2020 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2020 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the subject outline for Food and Hospitality. It provides information and advice regarding Assessment types, the application of Performance Standards in both school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the 2021 subject outline for specifications regarding content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

School Assessment

In 2020 teachers were provided with an opportunity to reduce the number of tasks in line with changes introduced by the SACE Board due to COVID-19. It was noted that most teachers reduced the number of tasks for students and were quite flexible in changing or reducing tasks due to resources and facilities available at the time. Overall, there was no real concern regarding the impact of COVID-19 on the quality of student work including practical activities.

When teachers are reviewing their tasks in line with the subject outline for 2021, they should make a strong connection throughout the task to the identified area of study and the food and hospitality industry. Where teachers continue using an approved learning and assessment plan (LAP), they are encouraged to reduce the number of assessment design criteria in tasks to support students to explore the specific features for each task in-depth.

When teachers are considering a plus or minus grade, careful judgement should be made when making a decision, based on the balance of shading either side of the main grade band.

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

A range of interesting and contemporary issues were presented to students in 2020, with a noticeable increase highlighting local produce embedded in topics. Examples of popular industry trends included tapas, high teas, chilled desserts, multicultural dishes, veganism, healthy food trends, and the impact of social media on food trends. All research tasks should have an industry focus.

Examples of research tasks were:

* ‘To what extent are local restaurants responding to current trends of inclusion of local sustainable foods on their menus?’
* ‘Investigate and critically analyse the impact of social media and its influence on the local food and hospitality industry’.

Teachers should ensure research tasks meet the requirements of the subject outline and provide a statement or question that is manageable for students to demonstrate investigation and critical analysis within the local food and hospitality industry.

The more successful responses commonly:

* enabled students to display higher order thinking skills and address the performance standards at the high end when a current contemporary issue was identified as the focus of the task
* had clear connections to an identified area of study within the food and hospitality industry
* enabled students to demonstrate perceptive critical analysis of the contemporary issue when provided with an issue which allowed for differing points of view
* showed discernment in the use of the Internet, selecting a range of relevant primary and secondary sources of information
* used correct in-text referencing and a reference list to support analysis in the higher grade bands
* used selected quotes, data and statistics and subject specific terminology; ably satisfying literacy and numeracy skills in ICA3
* presented their task within the word count.

The less successful responses commonly:

* posed difficulty for students when the issue did not have a clear industry focus
* relied heavily on the Internet, with little relevance to the local setting
* showed very few sources or inaccurate acknowledgement of sources e.g. URL addresses
* used footnotes which were not formatted correctly
* showed inadequate discussion and analysis and little evidence of the student voice
* failed to use any statistical information or data, or quotes to demonstrate critical investigation.

Action Plan (Problem-solving)

The action plan was generally an effective process in planning the practical activity, allowing students to demonstrate problem-solving.

When teachers linked the task to an appropriate area of study, and were discerning in the selection of specific features, students had a better opportunity to discuss relevant factors to assist them in their decision-making, followed by justification and documentation of implementation strategies for their chosen practical. A clearly worded task without too many complicated factors allowed students to address specific features at a higher level.

One area which students often overlooked was the justification of their decision for the menu selection.

Examples of tasks presented in 2020:

* ‘Show your understanding of the impact of weekend markets on the local economy by developing a contemporary version of a traditional weekend market dish’.
* ‘Plan, prepare and present an entrée or main that reflects predicted food trends, and is suitable for inclusion on an A la carte menu to showcase the true taste of South Australia’.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a well-designed task, selecting highly relevant issues with strong connections to the food and hospitality industry
* demonstrated astute discussion of issues, leading students to make well-informed decisions regarding a suitable practical activity
* provided detailed justification of issues to support the menu selection, and relevant implementation strategies to support the practical application
* followed with a clear implementation plan relating to the processes to be carried out for the practical application

The less successful responses commonly:

* used background research as their introduction to the task, disadvantaging students in writing in-depth about the selected issues
* recalled issues in a series of dot points almost word for word from the actual task
* struggled to complement their plan with a suitable practical activity when the task design was too complex
* used a template for the action plan, proposed by the teacher. This caused limited discussion of issues as subheadings in the template were often unrelated to the selected area of study.

