NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Health and Food Technology
Levels	N3 to N5
Date published:	July 2014

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.

NQ Verification 2013–14 Key Messages Round 1

01 ## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	**Health and Food Technology**
Verification event/visiting information	**Event**
Date published:	**January 2014**

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H1YT	75/74/73	Food for Health
H1YX	74/75	Food Product Development
H200	75/74	Contemporary Food Issues
H203	74	Added Value Unit

02 ## Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres had used a valid approach to assessment for all candidates, ie they had used the relevant Unit assessment support pack (UASP) to assess all candidates.

The most commonly used approach to assessment was the Unit by Unit approach. A small number of centres had used the portfolio approach for all candidates (UASP 2).

A number of centres had used a centre-devised assessment approach, which had not been prior verified. A significant number of centre-devised approaches were not accepted as they did not enable the candidates to meet the Assessment Standards for the appropriate Unit or level. All centres are required to have all centre-devised assessments prior verified by SQA before use to ensure that they enable the candidates to fully meet the Assessment Standards. Centres are advised that, when devising or adapting assessment approaches, it is not

appropriate to expect the candidate to go beyond the required standard for the level.

If centres choose to submit only one assessment judgement, as is permissible, they should ensure they select an Assessment Standard that can stand alone. For example, Assessment Standard 2.2 in *Food for Health* must be accompanied by Assessment Standard 2.1, otherwise it is not possible to determine whether or not suitable ingredients or cooking methods have been selected.

Assessment judgements

Overall, the assessment judgements for Health and Food Technology were in line with national standards, but there are number of development recommendations and required actions that relate to the assessment judgements.

Many centres made good use of candidate assessment records. These clearly showed why the assessment judgements had been made. All centres should follow this good practice.

For each candidate, centres should make very clear at what point the assessment judgement has been made, eg with a tick, commentary or stamp. This was unclear on a significant number of items of candidate work. If teachers do not wish to write on a candidate's work then they should add a commentary that clearly shows why the candidate has passed or failed and make a specific note relating to the candidate's work. For example:

Food for Health Outcome 1.1: the candidate has passed this Outcome as their statement of benefits to health for fruit and vegetables, fat and carbohydrates are detailed and correct. However, their description for sugar is insufficient at National 5.

Centres should ensure that candidates give the correct depth of answer. Some candidates had 'listed and described', but not 'explained' as required at N5 in some Outcomes.

Specific advice regarding the *Food for Health* Unit:

♦ Outcome 1.1 — N5 requires candidates to describe three benefits to health of a balanced and varied diet. However, a number of candidates had only listed these, which is not sufficient detail at this level.
♦ Outcome 1.2 — N5 requires candidates to give specific information related to dietary advice as indicated in the SQA documentation (eat more/eat less is required at N3 level only).
♦ Outcome 1.3 — At all levels, candidates should explain/discuss/include the main effect on health of each nutrient, not simply state the function. At N3, candidates can be given a list of nutrients; at N4 and N5 candidates must name the nutrients.
♦ Outcome 1.4 — At all levels, candidates are asked to describe the effect on health of the dietary disease/condition, not simply explain the disease/condition.

- Outcome 2.1 — At all levels, candidates are required to name one appropriate ingredient or cooking method for each identified health need. This cooking method or ingredient should be one from their chosen recipe.
- Outcome 2.2 — It is essential that an Assessor Checklist and/or signed photographic evidence is included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made.
- Outcome 2.3 — This is only required to be completed by N5 candidates.

Specific advice regarding the *Food Product Development* Unit:

- Outcome 2.1 — N5 requires candidates to provide detailed and relevant information gathered from investigations. It is not sufficient to include the responses to only one question.

In this round of verification there was limited evidence submitted for this Unit.

Specific advice regarding the Contemporary Food Issues Unit:

- Outcome 1.4 — At N5 the UASP incorrectly names the consumer organisations but the assessment requires candidates to do this for themselves. SQA is aware of this issue and the UASP will be amended. In this round of verification, candidates were not penalised but centres should ensure this is amended for future candidates.
- Outcome 2.3 — It is essential that an Assessor Checklist is included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made.

03 Section 3: General comments

It was encouraging to see how much progress has been made with evidence from all three Units being presented at the first round of verification. Overall, the quality of candidates work was very good.

When preparing materials for verification, all centres are reminded to include an accurately completed Verification Sample Form listing candidates in alphabetical order and grouping candidates at the same level, where appropriate.

It is very important to include an accurately completed Flyleaf with verification materials for each candidate, clearly showing which assessment approach has been used and the teacher's decision on whether the candidate has passed or failed to meet the Assessment Standards (even for interim evidence).

Centres should ensure that levels match on the Verification Sample Form, Flyleaf and Candidate Assessment Records.

