2022 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2022 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 relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

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

School Assessment

When teachers are reviewing their tasks for 2023 in line with the Subject Outline, they should make a strong connection throughout the task to the selected 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 most relevant specific features for each task in-depth.

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

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

Teachers addressed current issues including economic and environmental sustainability, minimisation of food waste and food bank programs and the influence and role of social media in promoting food and hospitality issues and venues. Political and legal aspects of the industry were common issues addressed through food safety standards and industry responses to Covid19.

The more successful responses commonly:

* linked their response to a selected area of study, not only in the introduction, but throughout the research
* responded to appropriately challenging tasks which allowed for higher order thinking skills, and enabled students to use relevant industry examples to support their discussion
* discussed issues holistically and demonstrated relevant critical analysis of the topic
* selected appropriate diagrams, images, graphs, quotes and statistics that were referred to in-text and correctly labelled, ably addressing literacy and numeracy in ICA3.

The less successful responses commonly:

* struggled to address the selected area of study which should have provided a supporting theme or framework for the task
* demonstrated little evidence of planning the written task and limited utilization of relevant sources
* struggled to address the task within the word limit when multiple areas of study were selected, consequently losing focus
* provided a description of trends (when this was the focus) rather than a detailed critical analysis
* struggled to provide evidence of effective research and added personal opinions together with their own experiences without supporting references.

Action Plan (Problem-solving)

The Action Plan was generally an effective process for 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.

Examples of tasks included: ‘A signature dessert suitable for a function centre’, ‘Quality cupcakes worthy of being sold commercially or on-line’, ‘Sustainable produce to sell at local farmers’ markets’.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a well-designed task with clear instructions, linking the selected area of study and main point of the task to the Planning and Practical Application
* selected highly relevant issues, with strong connections to the food and hospitality industry
* provided evidence to explain and link their choice of menu to their planning
* explained how the decision was a suitable choice of practical against the issues identified
* provided detailed justification of issues to support the menu selection followed with a clear implementation relating to the practical application.

The less successful responses commonly:

* submitted an investigation as their Action Plan which hindered the ability to address the assessment design criteria of problem solving
* attempted to discuss multiple issues which were not possible to address adequately within the word limit
* listed issues/factors in the planning which tended to be generic without specific discussion or link to the area of study or topic selected
* appeared to have decided on a recipe or dish and then tried to align it to the task instead of using the issues as a basis for selection
* used a template for presenting their planning, resulting in limited discussion of issues as subheadings in the template were either inconsistent with wording in the subject outline or students repeated concepts from one column to the next.

Practical Application

The practical application was an outstanding feature in the majority of schools with evidence of high quality food presentation. Practical evidence is an important feature of the practical task and should be included to allow students to demonstrate the specific features being assessed in their practical activity. Some schools incorporated tasks such as: seasonal foods for contemporary menus, foods for mobile food trucks, signature desserts, celebration cakes and foods for tasting platters. A few schools experimented with Indigenous Australian ingredients, providing students with an opportunity to combine unique ingredients to demonstrate creativity, with a focus on sustainability.

The more successful responses commonly:

* presented creative practical activities, demonstrating a high level of technical skill and a link to the food and hospitality industry
* included detailed practical evidence linked directly to specific features selected from the assessment design criteria of practical application
* provided examples of clear images of products made and processes undertaken to achieve the product i.e. different steps or stages photographed and clearly annotated
* used a range of innovative technology similar to that used in industry to present elements of the task and demonstrate a wide range of skills when PA3 was selected (e.g. blast chillers, combi ovens, 3D printers).

The less successful responses commonly:

* displayed minimal practical evidence
* demonstrated a simple task with a minimal range of skills which didn’t align to the identified area of study
* Presented a task that did not involve using food to demonstrate practical skills and therefore didn’t meet the essence of the practical activity not demonstrate the specific features of the practical task
* selected a food product which didn’t fit the assignment brief
* showed weaknesses in processes carried out, with limited evidence of management of time or effective use of technology.