Practical Application

The practical application was an improved feature of the course across the majority of schools with an incredible range of industry standard food presented. Many examples of contemporary food products were a pleasure to view. Although student evidence was an outstanding feature of the work presented in 2020, the final product must be a feature of the visual evidence.

Many schools planned tasks for students in pairs or small groups, providing opportunities for them to achieve success at a higher standard in their practical work.

The overall grade for the practical application must reflect the grade awarded for the specific features selected. Most teachers provided clear evidence in shading the performance standards as well as a general comment to support the grade awarded.

Teachers should present students with a separate performance standards record sheet for each practical task assessed, to provide them with clear feedback on features to be assessed.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated an outstanding level of management throughout the task, with strong evidence of productive and efficient use of technology in the preparation and service of food
* selected challenging recipes — based on a complex range of processes and skills of industry standard
* achieved success when they presented no more than two pages of annotated evidence (not just a recount of what happened)
* used the SACE student evidence sheet to clearly identify how they had met the processes for the practical application, e.g. demonstrating efficient organisation and quality control to industry standards, as well as capturing evidence of final plating or presentation
* showed clear evidence of how food hygiene and kitchen safety were addressed.

The less successful responses commonly:

* showed minimal or no visual evidence of the final product or presentation, relying on brief written comments
* demonstrated limited ability to address the selected assessment design criteria for the planned practical activity
* completed simple recipes, often based on pre-made sauces or pastries to simplify techniques
* selected practical products which didn’t link to the task, (e.g. healthy food — students selected deep fried pastries)
* showed weaknesses in the processes carried out, as well as limited ability to demonstrate time management, effective use of technology and safe food handling.

Individual Evaluation Report

It was evident that most teachers had reduced the number of specific features per task, allowing students to address the criteria in greater depth.

While most students capably reflected on the processes and outcomes against E1, E3 and E4 were often limited in scope. E2 (technology) should be explicitly outlined in the task if it is to be addressed in this report.

The more successful responses commonly:

* presented a concise reflection on the practical application, supported with clear articulation of processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level
* demonstrated clear links to the research or the planning when E3 was identified in the task
* provided detailed responses on how the final product linked to the task, detailing clear strengths and weaknesses together with relevant suggestions for improvement
* reflected explicitly on the use of technology when this was a feature of the task, e.g. the outcomes when using technology in food preparation
* explained how the selected practical linked to contemporary trends and the area of study identified in the task.

The less successful responses commonly:

* followed a teacher directed format with specific headings, limiting opportunities to address specific features of the task at higher levels
* provided a recount of what happened during the practical, often outlining mistakes made and consequent results
* reflected on all specific features within the one task, limiting opportunities to reflect on practical outcomes in depth
* focussed on processes and outcomes but failed to link with planning or research, and related contemporary trends
* provided a brief summary of processes for completing the practical activity.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

It was encouraging to see that teachers had engaged students in designing a range of group activities for local communities considering COVID-19 restrictions. Most schools approached the challenge of the group activity with a task based on and ‘in-house’ activity. Common examples observed were dinners, morning teas, food trucks, lunches etc. Healthy eating practices were commonly addressed across group activities, with evidence in group planning, collaboration and evaluation of the task.

All students within the group must be awarded the same grade for planning, and each member of the group must submit a copy of the group plan. Teachers should assess this part of the task using only specific features P1 and P2.

When the highest grade level (A+) is awarded for the group activity, there must be clear evidence to support an A grade in all areas of the task.

The more successful responses commonly:

* challenged students to plan a local community function with a hospitality focus
* achieved success through planning a small-scale event rather than a large catering activity
* presented a detailed plan focussing on an issue, clearly tabling roles and responsibilities of group members
* provided evidence to support Healthy eating practices, supported by a practical task based on a healthy menu
* integrated teamwork as an integral part of planning, supported by visual and written evidence
* defined clear work plans and detailed roles, presented in table format.

