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# 2016 Chief Assessor’s Report

## Overview

Chief Assessors’ reports give 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, the quality of student performance, and any relevant statistical information.

In 2016, a total of 2137 students representing 181 assessment groups submitted work for the 20‑credit subject in Food and Hospitality. A small number completed the 10-credit subject.

Overall, moderators were pleased to note that teachers had supported student learning by structuring their learning and assessment plans (LAPs) to cater for the reduced number of evaluation tasks in Assessment Type 1, and had acknowledged reduced specific features from the assessment design criteria in the addendum. These changes allowed students to achieve greater success within 500 words in the research task and action plan, as well as the evaluation report in Assessment Type 1. Where teachers are over-assessing by choosing too many specific features, they are encouraged to reduce the number of these on their LAP for 2017 to provide better opportunities for students to address the performance standards at a higher level. When teachers are reviewing their tasks in line with the 2017 subject outline, they should carefully word tasks, addressing the food and hospitality industry in every task, with a strong connection throughout the task to the area of study selected.

**School Assessment**

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

Research Task

An interesting range of contemporary trends was presented in task design. The research component is an important aspect of the practical activity, as it provides students with an opportunity to practise a formal style of writing, using both primary and secondary resources. Teachers should review their task design for 2017 to ensure research tasks meet the requirements of specific features ICA1, ICA2, and ICA3 for investigation and critical analysis. A minimum of two research tasks should be undertaken for a 20-credit subject.

It is critical for teachers to construct tasks from an area of study basis, and develop a question or statement which will allow critical analysis of a contemporary trend or issue strongly linked to the food and hospitality industry. Class visits to local industry were a valuable means of providing a strong primary perspective. Examples included a visit to a cheese factory to observe food safety, HACCP procedures, and so on, to link with food safety; and a visit to an elegant fine-dining restaurant, which formed the basis of primary research based around the statement ‘Australia does not have its own cuisine’.

Further examples of contemporary research tasks from 2016 were: ‘Technology is becoming a major part of the food and hospitality industry, but are these technologies making things easier for chefs and restaurant staff or are they making it harder?’ and ‘That the Internet has replaced cookbooks — this has impacted on food choices and the wider food and hospitality industry’. Social media, sustainability, and technology were popular trends in research tasks.

**The more successful responses**

* showed that students were provided with a current contemporary issue, providing an opportunity for them to select a broad range of primary and secondary resources relevant to the task
* made clear links to address the area of study identified
* investigated relevant primary sources from their local community
* were provided with an issue where there is no correct answer or one which allows for differing points of view, and they were better able to show *perceptive* critical analysis linked to the research question
* used correct referencing and acknowledgment of sources through footnoting to support their analysis in the higher grade bands
* made their voice clear in their research and used selected quotes, data, and statistics, ably satisfying specific feature ICA3
* were presented with a task which allowed for the inclusion of numeracy, satisfying ICA3 with greater insight
* were discerning in their use of the Internet, using Australian sites to source relevant information.

**The less successful responses**

* consisted of several statements in the task, which confused students about the issue, and made it difficult for them to demonstrate critical analysis in relation to the performance standards for investigation and critical analysis at a high level
* provided a recount of their research, rather than attempting to formulate alternative points of view
* struggled to address the task effectively when the assessment design criterion of investigation and critical analysis was combined with the assessment design criterion of problem-solving
* used limited primary research
* relied heavily on the Internet, often with little relevance to their local setting
* used graphs with limited or no direct links to their research
* were disadvantaged when presented with tasks asking students to form an opinion, as this approach does not follow the specifications from the current subject outline
* were disadvantaged when presented with a task requiring them to give a historical account of an issue, which was neither contemporary, nor allowed for critical analysis
* demonstrated incorrect referencing, or did not show evidence of referencing.

Action Plan

The action plan was generally a very effective part of the practical activity, and allowed students of all abilities to demonstrate problem-solving against the specific features P1, P2, and P3. Teachers are reminded to address a minimum of two tasks with an action plan for a 20-credit subject and to be discerning in the selection of specific features for each task. It is suggested that teachers select one area of study per task. Examples: a task based around the ‘Great Aussie Pie’ was developed to address Area of Study 4: Sociocultural Influences; in another school, students worked in small groups to develop a menu for a sustainable cafe linked to Area of Study 2: Economic and Environmental Influences.

