



Course Report 2016

Subject	Health & 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 provided a wide variety of candidate responses. The majority of candidates performed well.

Marker reports and feedback from centres indicated that the level of the demand of the paper and the coverage of the course was good, with candidates able to access marks in all questions. However, it was noted that while many candidates had the breadth of knowledge, many did not have the depth, and therefore did not access additional marks.

The question paper contained questions that allowed candidates to be awarded marks in a variety of ways. A significant number of candidates did not appear to read the question properly or note the number of marks available.

A small number of candidates did not answer question 3 or 4 as they had not correctly read page 5, which said 'turn over for next question DO NOT WRITE ON THIS PAGE' and thought it was the end of the paper.

Component 2: Assignment

The choice of briefs this year was well received by centres, with candidates selecting the 'vegetable based food product using locally grown foods' brief or the 'snack product targeting athletes' brief in equal numbers. Both briefs produced a range of quality and marks. 'Local' was often interpreted differently by candidates, but this did not affect their assignment.

Candidates continue to perform better in the assignment than in the question paper. Centres had taken on board areas which candidates found demanding in last year's course report, as there was a marked improvement in section 2.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Question paper

- Question 1 (c) Candidates continue to answer this question well. Energy, protein, vitamin C and calcium were the nutrients that candidates analysed well.
- Question 1 (d) The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated good knowledge of how each marketing technique could promote food products in their evaluations. In some cases, candidates omitted the link to teenage consumers.
- Question 1 (e) Candidates had knowledge of the stages of product development and in the majority of cases explanations clearly linked to the manufacturer. Some candidates did not gain all the marks available as they did not identify the stage correctly.
- Question 2(a) This question was generally well answered, showing knowledge of different food additives. However, candidates often gave statements and not explanations, and many did not give three explanations.
- Question 2 (b) The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated understanding of the ratings for the new soup in their evaluations.
- Question 3 (b) The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated understanding of the contribution of bread in their evaluations. However, candidates did not gain marks for stating bread contained fibre, as they did not specify wholemeal bread. Many candidates did not give three evaluations or detailed enough evaluations to be awarded the developed mark.
- Question 3 (c) (i&ii) The majority of candidates attempted this question and demonstrated understanding of the contribution of organic/FairTrade in their evaluations. Candidates often did not give two evaluation points for each or evaluation lacked depth so could not get a developed mark.

Component 2: Assignment

- Section 1 planning (a) **(i) Key issues which reflect all aspects of the brief**
The majority of candidates could identify key issues reflecting all aspects of the brief and gained full marks for this section
- (ii) Justification of why the key issue is being taken forward**
The majority of candidates could select three key issues and justify them. Candidates should be reminded they should only

select three key issues — many selected them all, which was not required.

Section 3 product testing The majority of candidates carried out a sensory test and one other different test, presenting results clearly and giving at least two key pieces of information.

Section 4 (ii) improving/adapting product The majority of candidates gave at least three variations/adaptations/improvements to their product, which in most cases was justified by linking back to an investigation or their test.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Question paper

- Question 1 (a) Some candidates did not seem to understand the term 'alternative proteins' and only mentioned protein in their answer. The majority of candidates only gave one answer for this question and as a result couldn't access both marks.
- Question 1(b) A large number of candidates did not attempt this question. Those who answered it had limited knowledge about the interrelationship of nutrients.
- Question 1(c) When making a conclusion about the contribution made by her lunch to her food intake, candidates often gave a suggested improvement. Candidates were only awarded a mark if they could show where the nutrient, even if it was less than the Dietary Reference Value (DRV), was found in the lunch.
- Question 2 (c) Many candidates did not read the question correctly and gave causes of food poisoning, and did not explain why food poisoning may occur despite food manufacturers following hygiene regulations.
- Question 3 (a) (i)&(ii) Candidates provided very minimal answers for this question, which were often descriptions and not explanations. Egg was answered slightly better than fat.
- Question 4 (a) A large number of candidates did not attempt this question. While candidates gave facts about consumer organisations, they often did not evaluate. Candidates also gave facts about consumer laws which, unless linked to a consumer organisation, could not be awarded a mark.
- Question 4 (b) (i)&(ii) Candidates showed understanding of current dietary advice by giving examples of how manufactures could help increase fruit and vegetables / reduce salt intake. However, candidates did not evaluate the benefit to consumers and gave a consequence (which was a repeat of the wording of the question).

