

Food and Hospitality

2012 Chief Assessor's Report



Government
of South Australia

SACE
Board of SA

FOOD AND HOSPITALITY

2012 CHIEF ASSESSOR'S REPORT

OVERVIEW

Chief Assessors' reports give an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessment in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

It was pleasing to see that teachers of Food and Hospitality in 2012 had demonstrated a clearer understanding of the subject outline and in many cases had prepared exciting and challenging tasks from their assessment plans to address the contemporary nature of the areas of study within the subject. Teacher tasks provided students with valuable opportunities to demonstrate a range of practical skills, supported by relevant planning and research. Many teachers had utilised local and regional resources to provide relevance and interest for students.

Teachers are required to make a balanced assessment for each assessment type, based on the range of grades from each of the assessment design criteria for Food and Hospitality. Use of percentages and weighting of various design criteria is not relevant to the current subject outline.

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity (50%)

Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

Where teachers structured tasks with a well-defined focus on a contemporary issue related to the food and hospitality industry, and scaffolded the task well, students had an opportunity to investigate in depth and show critical analysis. Students who achieved the A grade were able to perceptively critically analyse and investigate the contemporary issue in depth, particularly when the task had a specific focus and required students to look at a range of data to assist in critical analysis. However, many students had difficulty researching to the level and confining their response to the maximum of 500 words. Although the SACE Board has identified opportunities for alternative forms of presentation, written responses were the common choice.

It was pleasing to see a more interesting range of contemporary trends identified through task design. Some teachers selected topics which did not allow for higher-level discussion or in-depth investigation. Some teachers appeared to not embrace the intent of the document and were still asking students to form an opinion. This style of task limited students' ability to analyse the issue and encouraged students to write in the first person. Teachers are encouraged to revisit their assessment plan, and modify tasks where they have continued to ask students to 'form an opinion' on an issue. The research task should provide an opportunity to prepare students to write in the format required for Assessment Type 3: Investigation.

The Internet was relied on heavily for sources of information, often with little relevance to the local setting. Teachers should be aware of breaches of rules in the research section and the subsequent penalties for plagiarism. There was clearly less evidence of primary sources, which is an important aspect in developing critical analysis of the selected issue. Students who achieved a high level of success supported their research with relevant quotes, data, and statistics — with correct acknowledgment — and used a balance of appropriate primary and secondary sources of information.

Referencing was not well formatted, with some students failing to acknowledge sources at all. Sources should be appropriately acknowledged and teachers should prepare students to use footnotes, reference lists, and bibliographies (see specific feature ICA2). Teachers and students should familiarise themselves with current referencing guidelines on the SACE website (www.sace.sa.edu.au).

There were limited examples of how numeracy is addressed in ICA3, although some students used data effectively. Literacy was generally of a high standard, with many students able to comfortably analyse information for relevance and appropriateness.

Action Plan (Problem-solving)

In designing the action plan, teachers should ensure that the format used articulates with the assessment design criteria and performance standards for problem-solving, and that the task addresses the area of study selected. Students need to be presented with a task which allows them to identify and discuss factors that they can problem-solve in relation to the food and hospitality industry (specific feature P1). It is essential for teachers to design tasks focused on contemporary food and hospitality trends, and to make a clear link between the focus in the action plan and the practical application. Where the task was unclear, students had little opportunity to demonstrate success. Most students could identify factors effectively, although many did not address them in the context of food and hospitality.

Students were more successful when they were able to recognise critical factors relevant to the task. The higher-achieving students were discerning in the factors chosen, and were able to strongly link these to the area of study — enabling them to have a clearer understanding of the context. In several classes, students addressed too many factors, and were less astute in their identification and discussion of factors involved in problem-solving. In some cases it was evident that the area of study was not linked to student action plans, as it may not have been clearly identified in the task.

The decision-making about problem-solving and implementation strategies (P2) was usually well done, with students making relevant, astute decisions to support the factors identified. It was noted that the higher-achieving students could make clear, informed decisions based on their research and understanding. For many students, there was generally a weakness in justifying the decision (P3) beyond personal choice. Some students attempted justifications, but often did not connect their writing directly to the factors identified.

Many students identified implementation strategies using dot points, addressing the requirements for their practical, and leaving more of the word-count for identifying and discussing factors at a higher level. Teachers should ensure that implementation strategies relate clearly to the practical implementation and decisions made.

