



## Course report 2022

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 appeals.

# Grade boundary and statistical information

## Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	1805
------------------------------------	------

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

<b>A</b>	Percentage	24.1	Cumulative percentage	24.1	Number of candidates	435	Minimum mark required	70
<b>B</b>	Percentage	27.9	Cumulative percentage	52.0	Number of candidates	505	Minimum mark required	59
<b>C</b>	Percentage	27.5	Cumulative percentage	79.5	Number of candidates	495	Minimum mark required	48
<b>D</b>	Percentage	12.2	Cumulative percentage	91.7	Number of candidates	220	Minimum mark required	37
<b>No award</b>	Percentage	8.3	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	150	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

## **Section 1: comments on the assessment**

Overall, the course assessments, with amendments, worked as expected and were accessible to all candidates.

### **Question paper**

The question paper performed as expected. Candidates who used the optionality feature mostly opted not to complete either question 3 or question 5.

Candidates had the opportunity to display a range of skills, and to show and apply their knowledge and understanding of course content. Feedback from the marking team, indicated that the question paper was fair, with a good balance of accessible questions that most candidates were able to attempt.

Some candidates mistakenly completed all questions which resulted in responses that lacked the depth of knowledge required at this level.

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

### **Assignment**

Both briefs gave candidates an opportunity to demonstrate application of knowledge and skills from across the course and both performed equally well. The most popular one was 'Develop a savoury dish for the school canteen which is high in fibre'.

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

It was noted that the removal of the requirement to make the product allowed candidates more scope for creativity, and some were able to use this to come up with interesting ideas.

## **Section 2: comments on candidate performance**

### **Areas that candidates performed well in**

#### **Question paper**

Question 1(a): Many candidates could name and give functions of two nutrients found in red meat.

Question 1(c): Most candidates gave two reasons why a consumer would choose to buy seasonal food.

Question 2(a): Once again, performance in the Dietary Reference Value (DRV) question was much improved with many candidates scoring four or more marks. Only a few candidates either did not link their evaluations to the information in the question or gave incorrect functions for nutrients. Most candidates showed that they could use evaluation skills effectively.

Question 4(a): Most candidates accurately identified changes to the meal to make it healthier. Some candidates described how these changes related to current dietary advice, however only a few fully explained their answers.

Question 4(b): Most candidates correctly identified two pieces of information required by law on a food product. Many of these candidates also accurately explained how this information was important to the consumer.

Question 6(c): Most candidates accurately stated two ways of reducing salt in the diet.

Question 6(e): Many candidates gave a correct advantage of organic foods with most candidates identifying cost as a correct disadvantage to the consumer.

### **Areas that candidates found demanding**

#### **Question paper**

Question 1(b): Although many candidates could describe positive reasons for reducing fat intake in the diet, very few could explain the benefits to health of making this change, therefore did not gain the marks available.

Question 1(d): Many candidates confused the role of a Trading Standards Officer with that of an Environmental Health Officer, and instead gave reasons why they would visit a food premises related to hygiene and food poisoning.

Question 2(c): Again, many candidates did not explain their answers fully, instead describing kitchen hygiene rules with no reason given. A few candidates misread the question and gave answers relating to the cooking of food rather than the preparation.

Question 3: this question was not attempted by most of the candidates.

Question 3(a): Some candidates misread this question, leading them to provide responses relating to the production or cooking of a ready meal, when the question asked for answers relating to product development. Many candidates who attempted the question gave correct stages of product development but did not accurately explain their role when developing a ready meal.

Question 3(b): Many candidates who attempted this question did not correctly evaluate how plastic packaging is used for a cook-chill product, instead, they gave some features of plastic packaging and general benefits or disadvantages to the consumer using them. Many candidates did not use evaluation techniques.

Question 5(a): Most candidates could correctly describe how changing the proportions of ingredients would affect the stated products, however very few accurately explained how this would affect the finished product and therefore did not access the marks available.

Question 5(b): Many candidates did not have the required knowledge of modified atmosphere packaging to allow them to evaluate its use for the consumer.

Question 6(a): Many candidates could describe why sensory testing is useful, however they did not give full explanations why a manufacturer would use it for a new product.