**The more successful responses**

* focused on the factors most pertinent to the area of study selected and based their discussion around those factors
* were provided with clear instructions, and the students were more explicit in the selection of issues and astute in the discussion, leading them to make well-informed decisions regarding a suitable practical activity.
* made a direct link to the selected area of study and addressed both the hospitality and food industry
* saw task design specifically address the wording from the subject outline (e.g. ‘identify and discuss’, ‘make decisions about’, ‘problem-solving’, ‘justify’, ‘implement’)
* made a strong link to the area of study and justified their choice of practical to support the link
* identified and discussed appropriate technology in their problem-solving, followed by clear implementation of it in the practical application
* implemented strategies clearly related to the practical activity and decisions made.

**The less successful responses**

* selected too many factors and the discussion lacked depth
* constructed their action plan in table format, limiting the factors and discussion to the lower grade bands, often due to many generic factors such as time management or Year 12 standard. These factors alone did not address the context of Food and Hospitality or the area of study
* selected their favourite recipe or a dish from the Internet, which had no direct connection to the area of study or the issues discussed
* were when the task was not well constructed and students struggled to complement it with a suitable practical activity, limiting opportunities for them to make strong connections between the plan and the practical
* incorporated specific features ICA1, ICA2, and ICA3, as well as the specific features for problem-solving. When this occurred, students experienced difficulty in providing depth in their writing to satisfy specific features P1, P2, and P3 of problem-solving and therefore were unable to achieve at the higher levels.
* students omitted to use a word-count, or wrote in excess of 500 words without penalty.

*Practical Application*

The practical application was the most pleasing part of the course for most of the students, as student evidence supporting this was noticeably an outstanding feature of the student work presented in 2016. Where teachers had included ‘evidence of practical’ in the task design, students were reminded to provide valid evidence throughout their practical work. Students should be discerning in capturing their evidence so that the amount of evidence does not distract from the quality provided. Many schools adhered to the suggested 2 pages, assisting students to reduce photos in size to capture the most relevant stages of their practical work.

Teachers are reminded to conduct at least one practical task as an individual activity. Innovative tasks included a pop-up bakery, and, in a task linked to technology, one class created a short video to capture their practical similar to the BuzzFeed app. Other examples presented included an Instagram signature dessert, an ‘Eat to Tweet’ task linked to social media, and the importance of plating. Many schools incorporated the use of Australian bush food or used local regional foods as a starting point for their task.

A teacher mark sheet should be included to reflect grades awarded for the practical, identifying *only* features which directly support the evidence provided by the student against specific features PA1, PA2, PA3, or PA4. Where teachers had identified all specific features in a task, students often struggled to address them at a high level. The overall grade for the task was sometimes assessed too high due to the imbalance caused by selecting all specific features, with little or no evidence from the teacher or student.

Outdated mark sheets for the practical activity should be removed and replaced with teacher feedback that reflects current assessment of the practical activity. Where students are not presented with performance standards, or where there is no identification of the specific features being assessed, they are not being supported to understand the assessment levels.

**The more successful responses**

* made a strong link with the area of study and were challenging tasks of Year 12 standard, based on a high level of skill
* were where evidence of the success and outcomes of the practical activity was provided by the teacher and the student
* saw the teacher involved in verifying the selection of the practical, eliminating tasks that were not sufficiently challenging
* where specific features PA1 and PA2 were identified in the practical task, demonstrated ongoing and efficient techniques, quality control, and management of time and resources
* when PA3 was addressed, selected and used appropriate technology effectively, demonstrating this throughout their practical evidence
* presented strong evidence of safe food-handling when PA4 was identified in the task
* where students had captured clear photographs of their work in progress, as well as the finished product or meal, and had carefully captioned photos with appropriate annotations against the performance standards selected, it was much easier to confirm the teacher grade in the higher grade bands.

**The less successful responses**

* involved a practical activity that was not aligned to an area of study
* had practical tasks that were simplistic and limited the opportunity for students to achieve successful outcomes, such as making pizza on a purchased base, or making scones and muffins, for which students were awarded high grades for all specific features of the practical application — which showed that the practical was over-assessed for the skills demonstrated
* saw basic practical choices selected based on what students liked to eat or cook, rather than having a strong connection to the task, thus lacking depth and rigour for a Stage 2 activity
* showed little or no evidence of the success of the practical activity
* were all carried out in pairs or small groups, which is not consistent with the subject outline that states: ‘At least one practical application must be undertaken individually.’
* demonstrated unfamiliarity with recipes and the student’s trial became the summative practical activity.

*Individual Evaluation Report*

Teachers must ensure *two* evaluations are undertaken across the four to six practical activities. Where teachers planned an evaluation report for every task with all four specific features being assessed, this made unnecessary work for students at the expense of quality reflection against selected specific features for evaluation.

Teachers who limited the number of specific features in their evaluation tasks provided students with an opportunity to write in depth within 500 words. In these instances, students were able to focus in a solid paragraph and address the criteria in depth, linking back to the area of study in the action plan or research task, rather than just mentioning it.