Practical Application

The practical application is designed to make clear links with the research task or decisions contained in the action plan. This year, students were much more focused on providing practical evidence, through annotated photographs as well as written documentation. Where teachers had addressed the intention of the document, and included 'evidence of practical' in the task design, students were supported in providing clear evidence of their work. Many students are submitting comprehensive evidence of their learning that demonstrated many aspects of the practical application against the relevant assessment design criteria. When this was the case, grades awarded for the practical were able to be supported at moderation.

Many students demonstrated a range of evidence to support their learning in areas of technology (PA3) and application of safe food handling (PA4), and, to a lesser extent, evidence of techniques and quality control in preparing and serving food (PA1). Overall, many students presented outstanding evidence of the practical application and were then able to articulate the processes in the evaluation.

Some samples of work showed evidence that some teachers were still using a marking scheme to grade students on their practical work which did not adequately address the current performance standards. Evidence is clearly an important tool in supporting the grade awarded for the practical, as well as assisting students with the evaluation. Teachers are strongly encouraged to incorporate photographic evidence of processes along with the finished product or outcome to address performance standards, so that grades for practical performance can be confirmed.

Individual Evaluation Report

Where the task was structured the task appropriately, students were given the opportunity to not only reflect on their practical application, but make a connection between the decisions contained in the action plan or the key findings in their research (E3). The higher-achieving students were able to write a sophisticated evaluation of processes and outcomes to reflect on the final stage of the practical application, and demonstrated their ability to identify processes behind outcomes. Some students were not supported to reflect on processes and outcomes in detail (E1).

The lower-achieving students engaged heavily in recounting what had happened during the practical and made generalised statements about the outcome. Many students made informed appraisals and some considered relevant connections to the task. Evidence suggests that many students and teachers are using an outdated format to address the assessment design criteria. Technology was not addressed adequately in many reports where specific feature E2 was used. There was often little evidence of an appraisal of sustainable practices or globalisation on the food and hospitality industry. This area must be addressed when E2 is identified on the assessment plan, and should be reflected in the task instructions.

Teachers showed more of an awareness of selecting an appropriate range and combination of specific features to be assessed in the evaluation report. On the whole, students generally wrote honest and reflective reports, but many were still a recount of the practical application, with too many written in the first person. Often there was little connection noted between the research or action plan and the practical.

Teachers are encouraged to guide students to make a considered explanation of these connections, and support students in using the terminology in the performance standards to assist them to address the selected specific features. The task design did not always allow for an in-depth evaluation of contemporary trends related to food and hospitality (E4). Often, students did not reach any conclusion about the trend being investigated in the action plan or research task in relation to their practical application.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity (20%)

Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

The task design for the group activity must address healthy eating practices and it was pleasing to see that most teachers had embraced a healthy eating focus. Without this focus, teachers are unable to assess the assessment design criteria C2. Students generally showed evidence of being able to identify and discuss issues as a group. The word-limit posed a challenge for some groups, with some schools still unaware of the word-limit or identifying it. Time plans could be tabled as student evidence, but these do not need to form part of the word-count for the group plan. It is recommended that teachers revisit the subject outline to familiarise themselves with the intention and outcomes of the group task, and to ensure that the group task has a focus on contemporary trends or issues relating to food and hospitality.

Some schools presented more effective recording of the group plan, and made good use of tables, often clearly stating job roles within the group. Many teachers did not realise that the group plan does not specify justification. It is important that all students have a copy of the group plan in the moderation package, due to the sampling process. Teachers are reminded of the link to an identified area of study. There was little evidence of sustainable practices or globalisation in this task.

When students were able to participate in two group activities, they had a better opportunity of successful achievement against the performance standards. Teachers using only one group task may wish to use the addendum if a student is absent for that task. The range of group activities viewed included lunches and dinners for guests, high teas, and catering activities. It is advisable to present student evidence to support the grade awarded for collaboration.

Where there was little evidence of collaboration, moderators found it difficult to verify the grade awarded. In some packages, evidence of collaboration was difficult to find; for example, no submission of a group plan.

Group Practical Application

Many teachers designed appropriate group activities related to a specific area of study, and with a catering focus. Teachers are reminded to word their group practical application to allow opportunity for students to demonstrate their ability to participate effectively in a team to support healthy eating practices.

