



## Course Report 2017

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	Higher

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future assessment. It 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.

# Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

## Summary of the course assessment

### Component 1: question paper

The Higher Health and Food Technology question paper covered a broad ranging variety of course content, and a number of candidates performed well in this question paper.

Markers reports and centre feedback indicates that the level of demand of the paper was fair, providing good course coverage as well as allowing candidates the opportunity to access marks in all questions.

However, it has been noted that many candidates' responses lacked depth of knowledge, so they were unable to access full mark allocation. It was also noted that not all candidates read the questions properly or noted the number of marks available for each question.

In some cases, it was evident that candidates had been presented at the wrong level and the demands of the course were too challenging for these candidates.

### Component 2: assignment

Both briefs were well received by centres and candidates this year. The most popular brief appeared to be the 'Fairtrade' one. Both assignment briefs reflected a range of marks and a range of quality of responses.

Candidates continue to perform better in the assignment than in the question paper. Centres have clearly used the most up-to-date assignment information as almost all candidates' responses reflected the amendments to Section 4.

# Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

## Areas in which candidates performed well

### Component 1: question paper

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| Q1 (b) | The majority of candidates answered this question well, demonstrating a good knowledge of cook-chill foods, and they linked this well to a single person.                                      |
| Q2 (a) | This question was well answered, with candidates showing a good depth of understanding of organic ingredients, and they were able to provide evaluative comments that linked well to the café. |
| Q2 (c) | The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated a good knowledge of promotional techniques, and were able to link this knowledge to the café.                              |
| Q3 (a) | This was well answered by most candidates, showing a knowledge of different factors in relation to a teenager's food choice.   |
| Q4 (a) | Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of ultra-heat-treated products, and were able to apply this knowledge to a breakfast club.  |
| Q4 (c) | The was generally answered well with candidates showing a good understanding of the role of the EHO.   |

### Component 2: Assignment

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Section 1 | (i) Key issues which reflect all aspects of the brief |
|-----------|---|

Planning (a) Almost all candidates identified the key issues which reflected all aspects of the brief.

## Areas which candidates found demanding

### Component 1: question paper

Question 1(a) Candidates could identify the benefits of a diet high in carbohydrates, but found it difficult to provide the link to Coronary Heart Disease.

Question 1(c) Many candidates did not reach full mark allocation for this question. Some candidates did not link their answers back to 'the 35-year-old man training for a marathon'.

Many candidates also offered an alternative source of the nutrient for his lunch instead of making a conclusion about the contribution of the lunch. Candidates were only awarded the mark if they were able to show where the nutrient was found in the lunch.

Some candidates analysed more than three aspects of the lunch when in fact they should only be analysing three aspects/nutrients. This then had an impact later in the paper as some of these candidates ran out of time to complete all questions.

Question 1(d) A large number of candidates did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the rating of the attribute in relation to the cereal bar, ie the cereal bar has been rated very high for crunchiness, which may indicate that it is dry, and therefore may not appeal to the athlete.

Question 1(e) Candidates provided very minimal responses, and these were often descriptions and not explanations of the factors that can increase the risk of bowel disease.

Question 2(b) This question was not well answered. Candidates provided very minimal responses that did not explain how cross-contamination could occur. The production of salads in the café was also regularly missed out of responses.

Question 3(b) Candidates did not show a clear understanding of current dietary advice. Many candidates could not link different pieces of advice to the teenager's meal. In many cases, candidates had not read the question correctly and were evaluating the nutritional benefits of the meal.

Question 3(c) A large number of candidates did not provide enough detail here, and their responses were not explanations of how the nutrients worked together. Many did not have the depth of knowledge to access both marks.

Question 4(a) Many candidates were unable to access full marks as their knowledge of food additives and functional foods was limited.

Question 4(c) Candidates provided very minimal answers to this question. Many did not provide explanations, but instead only a brief description of the role of an Environmental Health Officer, not how the EHO would enforce food safety.

## Component 2: assignment

Section 1 Planning (a)	(ii) Justification of why the key issue is being taken forward Some candidates did not provide a justification of 'Fairtrade' or 'farm produce', but instead gave a very brief statement.
Section 1 Research (b)	Centres should make use of the Appendix in the Higher Health and Food Technology Course and Unit Support Notes to ensure that candidates carry out/demonstrate research techniques correctly. It is evident in many candidates' assignments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◆ Sources of research are not being provided.</li><li>◆ Information/results are too minimal/basic for Higher level.</li><li>◆ Results of questionnaires are not individual but provided as percentages or a summary.</li><li>◆ They do not use the results of their investigations to develop their product. They should give points of information that clearly lead to the development of a product.</li><li>◆ There is not a clear progression link between investigations. These links must be valid but should not simply repeat the previous investigation.</li></ul>
Section 2 The product	Although this was raised in 2015 and 2016, and a small improvement in candidate performance has been noted, this is still an area some candidates are not carrying out correctly. When candidates provide a feature/ingredient of their product they must justify this in relation to why it is an appropriate choice for their product. This justification should take into account the results from the investigations carried out. Some candidates are still producing more than one product as a solution, for example, soup and a sandwich with a filling. This is two products and does not reflect what has been asked of candidates.
Section 3 Product Testing	<b>Photographic evidence</b> It is good practice to provide photo(s) of the product. We are still seeing some candidates where no photograph is available or where the photograph does not accurately reflect the product made. In one example, the recipe and Section 2 states that iced cupcakes will be produced but the photo does not show any icing/piping. <b>Second test</b> Some candidates are not carrying out two different tests. It is essential that one test is a sensory test and the second one is a different technique.
Section 4 Evaluation	(i) Evaluating the food product based on results of testing Most candidates have understood that for this section two evaluative points must come from each test, but some are still linking all of these comments to one test. (ii) Improving or adapting the product

Some candidates are not linking the improvements or adaptations to the results of research/testing.

