



Course Report 2018

Subject	Health and Food Technology
Level	National 5

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

The course assessment was updated this session to reflect the removal of unit assessments from the course assessment process. The question paper and the assignment both had a mark allocation increase of 10 marks to 60 from the previous 50. This required an additional question to be added to the question paper and a number of substantial changes to the assignment.

Component 1: question paper

The question paper, with the additional question, 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.

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

Component 2: assignment

The updated assignment was well received by centres. Both briefs gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate application of knowledge and skills from across the course.

The 'develop a dish for a school canteen that increases intake of fruit and vegetables' brief was marginally more popular but markers commented that candidate performance was similar in each brief, with candidates showing a wide range of quality and marks.

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

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: question paper

1(b)	Most candidates gave at least two correct functions of protein.
1(c)	Most candidates could give two reasons for choosing a vegetarian diet.
2(a)	Most candidates made a very good attempt at this question, correctly linking the nutrients in the dietary analysis to the teenage student. However, some candidates showed a lack of nutritional knowledge and were therefore unable to access the marks.
2(b)	Most candidates could give two dietary factors contributing to coronary heart disease.
2(c)	Most candidates could describe two functions of water in the diet.
3(a)	Most candidates identified two stages in the food product development process however, not all explained them well.
3(d)	Most candidates could explain why a food manufacturer would carry out sensory testing.
4(a)	Most candidates gave at least two or more well evaluated responses.
4(b)	Most candidates explained how nutritional knowledge and budget affected consumers' food choice however, many struggled to correctly explain how food miles may affect food choice.
6(b)	Most candidates could state two points of information that must be included by law on a label for breakfast cereal, and could also explain how the points they identified help consumers make informed choices.
6(d)	Most candidates correctly described two ways of reducing salt in the diet.

Component 2: 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 with valid sources. Many candidates selected and summarised the main points of information which could be used to develop a product in a clear and easy to read format. This section, although now expecting candidates to produce more research, was much improved from previous years.
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, and sometimes an imaginative key. Most candidates provided at least two valid conclusions from their results.
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 which candidates found demanding

Component 1: question paper

1(a)	Many candidates mixed up High Biological Value and Low Biological Value, giving sources for the wrong component. A significant number did not attempt this question.
1(d)	Many candidates gave practical ways of increasing fruit and vegetables in the diet such as smoothies/soups, however, did not give ways supermarkets could encourage consumers to eat more fruit and vegetables such as offering discounts or samples.
3(b)	Many candidates could describe functional properties of sugar and eggs in a baked product however did not fully explain them.
3(c)	Candidates described 'fair trade' but did not fully explain advantages and disadvantages to the consumer.
4(c)	Some candidates did not fully explain why preservatives are beneficial in food production, instead relating their answers to additives in general, eg colourings and flavourings. Many candidates were only able to give one explanation of preservatives.
5(a)	Many candidates struggled to explain why all of the issues could cause food poisoning. Many answers were vague and lacked the detail required.
5(b)	Many candidates described properties of cardboard however, did not evaluate the suitability for use as a packaging material.
5(c)	Candidates found this question very difficult and a significant number gave no response. The majority could identify two consumer organisations but had difficulty describing how they protect the consumer when buying food.
6(a)	Many candidates described benefits of breakfast cereals rather than explaining the nutritional benefits of eating them. A significant number of candidates gave fibre as a nutrient.
6(c)	Most candidates described methods of preventing tooth decay however, did not explain how these methods work.

Component 2: assignment

<p>1(b) Generating ideas</p>	<p>Many candidates did not give detailed descriptions of ideas which could be suitable for the brief. Instead, many gave either a recipe, list of ingredients or a title.</p> <p>Some candidates did not justify why their ideas were suitable and did not use the information found in their research.</p>
<p>2(a) Information about the product</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Many candidates did not fully complete the justifications section. In the workbook, candidates are asked to ensure that their justifications are related to at least three ingredients, one cooking method and two features of the product. This is a minimum requirement. There are eight marks available, therefore candidates are required to give more than this — many candidates did not do this and therefore could not access all of the available marks.</p> <p>Many candidates also did not refer to either the brief or research when justifying why they had chosen the product — in particular, cooking method.</p>
<p>4(a) (i,iv) Evaluation</p>	<p>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.</p>

Section 3: advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: 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. This session many candidates were denied access to marks as they gave brief answers where a much more detailed response was required.

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

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. They can be found in the General Marking Principles section for National 5 Health and Food Technology past papers. Past papers and associated marking instructions can be found on SQA's web site, which is accessible to all.

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, eg 'elderly' man/woman/pregnant woman/teenage boy, so as to ensure the information is evaluated correctly.

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 although this is not a requirement. The DRV question also has a specific way in which marks are allocated and this should be communicated to candidates. Again, marking instructions of past papers give detail and clarity on this point.

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. Some areas of course content such as consumer organisations and technological developments in food production generated a significant number of no responses this session showing a lack of awareness of these areas.

Centres should also ensure that they are aware of any updates which may be made throughout the session.

Component 2: assignment

Centres should check that they are using the most up-to-date candidate workbook and candidate instructions. Centres who use copies from previous years' risk disadvantaging

candidates as older versions do not have the most recent amendments and therefore deny candidates access to all available marks. The PDF version can be downloaded and printed and used for handwritten work. The Word version can be downloaded and typed into. Extra pages, diagrams, pictures etc, may be added as necessary. This document can be found on SQA's website which is accessible by all.

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

It is essential to have three separate investigations. It is not acceptable, for example, to split an interview with the same expert or a questionnaire with the same respondents into two investigations. Each investigation should be completed separately.

Conclusions from research should be selected and summarised from results of an investigation. It is therefore important for candidates to include the results gained from the investigation, eg questions used in a survey with results gained, so that conclusions can be validated.

In the food product ideas section (1b), complete recipes or lists of ingredients are not required as these are not descriptions of the product. Candidates should describe what they are making so that the marker can picture the item.

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

In section 2(b)(ii) there are eight marks available. The justifications must be related to at least three ingredients, one cooking method and two features of the product. This is a minimum requirement. Candidates should give more than the minimum to access all available marks. For example, a candidate could choose to justify four ingredients and three features to access all the marks, however this is their choice. The justifications must also link back to both the brief and results from the investigations. For example, for the cooking method, if a candidate chose baking because the school canteen has an oven, this point must be able to be validated in the research.

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. Totals are also not required.

Please note, centre devised tests/pro-forma's are also not acceptable.

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

It is not good practice to copy the conclusions drawn from the results directly to the evaluation section — this section requires more detail.

In the evaluation section, candidates should ensure that they refer back to their research. Please note, the sharing and seeking of advice on social media in relation to the course assessment is inappropriate, and candidates may in turn be disadvantaged by this.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2017	1786
Number of resulted entries in 2018	1474

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	15.6%	15.6%	230	84
B	25.2%	40.8%	371	72
C	25.4%	66.2%	375	60
D	18.0%	84.3%	266	48
No award	15.7%	-	232	-

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.