Question 6(b): Candidates' knowledge of Food Standards Scotland was very poor. Most candidates again gave answers related to the Environmental Health Department instead.

Question 6(d): Most candidates again gave descriptions of why water is important in the diet, however they did not fully explain their answer.

## **Areas that candidates performed well in**

### **Assignment**

Section 1(a) Exploring the brief

Most candidates identified the issues in the brief, and many went on to accurately explain why each key issue was important.

Section 1(b) Carrying out research

This section was completed well by most candidates. Most candidates used valid research techniques — the most commonly used techniques were an interview with an expert, questionnaire, and internet research.

Sample sizes in questionnaires were mostly big enough and conclusions were accurate. A few candidates still used a generic 'expert' for the interview, for example Home Economics teacher which is not always appropriate as they may not have the experience or skillset.

## **Areas that candidates found demanding**

### **Assignment**

#### Section 1: Present ideas

Candidates gave descriptions of possible ideas/products however, many did not fully describe these. Many candidates gave vague descriptions of the product and omitted many details which meant the product could not be visualised. Most candidates did, however, accurately relate these ideas to both the brief and the information they had found in their investigations.

#### Section 2

Some candidates are still using imperial or other measurements instead of using metric. Some candidates are also still using incorrect terminology in relation to ingredients and therefore were unable to access the available marks.

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

### **Question paper**

Candidates should be given more experience of answering exam-style questions with optionality included, in the correct time allocation. Centres should ensure candidates know how to select optional questions which best suit them and advise them how to structure their responses. This will help candidates to structure their time and help them respond effectively to the question paper.

Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the command words used in the question paper and should support candidates with training in exam technique throughout the course.

In particular, candidates should be taught the difference between 'describe' and 'explain', as differing depths of answer are required for each. Candidates would benefit from practicing these types of questions as many this session were unable to fully explain their answers.

Evaluation answers should include a judgement and an impact relating to the detail in the question.

Centres should encourage candidates to take time to read each question carefully, so they do not miss important information or continue with a thread from the previous question which has not been asked for.

Centres should also be aware of the quality of handwriting required and ensure that candidates are not disadvantaged due to markers being unable to read responses.

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

Content from the contemporary food issues area of the course was shown to be an area where candidates struggled to give detailed answers — in particular, candidates showed lack of knowledge of organisations that protect the interests of consumers.

### **Assignment**

Centres should check carefully that they are using the most up-to-date candidate workbook and candidate instructions — this year, a number of centres used pro forma from a previous year which had not been amended correctly.

Centres should ensure that all sheets belonging to candidates are presented for marking. This year it was noted that a significant number of assignments were presented with missing pages, which would have had an impact on candidate's marks if this had not been picked up by markers.

Numbering sheets and performing a final check with the candidate before signing the flyleaf, may help to prevent this happening.

Centres should check that all information and diagrams are easily read. If printing diagrams or pie charts that rely on a colour key for displaying information, please ensure that these are presented for marking in colour, to ensure that candidates are not disadvantaged.

Sheets should not be stapled together before placing in the clear pocket provided by SQA.

It is useful if centres are submitting handwritten assignments that these are checked for legibility to ensure candidates do not lose marks due to some information being undecipherable.

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 and how they will provide relevant information.

Each investigation should be completed separately. Candidates should also complete these independently of each other and, although it is recognised that candidates may have to use the same source, for example an interview, different questions should be used and different conclusions should be drawn.

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

Candidates should ensure that the expert chosen for interview does have relevant knowledge and experience — this should be stated where it is not immediately obvious. For example, when interviewing a Home Economics teacher, it is not necessarily clear that they have previous experience in industry or catering.

In the food product ideas section 1(b), candidates need to provide a visualisation, such as what the product will look like, how the ingredients have been prepared, for example sliced peppers or chopped onions, rather than providing a list of 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. This is important as it is a product development exercise, and the recipe should, in theory, be able to be reproduced numerous times with identical results.

Justifications of ingredients and 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.



Candidates should not use a key issue as a feature for the justification section. For example, this year it was noted that some candidates used 'high in fibre' or 'savory' as both a key issue and feature.

## Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade 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 for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty 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 on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).