The less successful responses commonly:

* selected a catering task which was too challenging for the class size and/or skill level of students
* showed insufficient evidence of planning, lacking clear action with limited identification and discussion of issues
* overlooked or misinterpreted the healthy eating focus
* used a table format to address justification and decision-making, inflating word count
* failed to provide delegated roles within the group
* described what action each group member would carry out in planning.

Group Practical Application

Each student should submit clear evidence of the practical application. Most students did this effectively with selected images and annotations to explain processes against the selected performance standards.

Some examples of group practical activities from 2020 included:

* a contemporary food truck reflecting multi-cultural food choices
* a 3-course meal for 10 members of the school staff
* morning tea take-away boxes for local school staff
* a pop-up market menu for a community event outdoors to support healthy eating practices.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated outstanding quality in practical tasks to support local community events or large catering exercises
* managed catering activities effectively by dividing the activity into sections for students within a whole class
* addressed healthy eating practices in preparing challenging recipes to reflect trends
* demonstrated use of a wide range of newer technologies, leading to improved food presentation
* demonstrated individual tasks that were of high quality through clear visual and written evidence.

The less successful responses commonly:

* selected basic menus which limited opportunities for students to demonstrate a range of practical skills expected at Stage 2 and/or produce foods with a healthy eating focus
* reflected a low standard of presentation with little practical evidence
* resulted in poor management due to student absence and/or lack of prior practice of skills and use of equipment
* failed to supply sufficient visual and annotated evidence of the practical activity.

Collaboration

Teachers may need to review ways of collecting evidence of the group performance when the task is in progress, as students showed a lack of understanding of how to provide evidence of collaboration.

Without the focus on healthy eating, teachers are unable to make a valid assessment against the specific feature C2.

The more successful responses commonly:

* addressed healthy eating effectively in the planning and menu decision to satisfy C2
* showed clear evidence of discussion to support the collaboration grade awarded
* captured evidence of collaboration with images and preparation lists.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited visual and/or written evidence to support collaboration
* selected a practical activity which did not support healthy eating practices.

Individual Evaluation Report

The only individual component of the group activity is the Individual Evaluation Report.

Students were more successful in reflecting on individual processes and outcomes, but many struggled with evaluating the effectiveness of the group performance. It was clear in many evaluation reports that some group members were absent or did not fulfil their team roles adequately.

The more successful responses:

* showed clear reflections on evidence of collaboration and strong links to the healthy eating focus
* captured an honest appraisal of group and individual performances, addressing the specific features selected for the task
* reflected on issues addressed in their group decision-making prior to the practical
* capably reflected on both group and personal performance
* suggested improvements that were clearly justified
* captured the essence of the assessment design criteria selected for the task.

The less successful responses:

* presented a recount of what happened, often only addressing what worked and what didn’t
* addressed the success or otherwise of their own efforts but failed to adequately reflect on the group performance
* discussed the inability of group members to cooperate
* struggled with suggestions for improvement, or failed to suggest any improvements
* struggled to evaluate the task effectively when all specific features for evaluation were selected.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

ICA1: Investigation and critical analysis of contemporary trends and/or issues related to the food and hospitality industry

It was pleasing to see students address a range of contemporary local issues affecting the food and hospitality industry. The impact of COVID-19 on the food and hospitality industry was a strong area of interest, which different students covered across a range of perspectives such as the impact on food safety and hygiene through to strategies used by businesses to remain viable. Other issues such as sustainability, ethical eating and the management of waste remained popular and were embedded in topics covered by students.

In assisting students to identify areas of interest, brainstorming current local, national, or global issues is an effective strategy to provide a broad picture of potential areas for investigation and encourage students to develop original ideas and individual perspectives.

