



Course Report 2017

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	National 5

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: assignment

This year the briefs were well received by centres, with each one offering a different choice of topic and allowing candidates scope for applying their knowledge, understanding and skills from across the course.

A significantly higher number of candidates chose the 'baked product for a school event using fairtrade ingredients' option than the 'product for a farm shop café using produce from the farm' option, but both, once again, produced assignments of varying quality and depth.

Overall, performance in the assignment was of a lower standard than in previous years due, in part, to an increase in the use of centre-devised pro formas for some sections. This does not allow candidates access to all available marks.

Component 2: question paper

The question paper component of the assessment 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 across the three units.

Comments and feedback from marker reports indicated that there was a good balance of accessible questions, which the majority of candidates were able to attempt, and there was also challenge for the more able candidates.

The average mark was lower than last year. This was mainly due to many candidates incorrectly answering the command word in the question. In particular, some candidates confused 'describe' and 'explain' questions, which resulted in them not always giving appropriate detail for the question — these candidates gave a basic description when they were asked to provide an explanation. Answers to evaluation questions however, showed some improvement.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: assignment

- 1(a) Most candidates could identify and explain the importance of the key issues in the brief, and achieved full marks for this section.
- 1(c) Most candidates could give three reasons for selecting their final product and provided an appropriate recipe. However, few candidates indicated that they had made substantial variations to their chosen recipe.

- 2(a) Candidates who chose to write about labelling/packaging/advertising/marketing their product mostly gave clear, concise information that related back to the brief.
- 3(a) 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, and sometimes imaginative, key. Most candidates provided at least two valid conclusions from their results.
- 4(a)(i) Most candidates gave two detailed evaluations linking their chosen product to information found in research.
- 4(a)(ii) Most also gave improvements/adaptions they could make to the product.

Component 2: question paper

- 1(a) Most candidates could identify, and give the correct function of, two nutrients found in fruit and vegetables.
- 1(b) Most candidates could give two practical ways to increase consumption of fruit and vegetables.
- 1(c)(i)(ii) Most candidates could identify a method of cooking that helps meet current dietary advice, and could explain how it does so. Some candidates, however, linked their answer to retention of vitamins instead of current dietary advice.
- 2(a) Candidate responses to this question continue to improve, with more candidates showing good nutritional knowledge and evaluating how the daily amount of the nutrients identified could affect the health of the elderly man. However, a significant number of candidates are still not evaluating correctly and did not relate their answer to the elderly man.
- 3(b) Most candidates could evaluate why the glass packaging could either be suitable or not suitable for the pop-up shop in the school café.
- 3(d) Most candidates could identify two ways to prevent coronary heart disease.
- 4(b)(ii) Most candidates gave an accurate description of rating tests.
- 4(c) Most candidates could identify two points of statutory information found on a cake label and explain the benefit of each point of information to the consumer.
- 5(b) Most candidates could identify at least one use of colourings in breakfast cereals, but many struggled to achieve a second mark.
- 5(d) Most candidates could state two ways of reducing sugar intake at breakfast.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: assignment

- 1(b) ♦ Most candidates gave at least one valid source for their research, but some did not give enough detail, eg gave the name of an 'expert' but did not give any indication what made them an expert; or gave questionnaires

to 10 people but did not say who they were or why they were relevant to the brief.

- ◆ Many candidates carried out very limited research, which narrowed the information collected to a list of ingredients, many of which were very similar in nature.
- ◆ Many candidates identified three product ideas, but did not give adequate descriptions or explanations related to either the brief or research but used assumed knowledge.

- 2(a) Many candidates who chose nutritional information or costing in this section did not give a valid source, so did not access all the available marks.
- 4(a)(ii) Some candidates copied the conclusions from their sensory testing rather than evaluating correctly.
- 4(a)(iv) Many candidates did not make conclusions on the overall suitability based on the issues in the brief. The conclusions were vague and not fully linked to the brief.