**The more successful responses**

* were where schools undertook two evaluation tasks, as permitted in the subject outline, allowing students to focus their efforts.
* presented concise evidence of the practical application and then articulated their processes and outcomes, satisfying specific feature E1 at the insightful level
* were able to make clear links to the area of study and the food and hospitality industry
* addressed not only ‘what happened’ but also ‘why’, and suggested improvements
* showed effective links to the research or the planning when E3 was identified in the task
* were not presented with the maximum number of evaluation tasks, and so were not assessing the same specific features multiple times

**The less successful responses**

* presented with an evaluation for every task, with all four specific features being assessed
* saw all four specific features assessed; students often addressed E1 only, yet were awarded higher grades against performance standards for E1, E2, E3, and E4 (500 words is insufficient to address all specific features in sufficient depth to achieve at the highest level) — specific features E2, E3, and E4 were often overlooked.
* only addressed processes and outcomes, rather than linking to contemporary trends and the area of study
* wrote a recount of the practical task, rather than being reflective and evaluative in the discussion relating to it
* used an old format with specific headings or too much scaffolding, limiting opportunities to achieve at the higher levels
* had too many specific teacher-directed questions, limiting students’ ability to address the specific features for evaluation at the higher levels.
* used scaffolding from the teacher in every evaluation task.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

*Group Decision-making*

The group activity presented a wide range of practical applications. The group decision-making report *must* be completed as a group, not individually. Every student must have a copy of the group decision-making response in their package.

Healthy eating practices must be addressed within *all* group activities, and therefore need to be a focus in the group decision-making task. The healthy eating focus should be reflected on in the evaluation in relation to specific feature E4. Although groups addressed dietary issues for selected guests and healthy cooking methods, the spirit of the task is to address healthy eating guidelines and the nutritional value of menus. Without the focus on healthy eating, teachers are unable to make a valid assessment against the specific feature C2.

Students generally showed evidence of being able to identify and discuss issues as a group. Teachers generally chose to assess specific features P1 and P2 in problem-solving, in line with the task description. It is not intended to use P3 to assess the group decision-making.

In order to support the highest grade level (A+) in the group activity, teachers must clearly demonstrate that all areas of assessment support an A grade through the evidence provided. The group decision-making and the individual evaluation report must be in the A grade band, as well as the group practical application.

**The more successful responses**

* showed students had better opportunities to contribute to group planning when clearly presented with a healthy eating focus
* enabled students to develop a wider range of skills where two group tasks were planned
* were where the group decision-making was submitted for all students in the group
* ensured a detailed outline of what each group member was to complete, tabling allocation of roles
* were assessed by the teacher with all students in the group awarded the same grade
* displayed negotiation skills to indicate preferences or narrow down possible menu choices; analysis of customer feedback was used to indicate modifications to consider dietary needs and so on.

**The less successful responses**

* showed limited identification of issues and planning
* overlooked the healthy eating focus
* reflected different grades awarded by the teacher for the group plan
* showed evidence that students are writing individual journal entries for group action plans rather than following the guidelines in the subject outline.
* presented decision-making notes and pages of research as their planning
* did not present a copy of the group plan

*Group Practical Application*

Many teachers designed appropriate group activities related to a specific area of study with a large catering focus, commonly reflecting local produce and supporting the local community. Teachers were challenged when assessing students who were either absent for the group practical task, or where the task had to be cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances, particularly when only one group task was set. When students were able to participate in two group activities, they had a better opportunity to achieve success in this assessment type.

While there were many examples of excellent student evidence in the group practical application, every student should submit clear evidence of this task. Some students did this effectively with photographic evidence together with annotations to explain processes against the performance standards. Students should be encouraged to organise devices to enable them to capture progress and final outcomes of their learning.

Teachers should be mindful of the weighting of the group task and the time allocated in order to provide sufficient time for students to address all tasks identified on the LAP. Some examples of successful group practical activities from 2016 were:

* a high tea for senior citizens
* a healthy breakfast for primary schoolchildren
* meals based around healthy eating for boarders
* healthy food trucks
* formal dinners for the local community or staff members
* a sustainable cafe
* a long table restaurant
* a formal dinner and fundraising for charity
* pop-up restaurants and food trucks
* foods to sell at farmers markets
* designing nutritious meals for fast-food outlets
* using home-grown produce to support a large catering function (linked to sustainability)
* dinners with a multicultural focus.