For a significant number of centres, there was no evidence of internal verification, which may explain why there was a lack of consistency in judging evidence across all levels. Centres are required to adopt rigorous internal verification processes that are supportive in identifying development issues with regard to assessment. The processes should be designed to support assessors across all

levels and ensure that they feel confident in making assessment judgements. Internal verification should be planned and appropriate, and a clear record of the process should be kept.

Centres should note that only assessment materials where an assessment judgement has been made should be sent to SQA for verification, ie no pupil notes, jotters, class notes or other materials are required.

NQ Verification 2013–14 Key Messages Round 2

 Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	**Health and Food Technology**
Verification event/visiting information	**Event**
Date published:	**March 2014**

National Courses/Units verified:

H1YT 75/74/73   Food for Health
H1YX 75/74/73   Food Product Development
H200 75/74/73   Contemporary Food Issues
H203 74   Added Value Unit

 Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres had used a valid approach to assessment, eg they had used a Unit assessment support pack to assess all candidates. A small number of centres had made minor amendments to the Unit assessment support pack, eg they had amended the candidate brief or added an additional candidate brief to offer more personalisation and choice. This is acceptable as long as the Assessment Standards can still be met by the candidate. Minor amendments to the Unit assessment support pack that still meet the Assessment Standards do not require to be prior verified by SQA.

If centres wish to use a wholly centre-devised assessment approach, this must be prior verified by SQA before it is used with candidates. A small number of centre-devised approaches were not accepted as they did not enable the candidates to meet the Assessment Standards. Centres are advised that when devising or adapting assessment approaches, it is not appropriate to make the candidate go beyond the required Assessment Standard.

Although some centres submitted only one assessment judgement, centres are encouraged to send in all Unit assessment materials that have been completed as this will ensure detailed and supportive feedback. If only one item is to be submitted, centres should remember to select an Assessment Standard that can stand alone, eg Assessment Standard 2.2 in the Food for Health Unit must be accompanied by Assessment Standard 2.1; otherwise, it is not possible to determine whether or not suitable ingredients or cooking methods have been selected.

Assessment judgements

It was encouraging to note that, overall, the quality of the assessment judgements for Health and Food Technology had improved from round 1. Most centres are assessing their candidates correctly to the national standards. There are still a number of areas that require attention, which are outlined below.

Good use had been made of the candidate assessment records, showing clearly why the assessment judgements have been made. All centres should follow this good practice if selected for verification. In addition, throughout the evidence, centres should make very clear at what point the assessment judgement has been made, ie with a tick, commentary or stamp on the candidate's work. This was unclear on a number of items of candidate work. If teachers do not wish to write on candidate work, they should add a commentary that clearly shows why the candidate has passed or failed and make a specific note relating to the candidate's work, for example:

'Food for Health Assessment Standard 1.1: the candidate has passed this Assessment Standard as their benefits to health for fruit and vegetables, fat and total complex carbohydrates (TCC) are detailed and correct, but the information given about dairy foods is insufficient at National 5 level.'

Centres should ensure that candidates are giving the correct depth of answer, eg candidates had listed and described, but not explained, as is required at National 5 in some Outcomes.

Specific advice regarding the Food for Health Unit

Assessment Standard 1.1 — National 5 requires candidates to describe three benefits to health of a balanced and varied diet; however, a number of candidates had only listed these, which is not sufficient at this level. Ideally, we are looking for a link between the foods eaten in a balanced and varied diet to an explanation of the benefits to health, for example:

'A balanced and varied diet will include enough fruit and vegetables. Fruit and vegetables are good sources of vitamins. This will help to reduce your risk of common infections such as the cold.'

Assessment Standard 1.3 — At all levels, candidates should explain/discuss/include the main effect on health of each nutrient, not simply state the function. At National 3, candidates can be given a list of nutrients. At

National 4 and National 5, candidates must name the nutrients themselves. (They cannot select the nutrients from a given list or complete a matching exercise.)

Assessment Standard 2.1 — At all levels, candidates are required to name one appropriate ingredient or cooking method for each identified health need. This cooking method or ingredient should ideally be from their chosen recipe.

Assessment Standard 2.2 — It is essential that an Assessor Checklist and/or signed photographic evidence are included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made.

Specific advice regarding the Food Product Development Unit

Assessment Standard 1.1 — All levels require candidates to select ingredients. Ideally, these will be ingredients that are used in their chosen recipe.

Assessment Standard 1.2 — National 5 requires candidates to explain four development stages, to include the main characteristics or features of each stage and to explain the importance of each stage in the product development process. The explanation of the importance of each stage in relation to the manufacturer was not included by many candidates.

Assessment Standard 2.1 — National 5 requires candidates to complete two different techniques to gather information about the needs identified, eg an internet search and a questionnaire. It is not appropriate for candidates to carry out two pieces of research using different written texts, eg textbooks and recipe books as these are the same technique. At National 4, two sources of information are required, but these may be gathered using the same technique. At National 5, candidates are required to provide detailed and relevant information gathered from investigations. It is not sufficient to include the responses to only one question in a questionnaire. At National 5, candidates are required to provide detailed information about their food product idea, ideally a recipe, not just a list of foods they will use.