Once again, students need to submit clear evidence of the group practical application. Some students did this effectively with photographic evidence, with annotations to explain processes, as well as clear evidence against the performance standards. Some teachers shaded performance standards but there was often no evidence of the practical activity. Some tasks were seen to be very challenging for

the group, particularly large-scale catering events. Overall, student work demonstrated active and thoughtful involvement.

Individual Evaluation Report

Students were able to reflect on their individual processes and outcomes, but evaluation of the group performance was often a struggle for many students. The specific features E1 and E3 were notably addressed more effectively than E2 and E4. Where students were successful in their evaluation, they were very honest in their appraisal of the group and individual performance.

EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

Assessment Type 3: Investigation (30%)

The following comments apply to both the 10-credit and 20-credit subjects. Both require evidence against the same performance standards, as a written report of up to 1000 words for a 10-credit subject and up to 2000 words for a 20-credit subject.

The investigations seen in 2012 addressed a wide range of contemporary issues linked to food and hospitality. The majority of students were successful in completing the investigation against the assessment design criteria for Investigation and Critical Analysis, and Evaluation.

Basing the investigation on a relevant contemporary issue is critical to success in the task as this is directly addressed in the performance standards for Investigation and Critical Analysis. In the more successful responses, students developed a relevant contemporary trend or issue closely related to both food *and* hospitality. It was pleasing to see that many students selected current issues from the media or trends seen in hospitality establishments, or from current food and hospitality industry magazines.

The timing, guidance, and supervision provided to students by teachers throughout the process is crucial in providing verification of student work, as well as assisting them to achieve their potential in this major task. Teacher guidance is particularly important during the planning phase, when students should select relevant issues and develop a clearly stated research question or hypothesis. It was clear that time spent in the planning phase was important to the development of a well-crafted research question or hypothesis which was then linked to students' ability to develop skills of critical analysis. When the answer to a research question is too obvious, it is difficult for students to achieve perceptive and well-considered depth in their response.

Students are encouraged to make a direct link between their research question or hypothesis and a selected area of study. The better investigations reflected a clear understanding of how the relevant issue related to the area of study, supporting students to make clear and direct links to food *and* hospitality. Topics that were not linked to an area of study tended to be addressed in a more superficial manner. While most issues were relevant to food, some students made no link to hospitality, and chose topics based wholly on areas such as nutrition or farming. It is critical that students link their investigation to the food *and* hospitality industry in order to address the performance standards comprehensively.

Originality should be encouraged and it was pleasing to see within classes that the cohort had addressed a wide range of issues. While duplication of topics is not prohibited in the subject outline, it can suggest that students are not aware of the range of issues possible, or are not willing to investigate independently.

The stronger introductions provided a clear outline of the scope of the task and gave a good indication of the focus for the research. The majority of students developed guiding or focusing questions which provided a clear direction for their investigation. The better focusing questions offered depth and scope for critical analysis, as well as the opportunity for the topic to be addressed from a range of perspectives. This enabled students to develop their argument in depth, and facilitated a higher level of integration of primary and secondary research. Focusing questions should be limited in number to encourage a greater depth in responses. The majority of students used their focusing questions as headings which encouraged inquiry and analysis, rather than presenting slabs of information. A few investigations showed basic description of one or more contemporary trends, often caused by the narrow focus of a topic. Where students selected too many focusing questions (five or six) they were not able to provide the depth of investigation and analysis required by the performance standards to achieve at a higher level.

It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of students utilised primary and secondary data effectively. While it can be challenging for students to access suitable primary research information, many were creative and accessed relevant material through email or blogs. Reliance on internet sources was very strong and formed the basis of evidence for some students, which often limited students' ability to examine the topic thoroughly. Using only websites as a basis for discussion tended to limit students' ability to analyse their issue and evaluate it successfully. Where internet sources are heavily used, students should demonstrate a discerning approach to relevant and appropriate sites; for instance, taking care not to use data from American sites and then suggesting that the information applies to food and hospitality in Australian settings. Students should also aim to be objective in the presentation of findings. Higher-level investigations often use highly relevant information that directly relates to a local context. This encourages analysis at the highest level.