Question 4 (c) Candidates could identify dietary factors of obesity but they often found difficulty explaining what caused obesity.

Component 2: Assignment

Section 1b Candidates are all carrying out three investigations using at least two research techniques. Many centres are using the appendix in the Higher Health and Food Technology Course and Unit Support Notes (May 2015) to ensure candidates demonstrate research techniques correctly. However, a large number of candidates still:

- ◆ don't give sources for their research
- ◆ provide minimal information from their research
- ◆ don't focus their research on the wording of the brief
- ◆ present questionnaire results as percentages not individual results
- ◆ give statements from their investigations and don't use the information they had found to give points of information that could be used to develop the product

Section 2 The product While there has been an improvement in this area from 2015, candidates do not seem to understand the justification of features; there was often no link to the product they had chosen to make, just a generic comment about why the feature would be good. Candidates should be clearly linking to the product they have chosen to make and giving a justification based on the investigations they have carried out.

Section 3 Product testing

Photographs

The majority of candidates provided a photograph. However, in a few instances the photograph did not accurately reflect the product. For example, the recipe stated the candidate was making bars, which were justified as a feature but the photograph did not show bars.

Sensory Test

Some candidates were not using the scale they had provided to select their key pieces of information; this meant they could not be awarded the mark.

Different Test

Nutritional analysis was often not carried out correctly by candidates; they gave nutritional information of the product not the individual ingredients.

Section 4 (i) evaluation Candidates often gave statements instead of evaluations.

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 for this paper clarify how marks are allocated to each question. Marks can be awarded in a variety of ways to allow candidates flexibility in their answers.

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.

Candidates appear to be well prepared for the DRV question. However, if candidates are asked to analyse, centres should ensure candidates analyse and not evaluate. Many candidates used fact, opinion and consequence to answer this question, and often were unable to access all nine marks. Candidates should ensure they have covered the three bullets in the question linking clearly to the identified group — this year a 15-year-old vegetarian. When making a conclusion about the contribution made by the meal to food intake, candidates should avoid making a suggested improvement.

Centres should continue to 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. This year, functional properties of foods, alternative proteins, obesity and inter-relationship of nutrients were areas in which candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge.

Component 2: Assignment

Centres should ensure that all work completed by the candidate is sent to SQA for marking. This year, several 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 are there prior to sending to SQA. This will also help when marking is carried out.

There was evidence that in some centres candidates were doing exactly the same investigation, in the same format and order. This could hinder progression, as candidates were following teacher-led instructions rather than making the links themselves. Candidates should have experienced a variety of investigative techniques throughout the course and unit assessments, which would enable them to select appropriate investigations independently.

Survey Monkey is an appropriate tool to collate questionnaire results. However, candidates must present the results in their assignment. Many candidates this year only gave the link. This expires, meaning the marker cannot see the questions.

Good practice would be to include a clear photograph in Section 3: Product Testing, as this can provide additional evidence for the candidate to reflect on in Section 4: Evaluation. When describing amendments in section 4(b), candidates should be encouraged to ensure the amendments are appropriate to both the brief and the product.

Candidates should regularly be using sensory testing while carrying out practical work during the course. They should be creating their own test with their choice of sensory characteristics and scale. This will help ensure they understand how to interpret results when it comes to the assignment.

Recipes included should be in realistic proportions and always use metric measurements.

All pages of the assignment should be numbered. This does not have to be typed but could be handwritten — especially if the assignment is printed back-to-back.

Assignments should not be stapled but put in the clear face pocket provided by SQA, with the completed fly leaf at the front.

Grade Boundary and Statistical information:

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2015	943
------------------------------------	-----

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

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	20.3%	20.3%	294	70
B	22.8%	43.1%	331	60
C	27.3%	70.4%	395	50
D	8.1%	78.5%	118	45
No award	21.5%	-	311	0

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.