This Unit offers personalisation and choice to candidates. Candidates are required to gather their own information about the needs they have identified from the brief and then use the information gathered to identify their own suitable food product. It is therefore likely that candidates will all make different dishes. It is not appropriate for candidates to be directed to what dish to make and it is not appropriate for all candidates to make the same dish.

Specific advice regarding the Contemporary Food Issues Unit

Assessment Standard 1.1 — There was some confusion over factors that affect consumers' choice of food. We are looking for information on factors such as allergies, lifestyle, budget, foreign travel etc.

Assessment Standard 1.4 — National 5 Unit assessment support packages 1 and 3 incorrectly name the consumer organisations, but the Assessment Standard requires candidates to do this for themselves. SQA has amended the Unit assessment support packages. No candidates were penalised in this round

of verification but centres should ensure they use the amended versions for future candidates.

Assessment Standard 2.3 — It is essential that an Assessor Checklist is included, with commentary, to confirm that the product has been made.

Specific advice regarding the Added Value Unit

It is not permissible to complete the Added Value Unit and state that this has also been used to meet the Assessment Standards for the Units. The Units must be completed wholly and separately from the Added Value Unit.

The Added Value Unit has been designed to add value at the end of the Course. It should not be completed before the Units have been completed and therefore we would not expect to see it submitted for verification in rounds 1 and 2.

03 Section 3: General comments

It was encouraging to see that some assessors are accurately and consistently applying the Assessment Standards and are striving to ensure that candidates produce work of a high quality. Overall, the quality of candidate work was very good.

Use of ICT is not essential to meet the Assessment Standards in the Units or in the Added Value Unit. Photographic evidence, whilst useful, is not mandatory as long as detailed observational checklists are completed by the assessor.

When preparing materials for verification, all centres are reminded to include an accurately completed Verification Sample Form listing candidates in alphabetical order, grouping together candidates in the same level, where appropriate.

It is very important to include an accurately completed Flyleaf with verification materials for each candidate clearly showing which assessment approach has been used and the teacher's decision on whether the candidate has passed or failed to meet the Assessment Standards (even for interim evidence).

Centres should ensure that levels entered on the Verification Sample Form, Flyleaf and Candidate Assessment Records match up as there were a number of administration errors.

For a significant number of centres, there was no evidence of internal verification, which may explain the lack of consistency in judging evidence. Centres are required to adopt rigorous internal verification processes which are supportive in identifying development issues with regards to assessment. The process should be designed to support assessors across all levels and to ensure that they feel confident in making assessment judgements. Internal verification should be planned and appropriate and timely records should be kept.

Centres should note that only assessment materials where an assessment judgement has been made should be sent to SQA for verification, ie no candidate notes, jotters, tests, handouts or other materials are required.

Centres are reminded that the candidates do not have to go beyond the Assessment Standard. Some centres submitted three pieces of work for one Assessment Standard, which indicates that candidates are being over-assessed.

NQ Verification 2013–14
Key Messages Round 3

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Health and Food Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Verification event
Date published:	June 2014

National Courses/Units verified:

Health and Food Technology (National 4) Added Value Unit

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres had used a valid approach to assessment, ie they had used the Unit assessment support pack to assess all candidates.

Assessment judgements

It is encouraging to see that most centres are assessing their candidates correctly to the national standards. There are still a number of areas that require attention, which are outlined below.

Assessment Standard 1.1

Most candidates did identify the correct two issues. Centres should refer to the Unit assessment support pack which outlines the two key issues expected for each brief.

Assessment Standard 1.2

Centres should encourage candidates to use a range of investigative techniques. In some centres all candidates carried out the same two investigations (see Unit assessment support pack). Candidates should record the results of their investigations as well as providing a concise summary of their findings. These summaries should lead candidates to their solution. Candidates should not have

decided on their solution before embarking on their investigations. If a questionnaire is being used, candidates should ensure their questions are appropriate and relevant. Justification of the product chosen should be based on evidence gathered in the investigations.

Assessment Standard 1.3

Some centres provided very good evidence of assessor observation of the making of the product. All centres should follow this good practice.

Assessment Standard 1.4

Candidates who carried out sensory testing found it easier to provide valid reflective comments on the suitability of their product. Any reflective comments must be based on evidence and should not be based on the candidate's opinion.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

Good use had been made of the candidate assessment records, showing clearly why the assessment judgements have been made. All centres should follow this good practice.

All centres provided evidence of an internal verification process. Centres are reminded that this process should be supportive but not overly onerous.

Some of the evidence provided for verification went beyond the standard required for National 4. Centres should not ask candidates to go beyond the requirements of the Assessment Standards.