The more successful responses commonly:

* selected an issue with a clear link to an area of study from the subject outline, and this was documented or explained in the introduction providing an effective strategy to assist students to focus their investigation
* articulated and maintained a clear, strong and direct link to the food and hospitality industry
* provided a clear hypothesis or research question
* developed clear and relevant focus questions, enabling a focussed and structured response to the research question or hypothesis
* demonstrated that students had selected more open-type questions, which enabled them to show greater depth and analysis, such as a ‘to what extent’ type of question to compare a balanced view of information and develop an argument
* were able to show critical analysis by linking key ideas and comparing and contrasting information from different sources; often students presented information from secondary sources as a context or basis for discussion
* provided local examples that enabled students to provide relevant and focused information, adding depth to their investigation
* showed the ability to think critically by thoroughly analysing data and information; in these papers students tended to offer reasons for data or results after comparing and contrasting findings
* were able to show depth and breadth of research by considering the perspectives of all key stakeholders, which allowed students to further develop their argument.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on topics rather than issues
* had unclear or only superficial links to the food and hospitality industry, for example diet related disease where the research focussed on nutrition rather than how the food and hospitality is responding, or an analysis of beverages, again with the focus on nutritional data
* were not strongly or clearly linked to an area of study and did not use focussing or guiding questions to provide structure
* were broadly focused rather than identifying with local situations
* based their investigation on closed-type questions, with the answers to these questions obvious before they began, leaving little opportunity for valid discussion and analysis
* used focus questions that were too broad or were not clearly linked to the overall research question or hypothesis.

ICA2: Analysis of information for relevance and appropriateness, with appropriate acknowledgement of sources

The more successful responses commonly:

* incorporated survey or interview results that were synthesised, clearly presented, and used with secondary research to inform findings
* presented relevant research showing views from a range of perspectives or stakeholders
* utilised the views of experts, whether from primary or secondary sources, and explained the persons position or area of expertise as this added depth and credibility to their findings
* structured analysis and discussion around focus questions this assisted in providing a clear structure for the presentation and discussion of research
* added depth by analysing data, interpreting and discussing the implication of results. These students also often interpreted and analysed graphical information which enhanced their discussion
* used quotes succinctly, offering pertinent evidence followed by relevant and well-explained examples to demonstrate analysis while maintaining student voice
* incorporated photos to support discussion and analysis of information
* were discerning in the use of internet sources. Data which is related to a local context such as online menus, blogs and reviews may be more effective than data from international settings which may not apply to local food and hospitality settings
* referenced their sources appropriately.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented a breakdown of survey results with no discussion. This was also evident where students used too many quotes without analysing their meaning
* conducted surveys with peers which did not allow depth or analysis, or did not allow for appropriate collection of data, for example surveying peers on changes in patterns of fine dining
* indicated surveys or interviews had been conducted, but these were not used
* outlined interview responses in question and answer style, without any discussion or analysis of results.

ICA3: Application of literacy and numeracy skills, and use of appropriate terminology

The more successful responses commonly:

* appeared to have carefully drafted and proofread their work, presenting a logical flow of ideas with minimum repetition
* had clearly presented visual data, such as graphs, that were well labelled and explained, which ensured the information gleaned was analysed and clearly referred to in the body of the report
* ensured that information contained in graphs was clear and easy to read (not too small).

The less successful responses commonly:

* contained spelling or grammatical errors which detracted from the flow of ideas
* included visual information that was not referred to, making it unclear what inference should be made from data
* did not include any numerical data or statistical information.

E4: Evaluation of contemporary trends and/or issues related to the food and hospitality industry in different settings

The more successful responses commonly:

* evaluated evidence throughout their investigation, in addition to analysing findings in the conclusion. Students who did this tended to have a clear and in-depth final conclusion
* showed insight and depth in the conclusion, often suggesting implications or offering future solutions
* explicitly addressed their main issue and research questions and reflected on results
* clearly stated and adhered to the 2000-word limit for a 20-credit subject.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented a short conclusion
* summarised and recounted, rather than demonstrating an in-depth evaluation of the issue related to the food and hospitality industry
* reflected on the success or limitations of their research
* occasionally stated new findings.