



Course Report 2018

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	Higher

This report provides information on the performance of candidates. 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

Component 1: question paper

The question paper covered a broad variety of course content, and many candidates performed well.

Marker reports and feedback from centres indicated 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, through the normal style of questioning. Markers have noted an improvement in candidates' responses in particular within the evaluation questions.

However, it was noted that some candidates' responses lacked depth of knowledge, so they were unable to access full mark allocation. It was also noted that the number of marks available for each question was not taken into consideration by some candidates when giving their answer.

It was evident that there were some candidates who had been presented at the wrong level, and the demands of the course were too challenging for these candidates.

Component 2: assignment

The most popular brief this year appeared to be the 'school canteen'. However, both briefs were received well by candidates and reflected a range of marks and quality of responses.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: question paper

- Question 1(a) Most candidates answered this question very well, demonstrating a good understanding of many factors which influence consumer choice of food.
- Question 1(c) The Dietary Reference Value (DRV) question was handled relatively well by the majority of candidates this year. Candidates demonstrated good use of the analyse technique required to answer the question and accessed most marks. A good understanding of the nutritional needs of a pregnant woman was shown by the majority of candidates.
- Question 2(a) Many candidates coped well with this question and provided suitable evaluative responses that linked to the rice salad, as well as showing an understanding of the rating of each sensory attribute.
- Question 3(b) This was well answered by most candidates who were able to show an understanding of the effects of obesity on health.
- Question 3(c) Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the impact of packaging on both the environment and the consumer.
- Question 4(a) This question was well answered with candidates showing a good knowledge of locally produced foods and the impact for the burger restaurant if they were to use these products on the menu.
- Question 4(c) This was answered well by most candidates, demonstrating that they had a good knowledge of the impact of using red meat in the diet.

Component 2: assignment

Section 1(a): planning (i) key issues which reflect all aspects of the brief

The majority of candidates coped well with this section and were able to identify the key issues which reflect all aspects of the brief.

Section 3: product testing

Candidates performed well in this section of the assignment, with many accessing all or almost all marks. One sensory test and a further different test were carried out by the majority of candidates, with good results being presented, allowing for key pieces of information to be drawn.

Section 4: evaluation (ii) improving or adapting the product

Many candidates gave three variations/adaptations/improvements to their product, which in most cases was justified by linking back to an investigation or their test as well as linking to the assignment brief.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: question paper

- Question 1(b) Some candidates found it difficult to access all marks as they did not have a good depth of knowledge about osteoporosis.
- Question 1(d) In many cases the candidate did not explain the functional properties of eggs but instead gave a brief description. A link to baked products was also missed by a fair amount of candidates.
- Question 1(e) There was a lack of understanding of alternative proteins within many candidate responses, in some cases a lack of depth of knowledge was evident.
- Question 2(b) In many cases a lack of knowledge of the stages of product development was evident within the candidate responses. In particular, prototype production and marketing plan could not be explained by the candidates. Many candidates did not read the question carefully, as they did not explain how the stages could be improved by a food manufacturer.
- Question 2(c) Candidates' knowledge of consumer organisations was lacking and many candidates were unable to show how these organisations linked to the purchasing of food.
- Question 3(a) In some cases candidates did not read the question correctly and they could not demonstrate knowledge of functional foods as they had interpreted the question as being about functional properties. In other cases, there was a lack of understanding/depth of knowledge about functional foods to allow all marks to be accessed.
- Question 4(b) Some candidates stated basic facts about food hygiene instead of explaining control measures required to ensure food safety, linked to a burger restaurant.

Component 2: assignment

Section 1(b): research

A large number of candidates are:

- ◆ providing research that is minimal in detail
- ◆ providing research that does not have a clear purpose or focus
- ◆ carrying out recipe searches that are too vague and lack detail to allow facts to be checked
- ◆ not providing source(s) for their research
- ◆ presenting questionnaire results as percentages not individual results
- ◆ giving statements from their investigations and are not using the information they gathered to give points of information/conclusions that could be used to develop the product
- ◆ not linking or showing progression between the investigations in some cases, and the investigations did not flow well together

Section 2: the product

This section was not successfully completed by many candidates. Candidates were not providing justifications which were different, instead they were repeating the justifications for different features and ingredients and this resulted in repetition in their work.

Some candidates were still unsure of the difference between a feature and an ingredient and other candidates did not have a link to the feature/ingredient within their investigation. It is important to note that although a justification is provided, this justification must be evident within the investigations and research.

Section 3: advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: question paper

Candidates should be encouraged to identify the number of marks allocated for each question. They should ensure they have given enough description/explanations/evaluations/analysis for the marks allocated.

Marking instructions clarify how marks are allocated to each question. Marks can be awarded in a variety of ways to allow candidates flexibility in their answers. It is useful to train candidates how to give developed answers, as this will help them to access more marks and demonstrate depth of knowledge.

Candidates need to read questions carefully and ensure that their answers apply the knowledge they have gained throughout the course to the question.

Centres should prepare candidates by getting them to apply the knowledge in a variety of scenarios throughout the course, and emphasise the importance of linking back to the scenario, for example, the burger restaurant.

For the DRV question, candidates should ensure that they provide a clear impact on the diet of the individual, in this year's case the pregnant woman, instead of simply providing the function of the nutrients. Candidates are also asked to provide a conclusion about the contribution the meal makes to the individual's food intake, therefore candidates should only be making reference to the foods included in the meal and should not offer an alternative source for the nutrients. Again, this year some candidates were noted to have analysed more than three nutrients, which may slow them down significantly and cause them to run out of time to answer all questions in the paper.

Centres should continue to use the skills, knowledge and understanding section of the course specification to ensure that they cover all areas of content, so that their candidates are able to fully access the paper. This year, candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge of consumer organisations, alternative proteins, stages of food product development and functional foods.

Component 2: assignment

Again, this year, some candidate's work has been sent to SQA incomplete or with missing pages. Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. Many candidates had pages missing and were therefore unable to access all the marks. It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that all work to be marked is included. Good practice is to encourage candidates to number pages, which will help ensure all pages are included before to sending to SQA. This will also help when marking is carried out.

As already highlighted in previous course reports, it is apparent 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.

Candidates should make use of Appendix 3 of the Course Support Notes on SQA's website to seek clear guidance on carrying out research/testing.

Please note, assignments should not be stapled together but inserted into the clear-faced pocket provided by SQA, with the relevant flyleaf completed at the front.

It is important to note that the flyleaf must be signed by the candidate.

Some candidates provided clear photographic evidence of their product/solution; this helped as it gave them additional evidence to refer to in the evaluation section.

In the sensory testing section, it is not acceptable for candidates to use centre devised pro formas. Each product should have its own unique sensory attributes therefore the information/research for each candidate's sensory test should be different

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.

Recipes should be written using metric measurements, and realistic portion sizes should be provided.

All pages of the assignment should be numbered.

It would be beneficial if the assignment was not printed back-to-back.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2017	1438
Number of resulted entries in 2018	1375

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	11.9%	11.9%	163	70
B	22.0%	33.9%	303	60
C	29.1%	63.0%	400	50
D	12.7%	75.6%	174	45
No award	24.4%	-	335	-

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 which 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.

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 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.

Grade boundaries from exam 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 exams set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the corresponding practice exam paper.