are still unclear about summarising the results.
- 3(a)  
Product testing
- The sensory testing section was completed well by most candidates. Most selected a rating test and gave at least two valid reasons why this was done. The majority of candidates provided results that were easy to interpret with a detailed key.
- Most candidates provided at least two valid conclusions from their results — some providing a lot of detail.
- 4(a)(iii)  
Evaluation — improve or adapt the product
- Most candidates gave two well thought out adaptations/ improvements or variations to their product. Most candidates also gave valid reasons why these would be suitable.

## Areas that candidates found demanding

### Question paper

- 1(a) Many candidates stated rather than described practical ways to encourage children to eat oily fish.
- 1(c) Many candidates did not correctly use the command word here and described their answer rather than explaining them fully.
- 1(d) Many candidates described the duties of Environmental Health Officers rather than Trading Standards Officers.
- 3(c) Again, many candidates did not use the command word and described rather than explained factors to be considered when storing pastry products to prevent food poisoning.
- 4(a) Many candidates either described the causes of the diet-related diseases rather than explained how to prevent them, or gave minimal answers showing a lack of depth. However, some candidates gave at least one good explanation of how to prevent anaemia.

- 4(b) Many candidates chose not to attempt this question. Those who did attempt it mainly described what Ultra Heat Treated (UHT) is rather than explain why consumers may choose UHT products.
- 4(d) Again, most candidates either chose not to attempt this question or described two ways the Environmental Health department rather than Food Standards Scotland protects consumers.
- 5(d) Many candidates described what modified atmosphere packaging (MAP) is rather than explaining how MAP products benefit the consumer.
- 6(a) Most candidates did not evaluate the suitability of using Fair Trade products in a school canteen — instead they described how using Fair Trade benefits the people who produce the products, showing knowledge of what Fair Trade is, however not evaluating the suitability.

## Assignment

- 1(b)  
Generating ideas
 

Many candidates did not give detailed descriptions of ideas that could be suitable for the brief. Instead, many gave either a recipe, a list of ingredients or a title.

Some candidates gave three ideas which were very similar to each other and then used the same reasons for each — each idea should be different from the previous one — candidates should not copy and paste answers.

Some candidates did not justify why their ideas were suitable and did not use any information found in their research.
- 2(a)  
Information about the product
 

Some candidates are still using American terminology and/or imperial measurements. Candidates should be careful to ensure that all ingredients to be used are both in the list and also mentioned in the method.

Some candidates did not provide justifications which were different, instead they repeated the justifications for different features and ingredients and this resulted in too much repetition in their work. Each justification should be linked to a different finding from the research and that link stated. It is important to note that although a justification is provided, this justification must be evident within the investigations and research.
- 4(a) (i,iv)  
Evaluation
 

Many candidates struggled to come up with three evaluations/ final conclusions as they either did not refer back to results of investigations or repeated themselves and gave vague responses.

## **Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment**

### **Question paper**

Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the command words used in the question paper and the different responses required from each one.

In particular, candidates should be taught the difference between 'describe' and 'explain', as differing depths of answer are required for each. Past papers and marking instructions are useful tools for conveying this information to candidates.

Evaluation questions should always include a judgement and a link to the detail in the question.

Candidates should link their answers back to the situation/family/person in the question, to ensure that they are applying the facts correctly.

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/she/the man/the woman, it is essential to use the full description, for example, elderly man/woman, pregnant woman, teenage boy, to ensure the information is evaluated correctly.

Centres should use the skills, knowledge and understanding section of the course specification to ensure that they cover all areas of course content, so as to ensure that candidates are able to fully access the paper.

Centres should ensure that candidates are fully aware of all areas of course content. Content from the contemporary food issues area of the course was shown this session to be an area where candidates struggled to give detailed answers.

### **Assignment**

Centres should check that they are using the most up-to-date candidate workbook and candidate instructions.

Centres should not amend the pro forma in any way, and ensure that all candidates type/write in the correct boxes. Centre-devised pro forma are not acceptable.

Centres should ensure that all sheets are presented for marking — numbering the sheets is a good way of checking this. Sheets should not be stapled together before placing in the clear pocket provided by SQA.

Centres should ensure that candidates pick one brief and stick to it all the way through the assignment.

Each investigation should have a different valid source, detailing why they have been used/how they will provide relevant information. Candidates should not use vague terms. Each investigation should be completed separately.

Candidates should ensure that there are enough respondents for a questionnaire and that at least the minimum number of relevant questions have been asked (check appendix 3 of the course specification).

Candidates should ensure that they transfer information correctly from the research to the conclusions and then transfer data correctly between sections.

In the food product ideas section 1(b), candidates need to provide a visualisation, such as what the product will look like, not a list of instructions or ingredients. Products should also not be too similar.

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

Justifications of ingredients/features should each be linked to a different source of information which can easily be found in the investigations. Candidates should not use the same source for each.

For sensory testing candidates should be aware that a star diagram is a method of displaying results — usually of a rating or profile test — and is not the name of the actual test.

Candidates should also ensure that they have the required number of testers and that they state why this group have been used to test the product. They should also show the individual results from these testers rather than average or collated results.

A complete key should be given, not just top and bottom ratings.

In the evaluation section, candidates should ensure that they refer back to their research where appropriate.

## Grade boundary and statistical information:

### Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2018	1474
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2019	1461
------------------------------------	------

### Statistical information: performance of candidates

#### Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of course awards	Percentage	Cumulative %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
<b>Maximum mark</b>				
<b>A</b>	21.1%	21.1%	309	84
<b>B</b>	26.1%	47.2%	381	72
<b>C</b>	27.1%	74.3%	396	60
<b>D</b>	16.1%	90.4%	235	48
<b>No award</b>	9.6%	-	140	-



## 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.