## Section 3: Advice for the preparation of future candidates

### Component 1: question paper

- ◆ Centres must ensure that they are using the Course Assessment Specification (CAS) to ensure that they prepare candidates fully for the question paper, allowing them to fully access the marks. In particular, this year, it was evident that candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge in the following areas: complex carbohydrates and the role they play in reducing the risk of coronary heart disease; factors increasing the risk of bowel disease; food hygiene; current dietary advice; inter-relationship of nutrients; functional foods and functional properties of ingredients.
- ◆ Most candidates are well prepared for the DRV question, but it is still apparent that some are evaluating the information and not analysing. Candidates should ensure that they analyse three aspects of the diet (three nutrients) and ensure that they cover all three bullet points listed in the question, linking at all times to the specified group, ie 35-year-old man training for a marathon. Many candidates used fact, opinion and consequence to answer the question, which resulted in them being unable to access all 9 marks. It is also important that they do not simply provide a function of each nutrient — they should be showing the impact of the nutrient on the specified group. Candidates should also be made aware that they should not be making a suggested improvement to the meal, but instead make a conclusion about the contribution made by the meal to the food intake.
- ◆ It is important that candidates are encouraged to identify the number of marks that each question is worth. This will ensure that they provide the correct number of responses for the marks allocated.
- ◆ It is essential that candidates read all questions carefully and ensure that they apply the knowledge they have gained through the course to each question. It is also very important that candidates take notice of all aspects of the question, ie explain how cross-contamination could be prevented when producing salads in the café.
- ◆ Candidates should be trained to read the command words in each question to ensure that they provide the depth of response required, ie explain, evaluate, analyse.
- ◆ Candidates must be made aware that **all** questions in the paper must be answered.

### Component 2: assignment

- ◆ It is essential that all parts of the assignment are sent to SQA for marking. This year there were a considerable amount of candidates' assignments with pages/information missing. This resulted in the candidates being unable to access all the available marks. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that all worked to be marked is included.
- ◆ For the investigation section, it is evident that some centres are still allowing candidates to undertake investigations/research that are very similar or the same. It is not good practice for candidates to carry out the same investigations, in the same way and in the same order. For example, it was noted that in some cases, candidates carried out exactly the same three investigations with almost identical questions in the surveys/interviews. Investigations should not be teacher-led, but should be individual to each candidate, allowing them to progress and develop their own individual product.
- ◆ Also in the investigation section, it was evident that some candidates are providing/presenting investigations with minimal results. These results do not reflect the

standard required for Higher, and this also has an impact on Section 2 where candidates have to justify their product.

- ◆ Candidates should make use of Appendix 3 of the Course Support Notes to seek clear guidance on carrying out research/testing.
- ◆ Assignments should not be stapled together but inserted into the clear-faced pocket provided by SQA with the relevant flyleaf completed at the front.
- ◆ Good practice would be for each candidate to provide clear photographic evidence of their final product/solution, as this can provide additional evidence for the candidate to refer to in the evaluation section.
- ◆ Although Survey Monkey is an appropriate tool for collating questionnaire results, all results must be presented within the assignment. Providing a link to the results via Survey Monkey is not acceptable, as the link will expire and the marker cannot then see this information.
- ◆ In Section 3, some candidates have used a second sensory test for test 2. This has resulted in candidates being awarded no marks for test 2 as the task clearly specifies a different test.
- ◆ When carrying out sensory testing it is important to note that Star Profiles are not a valid method of testing as individual results cannot be seen.
- ◆ In Section 4, where candidates provide amendments it is essential that these are appropriate to the brief and the product.
- ◆ Recipes should be written using metric measurements, and portion sizes should be provided and also be realistic.
- ◆ All pages of the assignment should be numbered.
- ◆ It would be beneficial if the assignment was **not** printed back-to-back.

Whilst it was pleasing to see that the conditions of assessment for coursework were adhered to in the majority of centres, there were a small number of examples where this may not have been the case. Following feedback from teachers, we have strengthened the conditions of assessment criteria for National 5 subjects and will do so for Higher and Advanced Higher. The criteria are published clearly on our website and in course materials and must be adhered to. SQA takes very seriously its obligation to ensure fairness and equity for all candidates in all qualifications through consistent application of assessment conditions and investigates all cases alerted to us where conditions may not have been met.

## Grade Boundary and Statistical information:

### Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2016	1449
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2017	1438
------------------------------------	------

### Statistical information: Performance of candidates

#### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark -				
A	10.9%	10.9%	157	70
B	22.8%	33.7%	328	60
C	27.5%	61.3%	396	50
D	13.1%	74.4%	189	45
No award	25.6%	-	368	-

## General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and 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.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). 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 management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ 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, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this 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.
- ◆ 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.