Individual Evaluation Report

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

While most students capably reflected on the processes and outcomes against E1, E3 and E4 were often limited in scope. The Assessment design criteria E2 should be explicitly outlined in the task to support students in addressing the focus of E2.

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed evidence of successful reflection and depth of evaluation
* demonstrated strong links to the research or planning when E3 was identified in the task
* reflected on their performance with a concise but strong discussion on practical outcomes, supported with clear understanding of processes
* provided detailed responses on how the final product linked to the task, together with relevant suggestions for improvement.

The less successful responses commonly:

* struggled to achieve success when the task was scaffolded with instructions that didn’t align with the specific features selected
* followed a teacher directed format with specific headings, limiting opportunities to address specific features of the task at higher levels
* addressed processes and outcomes but struggled to reflect on contemporary trends or the area of study
* addressed E1, E2, E3 and E4 within the one task, limiting opportunities to reflect on practical outcomes at a higher level
* provided a summary of processes for completing the practical activity by presenting a recount of issues rather than a reflective discussion.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

Evidence of healthy eating practices was a pleasing feature of the group activities in 2022. It was encouraging to see that most teachers had designed group activities which engaged students with a manageable task and one which involved the local community. However due to Covid19 restrictions many schools adapted activities to fulfill a catering role within the school. Examples of themes for this task ranged from: ‘finger food for an evening art/drama performance’, ‘Individual lunch box meals for a sports day’, ‘food delivery boxes for a community venture’ and ‘presentation of food for a high tea function’

The more successful responses commonly:

* achieved success through selection of a smaller event rather than a large catering exercise, accommodating the skill level and experience of group members
* showed depth of understanding of the task requirement by addressing the specific features P1 and P2
* presented a detailed outline of what each group member was to complete, tabling allocation of roles
* demonstrated strong links in the discussion to support healthy eating practices, followed by a practical task based on an appropriate menu, linked to the selected area of study

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked an area of study focus and showed insufficient evidence of planning, with limited identification and discussion of issues
* overlooked the healthy eating focus in the planning and selection of the group practical task
* selected a task which was too challenging for the class size and/or skill level of students
* used a table format to address decision-making and justification, inflating word count.

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 assessment design criteria. Many schools planned activities to address Covid19 restrictions in serving meals to guests and presented food as a take-away option rather than serving meals to guests.

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* demonstrated outstanding quality in practical tasks to support local community events or in-house catering exercises, validated with appropriate evidence
* addressed healthy eating practices in both food selection and preparation
* demonstrated use of a range of innovative technologies
* showed outstanding practical evidence of group preparation and serving of the actual food for the group task.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited practical evidence of processes and outcomes against selected specific features
* 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
* struggled to show sufficient visual and annotated evidence of the practical activity to support the grade awarded.

Collaboration

Collaboration (C1 and C2) is intended to be used within Group Tasks. 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:

* provided detailed evidence of the group practical activity, including quality written comments and images relating to their teamwork
* provided examples of leadership at the decision-making, planning, trials and production and service of healthy food for the targeted group
* captured evidence of collaboration with images and documentation of planning and preparation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* showed limited evidence of leadership and discussion to support a collaborative approach
* selected a practical activity which did not support healthy eating practices in the planning and discussions to support healthy eating practices
* demonstrated limited visual and written evidence to support collaboration

Individual Evaluation Report

The only individual component of the Group Activity is the Evaluation Report.

Students were more successful in reflecting on individual processes and outcomes, but many struggled with evaluating the effectiveness of the group performance.

*The more successful responses:*

* reflected on their individual performance and that of the group, linking their task to healthy eating and the area of study selected as well as incorporating guest reviews and feedback
* used the word allocation effectively to evaluate the task, showing analysis in reflection, together with relevant improvements and conclusions
* capably addressed healthy eating, from the planning and menu decision, through to the practical application and final presentation
* articulated their own performance and that of the group with a concise but strong reflection on the practical application, supported with clear discussion of processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level.

