# 2018 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

## Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the previous year’s 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. 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 Subject Outline for 2019 for specifications regarding content and learning requirements, and to the Subject Operational information for operational matters and key dates.

# School Assessment

In Assessment Type 1, teachers should present students with a minimum of 4 tasks, including two with a Research Task and 2 with an Action Plan. When teachers are reviewing tasks for 2019, 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 LAP, they are encouraged to reduce the assessment design criteria in tasks, using the dddendum.

## Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

### Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

An interesting range of contemporary issues was presented to students in 2018, with a noticeable increase of local issues reflecting current industry trends.

Examples of popular issues were: Vegan trends, dietary requirements such as food allergies and intolerances; the impact of social media on the success of a restaurant; greening strategies for businesses to become environmental friendly; and Food recovery programs. Many teachers organised a full day class excursion to one or more food establishments to introduce students to their Research task or familiarise them with industry presentation standards.

Teachers should ensure Research tasks meet the requirements of the Specific Features 1, 2 and 3 for ICA, and provide a statement or question that is manageable for students to demonstrate investigation and critical analysis within 500 words

The more successful responses commonly:

* included well-constructed teacher tasks, identifying one specific issue which allowed for differing points of view, enabling students to demonstrate *perceptive* critical analysis linked to the Area of study
* showed a clear understanding of the issue selected, supported with a rich discussion
* showed discernment in use of the Internet, and used a balance of primary and secondary sources
* used relevant subject-specific terminology to address Literacy
* used correct referencing and acknowledgment of sources to support analysis.

The less successful responses commonly:

* addressed tasks that were too complicated (e.g. two or three very broad statements were presented) to demonstrate critical analysis in relation to the performance standards for ICA
* addressed tasks where teachers had combined the ADC for Investigation and Critical Analysis with ADC for Problem-solving, increasing difficulty for students to address the task effectively
* struggled to achieve at the higher levels when presented with outdated tasks asking them to form an opinion
* relied heavily on the Internet with little relevance to the local setting, limiting the student voice
* displayed inconsistent referencing, or lacked a reference list and footnotes
* provided only broad information on a topic, and included a menu decision within the task.

### Action Plan (Problem-solving)

The Action plan was generally an effective part of the Practical Activity, allowing students to demonstrate problem-solving against the Specific Features P1, 2 and 3. Teachers should select one Area of Study per task to allow students to discuss a range of factors and make well-informed decisions.

Examples of tasks included:

‘A Tapas menu for a restaurant/bar’ or

‘A lunch menu item showcasing Regional produce’ or

‘A gourmet dessert focussing on emerging technology for a new dessert bar’

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a well-designed task, specifically addressing the wording from the subject outline
* selected relevant issues and demonstrated astute discussion, leading to well-informed decisions regarding the practical activity
* provided strong connections to the Food and Hospitality Industry when addressing issues and justifying decisions
* identified relevant implementation strategies relating to the practical application.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used background research as the introduction to the task, distracting from the main purpose of the Action plan
* outlined issues briefly in a series of dot points from the task
* struggled to complement their plan with a suitable practical activity when the task was complex
* used a template to write their plan, limiting discussion of issues
* displayed excessive word count, often by way of tables that added new information

### Practical Application

Where several tasks were planned for students to work in pairs or small groups, there were opportunities for students to demonstrate success in their practical work. There was consistent evidence of new and current trends in industry throughout practical tasks.

The task was sometimes awarded a high grade overall due to selection of all specific features, with little or no evidence from the teacher or student to support this.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a challenging task, based on complex skills and industry standards
* demonstrated efficient techniques and management of resources, together with outstanding quality control
* demonstrated a high level of skill through competent use of technology
* reflected grades awarded for the practical, identifying ***only*** features which directly supported evidence provided by the student against the selected performance standards
* captured valid evidence through annotated photographs and notes against the selected ADC.
* were supported with relevant feedback.