Component 2: question paper

- 1(d) Many candidates gave a basic description of seasonal foods rather than explaining why consumers choose to buy fruit and vegetables in season. Answers were often vague.
- 2(b) Most candidates could explain why available income might affect the food choice of an elderly man, but many candidates appeared not to understand preparation and cooking equipment, and instead applied answers to his preparation skills. Also, many candidates linked geographical location to the food rather than the elderly man.
- In this question also, many candidates did not read the question/mark allocation carefully and therefore only gave three basic answers with no developed points or further answers.
- 3(a) Many candidates gave a basic explanation rather than link their answer to the school café/healthy choices menu.
- 3(c) Again, many candidates did not read the question or mark allocation carefully and gave a list of benefits of online shopping rather than evaluating the suitability for the family; or they only gave one or two simple evaluations for the four marks available.
- 4(a) Many candidates merely described the faults identified, and did not explain why they had occurred.
- 5(a) Many candidates correctly identified two ways of promoting the range of breakfast cereals but, once again, they only described these methods rather than explaining how they would promote the breakfast cereals.
- 5(c)(ii) Many candidates did not explain how time could lead to food spoilage during the production, giving only a description of the factor itself.

Section 3: Advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Assignment

Centres should check that they are using the most up-to-date proforma and candidate guide. Centres who use copies from previous years risk disadvantaging candidates because older versions do not have the most recent amendments so may deny candidates access to all available marks.

The pdf version can be downloaded and printed for handwritten work; the word document can be downloaded and typed on. Extra pages, diagrams, pictures etc, may be added as necessary. This document can be found on SQA's open website.

Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that all work to be marked is included. (However, completed questionnaires/testing pro forma are not needed — a blank copy and summarised results will suffice). It is useful to number pages — it may help to ensure that they are all there prior to sending, and allows the marker to know order to read them in. They should not be stapled. It's not uncommon for work to be sent in that is incomplete, and this may disadvantage a candidate.

Centres should give candidates more scope for showing personalisation and choice when developing their ideas, rather than taking a more directed approach. It has been noted that some centres have all candidates doing exactly the same investigations in the same format and order. This lack of individuality has led to only very basic assignments which lack the detail required at this level and therefore deny candidates access to marks. Candidates should be able to select appropriate investigations independently.

Guidance on assessment conditions and reasonable support (previously found in the General Assessment Information document) has now been published as a separate guidance document 'Guidance on Conditions of Assessment'. You can find this on the National 5 web page, beside the Coursework Assessment Task.

Candidates should be encouraged not to choose their product before they embark on research.

When candidates are using the internet to search for a recipe, it is recommended that they are directed to use UK-based websites. Recipes included should be in realistic proportions, and should always use metric measurements and British ingredient terminology.

Centres should take great care if allowing candidates to use centre-devised proformas for any part of the assignment — in particular, the sensory testing section. Again, some candidates are being denied access to marks due to over-direction from their teacher because they have not devised their own test, chosen which attributes to test themselves, and have been given a key to use.

In sensory testing, candidates should be aware that a star diagram is a way of displaying results — usually of a rating or profile test — and 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 has been used to test the product. It is not good practice to copy the conclusions drawn from the results directly to the evaluation section — this section requires more detail.

Component 2: question paper

Centres should use the Course Assessment Specification (CAS) to ensure that they cover all areas of course content so that candidates are able to fully access the paper. They should also ensure that they are aware of any updates which may be made throughout the session.

Centres should ensure that all candidates understand the different command words used and can use them appropriately in each question. In particular, candidates should be taught the difference between 'describe' and 'explain', as differing depths of answer are required.

Many candidates did not achieve some of the marks in this paper as they gave brief descriptions rather than full explanations. Answers should always be linked back to the situation/family/person in the question, to ensure that candidates are applying the facts correctly.

There is guidance on the different command words in the Marking Instructions for the paper on the National 5 web page. They can be found in the section 'General Marking Principles for National 5 Health and Food Technology'.

Candidates should be taught to read each question carefully and identify how many marks are available. Some questions will require unstructured responses where the candidate should give a number of points and/or developed points relating to a case study. It is good practice for the candidate to give the same number of responses as there are marks — it may help candidates to separate each new point with bullet points or numbers.

In the Dietary Reference Values (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, eg 'elderly man/woman', 'pregnant woman', 'teenage boy' to ensure the information is evaluated correctly.

Also in the DRV question, it is essential that candidates are familiar with the way in which marks are allocated to ensure that they access all available marks, as it is different from other types of question and there are a number of ways candidates can achieve marks. Marking instructions for this and previous papers will clarify how marks are awarded for this question.

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	1904
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2017	1786
------------------------------------	------

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	13.0%	13.0%	233	70
B	27.7%	40.8%	495	60
C	31.0%	71.8%	554	50
D	11.0%	82.2%	197	45
No award	17.2%	-	307	-

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.