The less successful responses:

* did not address the aspect of healthy eating when it was not a key focus in the instructions for the task
* provided an account of what happened during preparation and serving rather than addressing their performance at the individual and group level and other specific features as identified in the task
* failed to demonstrate their collaboration in either the evaluation or evidence in the practical outcomes
* addressed the success or otherwise of their own efforts but failed to adequately reflect on the group performance
* showed difficulty in evaluating the effectiveness of the task when all specific features for evaluation were selected.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

ICA 1: Investigation and critical analysis of contemporary trends and/or issues related to the Food and Hospitality Industry.

The selection of an appropriate contemporary issue for the investigation is critically important for success. It is essential that students choose an issue that is clearly linked to the food and hospitality industry and links to one of the Stage 2 Food and Hospitality Areas of Study from the subject outline.

It was pleasing to see students address a wide range of local content contemporary issues affecting the food and hospitality industry. While the impact of Covid-19 on the food and hospitality industry is still significant, students covered a range of different perspectives in relation to this topic, such as how businesses were recovering, what changes had been made to their practices/processes/menus (e.g. food safety and delivery) to ensure their businesses can remain viable and competitive in the industry. A number of students followed up contemporary local issues and trends such as regional food security, availability and food prices and the impact it is having on what’s available on hospitality menus. Other issues such as the impact of single use plastic bans, the use of social media in the industry, management of waste, ghost kitchens, hospitality in aged care facilities, bushfood and farm to table locally sourced foods remained popular and were embedded in topics investigated by students.

In assisting students to identify areas of interest, brainstorming current local, national or global issues from information gathered through the media, guest speakers, industry visits etc is an effective strategy to provide a broad picture of potential areas of investigation. Students are encouraged 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 and an area of study from the Stage 2 Food and Hospitality subject outline throughout the paper
* refined and focussed the issue to ensure the research scope wasn’t too broad and developed 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 and present a balanced discussion
* used a variety of research methods to inform their argument with all methods reflected in their reference list
* developed a response to their original research question or hypothesis
* considered all sides of collected data and analysed conflicting data (that was non biased)
* supported claims with evidence from various sources, made their own predictions and presented recommendations based on both primary and secondary data.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on topics rather than issues or were not linked to an Area of Study in the Food and Hospitality subject outline
* 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
* focussed on a food topic but did not make a link to the food and hospitality industry, for example issues related to food ethics
* 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
* used ‘What’ as a question stem for all three focus questions-not allowing for higher level critical thinking/analysis to occur
* had written three focus questions but only one or two were linked to the original topic question or hypotheses
* included pictures/tables/graphs that were not related to the topic and/or weren’t linked back to the topic through the body of the investigation
* presented obvious information that didn’t require any analysis, such as the history of Covid, nutritional content of fast food and daily nutritional requirements.

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 sources appropriately and used a variety of research methods to inform their argument with all methods reflected in their reference list
* used relevant images to support discussion and referenced these appropriately.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used focus questions that prompted descriptive rather than analytical writing
* presented information only showing research rather than analysis
* used survey results to validate points inappropriately for example a survey of the public may be used to gauge opinion but does not reflect expert evidence
* 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
* used resources that were not the most relevant (e.g. statistics from other countries so the information did not connect to the claim or point being made)
* 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
* relied on one or two sources of information only and generalised points from these sources
* wrote from a personal perspective rather than based on research
* made limited links to the food and hospitality industry even though the broad topic selected was focussed on food
* utilised data without analysing or discussing the information presented.

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

The most successful responses commonly:

* structured their response in a way that enabled a logical and clear flow of information without repetition
* 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).
* wrote in the third person and didn’t give personal opinions
* were written using nominalised language
* used linking sentences in paragraphs to relate back to the topic and focus questions
* used formal language
* showed good use of sentence starters.

The least successful responses commonly:

* contained spelling or grammatical errors which could reflect a lack of proofreading and 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
* used casual language and features such as pictures that weren’t related back to the narrative in the body of the work.

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

The most 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 least 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
* presented information in tables which showed research but not analysis, and created a discrepancy in the accuracy of the word count
* lacked a conclusion
* struggled to link the conclusion to the original question or hypothesis.