The less successful responses:

* failed to align the practical activity to the identified Area of Study, limiting the choice of food practical and the students’ ability to address the ADC
* struggled to achieve successful outcomes due to poor task design, e.g. simple meals showing minimal skill - for which students were awarded high grades for all specific features of the Practical Application.
* carried out all practical in pairs or small groups, not consistent with the guidelines
* failed to trial unfamiliar recipes and made obvious mistakes
* showed use of outdated Practical pro formas, which did not support students in addressing current performance standards and providing valid evidence.

### Individual Evaluation Report

Teachers must ensure a minimum of ***two*** Evaluations are undertaken across the 4 – 5 practical tasks.

The more successful responses:

* presented a strong reflection on the practical activity when the number of ADC were reduced
* presented concise evidence of the practical application and articulated processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level
* explicitly addressed E2 (technology) when this was a feature of the task
* addressed not only ‘what happened’ but also ‘why’ and suggested improvements.
* demonstrated strong links to the research or the planning when E3 was identified in the task
* explained how the chosen practical addressed the area of study.

The less successful responses:

* followed a prescribed format, limiting opportunities to address specific features at the higher levels
* reflected on E1, E2, E3 and E4 within one task, limiting opportunities to reflect on practical outcomes in depth.
* focussed on processes and outcomes but failed to show evidence of planning or research, and related contemporary trends.
* outlined the processes with a brief description of the practical task.

## Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

### Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

Healthy eating practices must be addressed within *all* Group activities, and therefore needs to be a focus in the Group Decision-making task as well as the selection of the practical task.

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

When the highest grade level (A+) is awarded for AT2, 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 with a food and hospitality focus
* presented a detailed plan demonstrating processes and strategies to satisfy the key concepts in the task, as well as collaboration within the group
* provided strong links to support Healthy eating practices, including a practical task based on a healthy menu
* integrated team work as an integral part of planning
* defined clear work plans with delegated group roles, presented in table format

The less successful responses commonly:

* were provided with a task departing from the guidelines in the Subject Outline
* selected a basic catering task which limited students to achieve problem-solving at the high levels, with no links to an area of study
* showed insufficient evidence of planning, 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 show allocation of job roles.

### 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 2018:

* A contemporary Food Truck reflecting multi-cultural food choices
* A Formal Dinner for a local community group
* A High Tea for invited guests
* Food recovery programs supporting the community
* A Vegan menu for a cafe

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated outstanding tasks planned to support local community events or large catering exercises
* managed Large-scale catering activities by dividing the activity into sections for students within a whole class
* had a clear focus on healthy eating practices, evident in both the planning and the practical activity
* demonstrated evidence of outstanding quality for both individual and group tasks.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked the standard of practical skills expected at Stage 2
* selected basic tasks which limited student’s opportunities to demonstrate food practical skills
* reflected a low standard of presentation.

### Collaboration

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

The more successful responses commonly:

* addressed healthy eating effectively in planning and menu decisions 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:

* selected a practical activity which did not 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 Individual Evaluation Report.

The more successful responses commonly:

* capably reflected on both group and individual performances, addressing the selected specific features
* reflected on issues addressed in the Group Decision-Making
* showed insightful evaluation, addressing in-depth evaluation of trends and appraisal of technology
* justified links to the identified area of study.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented a recount of what happened, addressing what was successful and what didn’t work
* reflected on individual efforts but struggled to address the group performance
* discussed the inability of group members to cooperate
* made no links with planning or the area of study.

# External Assessment

## Assessment Type 3: Investigation

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

Students commonly addressed local issues such as sustainability, ethical eating and the management of waste. It was refreshing to see many new and interesting issues selected, demonstrating awareness of emerging trends, for example:

* To what extent should the food offered at major sporting events follow healthy eating guidelines?
* To what extent does Uber-eats impact on the food and hospitality industry?
* Are food delivery services helping fuel a growing interest in gourmet fast food?

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.

The more successful responses commonly:

* selected an issue with a clear link to an area of study, and this was documented or explained in the introduction providing an effective strategy to assist students to focus their investigation
* provided a clear link to the food and hospitality industry
* provided a clear hypothesis or research question
* 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
* were not strongly linked to an area of study
* 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.

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.

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 referred to and made explicit
* 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
* 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.