In the higher-level investigations, it was clear that students had formulated surveys that were highly relevant to their issue and focusing questions, and had distributed them to a range of interested people. The use of relevant primary sources enhanced students' ability to demonstrate the assessment design criteria at a high level. Some students attempted surveys that were not relevant enough or sufficiently broad to be useful. For many students the sample group was limited or not from an appropriate background, and these shortcomings were often not recognised. A number of students were unable to effectively discuss the relevance or appropriateness of their findings throughout the investigation. Students who relied heavily on personal opinion or loose generalisations that were not substantiated by credible sources were hindered from successfully addressing the specific features of investigation and critical analysis. Some students summarised their survey results as part of the discussion, instead of including these results to support an opinion or to develop an argument. A few students included their survey in an appendix, without discussing their findings. Appendices are not required and should not be included. In the more successful papers, students discussed survey results thoroughly and used both primary and secondary data to address a range of perspectives. Where students

gave examples in support of discussion or statements, their points were more relevant and original.

The majority of students used visual data well, and this aided their ability to demonstrate analysis. Students must be discerning in their selection of data and facts. Where graphs and tables were used successfully, they were well presented and used to enhance discussion. Graphs are not needed when very limited variables are compared. Students are advised not to use several shades of the one colour in graphs as it is very difficult to distinguish between them. Contrasting colours or patterns should be used. Students should avoid using unnecessary images in their investigation. Where images are used, they should be clearly labelled and referred to in discussion.

Referencing was generally done well, adding credibility and authenticity to research. In some papers factual information was included in the discussion without reference to sources. This often made it difficult to determine the extent of the use of supporting evidence, and made it unclear whether information was personal opinion or based on actual research. Some investigations made extensive use of quotes (frequently too long and lacking adequate discussion), which showed little evidence of 'the student voice'. Teachers and students should familiarise themselves with SACE Board referencing guidelines. Students should ensure a list of both primary and secondary sources is included in their bibliography.

Students are encouraged to think broadly when concluding their study and to be mindful of not repeating what has already been said in exactly the same language. Although many students were able to analyse information and draw relevant conclusions without the inclusion of new data and quotes, some students summarised information presented rather than presenting a range of conclusions based on research. In the higher-achieving responses, students were able to refer back to their original research question or hypothesis to make strong connections and draw the investigation together.

The vast majority of investigations were well structured and demonstrated a high level of literacy, although a lack of proofreading was sometimes evident. It was pleasing to see most investigations were close to the word-limit of 2000 words, with fewer students writing in excess of this. However, some students wrote brief investigations or did not complete the task, thus limiting their opportunity to achieve success in the subject. Where word-counts were low, issues were often not adequately explored. Students are encouraged to include the word-count on the front cover of their paper. Students are also reminded to be aware of choosing an appropriate font for presentation of their work.

Students and teachers are reminded that the correct terminology for the external assessment task in Food and Hospitality is 'Investigation'.

Students should be careful to de-identify their work, and avoid using student and teacher names, or their school's name.

Teachers should carefully follow the guidelines for conducting the study, and familiarise themselves with the SACE Board guidelines relating to the supervision and verification of students' work. Teachers and students are reminded of rules relating to plagiarism and the consequent penalties for students who breach these rules.

The in-depth investigations demonstrated a depth of understanding and perceptive critical analysis of contemporary issues related to food and hospitality, effectively addressing the performance standards at a high level. Teachers are advised to check the subject outline and support materials on the SACE Board website for information to support their students in completing this task.

OPERATIONAL ADVICE

Packaging and presentation of materials for final moderation was an issue for some teachers. Separation of student work into Assessment Type 1 and Assessment Type 2 often did not always occur, although Assessment Type 2 samples were generally easily identifiable.

Teachers should familiarise themselves with the requirements for the subject throughout the year from the Food and Hospitality subject operational information. School-assessed work should be packaged in separate packages for Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity and Assessment Type 2: Group Activity, as they are moderated separately. Materials should be selected for the students identified according to the SACE Board selection process for the collection of materials.

Some teachers were unaware that they could change the details on the learning and assessment plan using the addendum. However, all teachers should be aware that the minimum number of tasks for a 20-credit course is *seven*. Teachers must include an approved learning and assessment plan with their package. Teachers should strongly encourage students to remove food orders, recipes, drafts, and other material which is not required in the assessment process. Individual student tasks should be stapled, together with a detailed task sheet and performance standards appropriately shaded to show grades awarded. Plastic folders and sleeves are not required for individual student tasks.

Chief Assessor
Food and Hospitality