2021 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2021 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 for Food and Hospitality. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in both school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the 2022 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 in line with the Subject Outline for 2022, 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, minimizing wastage, use of fresh and seasonal produce. Examples of popular industry trends were: Menus using Indigenous foods, sustainability and the local food supply, contemporary trends in dining, the role of social media in promoting food and hospitality venues and the use of seasonal foods on local menus.

Political and legal aspects of the industry were addressed through food safety standards and Covid19 prevention, restrictions, and management.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included concise but well-constructed assessment tasks, identifying one specific issue posed as a question or statement, directly supported by an area of study.
* enabled students to demonstrate perceptive critical analysis of the contemporary issue when provided with a clear issue that allowed for discussion of the selected specific features in-depth within the word count.
* responded to challenging tasks which allowed for higher order thinking skills, and enabled students to use relevant industry examples to support their discussion.
* included a rich variety of appropriate resources, current (within recent years) and referenced with a consistent referencing system
* selected appropriate diagrams, images, graphs, quotes, statistics etc. that were referred to in-text and correctly labelled, ably satisfying literacy and numeracy in ICA3.

The less successful responses commonly:

* struggled to achieve at the higher level when the issue did not have a current food and hospitality industry focus
* relied heavily on the Internet, with little or no examples to support the analysis
* 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
* demonstrated limited understanding and unpacking of the issue when it was presented in a format that was inconsistent with the subject outline
* overlooked a connection with the area of study identified in the task
* used footnotes which were not formatted correctly.

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 and on-line’, ‘Sustainable produce to sell at local farmers’ markets to meet legislated food safety standards’.

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a well-designed task addressing the wording from the subject outline, with clear links to an area of study in regard to the planning and practical application
* selected highly relevant issues identified in the task outline, with strong connections to the food and hospitality industry
* explained how the decision was a suitable choice of practical against the issues identified.
* demonstrated astute discussion of issues, leading students to make well-informed decisions regarding a suitable practical activity
* identified and discussed appropriate technology in their problem-solving
* 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:

* demonstrated limited understanding of the factors and therefore struggled to complement their planning with a suitable practical task
* 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.
* briefly outlined factors with limited connection or understanding of the assessment task, sometimes referring to generic factors such as time management or Year 12 standard which did not relate to the area of study
* frequently restated the task, and then had difficulty making strong connections with key issues in the task within the word count, if written.

Practical Application

The practical application was an outstanding feature in the majority of schools with evidence of high quality, industry-standard 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 foods 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 native Australian ingredients, providing students with an opportunity to combine unique ingredients to demonstrate creativity, with a focus on sustainability and a representation of Indigenous foods.

The more successful responses commonly:

* selected a challenging task — based on a complex range of skills and of industry standard, linked to their planning or research and area of study
* captured clear and detailed practical evidence through images and annotations, linked directly to the assessment design criteria
* demonstrated outstanding techniques and on-going quality control when PA1 and PA2 were features of the task
* used a range of innovative technology similar to that used in industry to present many elements of the task and demonstrate a wide range of skills when PA3 was selected e.g. blast chillers, combi ovens, 3D printers
* presented strong evidence of safe-food handling when PA4 was a feature of the task.
* provided clear evidence of the final plating or presentation to demonstrate quality control and success.

The less successful responses commonly:

* selected simple recipes with a minimal range of skills which did not align to the identified area of study or meet the selected assessment design criteria
* demonstrated simple practical tasks with minimal skills together with poor student evidence, awarding higher grades than was justified
* presented a task that did not involve using food to demonstrate practical skills and therefore didn’t meet the essence of the practical activity nor demonstrate the specific features of the practical task
* showed weaknesses in the processes carried out, as well as limited ability to manage time, use a range of technology and demonstrate safe food handling.

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:

* presented a concise reflection on the practical application, supported with clear articulation of processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level
* demonstrated strong 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
* explained how the selected practical linked to contemporary trends and the area of study identified in the task
* reflected explicitly on the use of technology when this was a feature of the task, i.e. the outcomes when using technology in food preparation.

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
* addressed E1, E2, E3 and E4 within the one task, limiting opportunities to reflect on practical outcomes at a higher level
* addressed processes and outcomes but failed to reflect on contemporary trends or the area of study
* 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 2021. 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.

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:

* engaged and challenged students, involving a local community function with a healthy eating focus
* achieved success through selection of a smaller event rather than a large catering exercise, accommodating the skill level and experience of group members
* 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 a healthy menu, linked to the selected area of study
* planned two group activities to gain a better scope of the grade.

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
* failed to provide delegated roles within the group.

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

Some examples of group practical activities from 2021 were:

* meal delivery kits
* a high tea for invited guests
* sports day lunch or brunch
* a pop-up restaurant
* boxed meals.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated outstanding quality in practical tasks to support local community events or in-house catering exercises
* provided students with a manageable task that supported a school function, e.g. finger food for an evening drama performance, individual lunch-box meals for a school sports day
* addressed healthy eating practices within their food selection and preparation
* demonstrated use of a wider range of innovative technologies, leading to improved food presentation
* demonstrated skills 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 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:

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

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited visual and 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 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 insightful evaluation, with clear reflections on evidence of collaboration and strong links to a 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
* had difficulty evaluating the effectiveness of the task 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

The selection of an appropriate 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 range of contemporary local issues affecting the food and hospitality industry. The impact of COVID-19 on the food and hospitality industry is still significant and continued to be 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. It was pleasing to see a number of students follow up contemporary local trends such as the impact of the ban on single use plastics for local food and hospitality businesses. Other issues such as aspects of social media, 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 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

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.

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
* were low in the word count giving a more limited opportunity to show depth and analysis
* 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.

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

The more 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).

The less 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.

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
* presented information in tables which showed research but not analysis, and created a discrepancy in the accuracy of the word count.