**The more successful responses**

* demonstrated high quality, with tasks planned to support local community events or large catering exercises
* conducted and managed large-scale catering activities by dividing the activity into sections for students within a whole class; for example, one group did the meal preparation, while the other group attended to front of house
* addressed healthy eating practices throughout the planning and the practical activity and used innovative ways to demonstrate this, such as the inclusion of a nutrition information panel on food prepared for sale.
* demonstrated a range of diverse and complex recipes
* presented high quality food, with a professional restaurant-style feel
* included colour photographs to present the stages and final outcome of the group practical.

**The less successful responses**

* had difficulty in managing the task due to lack of prior planning
* lacked teamwork to complete tasks efficiently
* lacked skills and ability to complete the task to the standard required in presentation and plating
* had difficulty in completing the task on time due to absences of group members and/or lack of prior practice of skills and use of equipment.

Collaboration in the Group Decision-making and the Group Practical Application

Collaboration (specific features C1 and C2) is intended to be used within the group decision-making and the group practical application. This was the area which showed the most variation. It was useful for moderators if teacher comments were included to support grades.

**The more successful responses**

* showed evidence of collaboration in their task
* addressed healthy eating effectively in planning and menu decisions
* showed clear evidence of discussion about the whole process of collaboration
* captured evidence of collaboration, e.g. photographs, copies of whiteboards with preparation lists.

**The less successful responses**

* showed limited evidence of collaboration (although some teacher grades did not reflect this)
* demonstrated both limited visual evidence and written comments
* showed little or no evidence to support healthy eating (see specific feature C2)
* added the healthy eating aspect after the discussion, rather than forming a basis for the discussion.

Individual Evaluation Report

The only individual component of the Assessment Type 2: Group Activity is the individual evaluation report.

**The more successful responses**

* captured an honest appraisal of group and individual performances
* showed clear insightful examples with reflection on sustainable practices
* capably reflected on both the group and personal performance
* capably linked their report to the specific features identified on the task
* reflected on issues addressed in their group decision-making prior to the practical.

**The less successful responses**

* presented a recount of what they did
* focused only on their own individual efforts
* were often supported with scaffolding or headings to assist them to address the features identified without providing in-depth evaluation
* indicated the less successful performance of the group by the inability of group members to cooperate
* showed students were challenged when required to address too many aspects in the evaluation.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

External assessment

Changes were made to the subject outline for 2016 to strengthen the link to the hospitality industry and the wording of specific features ICA1 and E4 now refer to ‘issues related to the food and hospitality industry’. It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of students made very clear and explicit links to the food and hospitality industry, providing them with the best opportunity to achieve success against the assessment design criteria.

Teachers are reminded that students have limited opportunity to achieve success against these specific features if their issue is outside the scope of the subject; for example, issues such as obesity or diets are not appropriate, nor are those related to food in the home. Similarly, issues related to areas such as one-punch laws or liquor-lockout laws are not suitable as they are not related to food *and* hospitality.

Clear guidelines for students and teachers relating to the investigation are provided in the subject outline. This year it was clear that successful students had benefited from teacher clarification and advice on planning, researching, drafting, and presentation. The subject outline states that teachers should offer advice to students on the following areas:

* developing a clearly stated research question or hypothesis
* defining the intended scope of the investigation
* considering the method to be used and the primary and secondary sources needed
* undertaking the investigation and acknowledging sources appropriately.

The vast majority of investigations followed a similar format, with an introduction section containing

* the research question or hypothesis
* links to an area of study
* relevant focusing questions
* an outline of methodology of research.

The introduction was mostly followed by a discussion of findings under each of the focusing questions and finally a conclusion where students evaluated and drew the analysis together. This structure was effective for students to present evidence against the specific features in a clear, logical manner. The introduction section does not need to be lengthy, but should set the scene for the discussion of research findings and evaluation which follows.

The following section discusses in turn each of the specific features of the assessment design criteria used in assessing the investigation.

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

Overall students presented a very wide and interesting range of areas of research, often addressing local issues such as sustainability, ethical eating and the impact of social media. It was refreshing to see many new and interesting issues selected, demonstrating awareness of emerging trends, for example:

* factors impacting on the use of South Australian seafood by local businesses
* regional foods have a significant impact on the popularity of local food and hospitality businesses
* blogging is an effective strategy to promote word-of-mouth advertising in the hospitality industry.

Students are encouraged to develop original ideas for research. Brainstorming current local, national, or global issues is an effective strategy to provide a broad picture of potential areas for investigation.

It is up to the student whether they develop a research question or propose a hypothesis. Care should be taken in crafting whichever is chosen. If students generate a question, they should pose a question rather than a topic. If a hypothesis is selected, it should be developed as a statement of an educated guess as to the relationship between certain factors — thus providing the basis for research.

The data presented from the research must be analysed in order to answer the question, or find support for the hypothesis. Many students chose a ‘to what extent’ type question for their investigation and this was an effective strategy to compare a balanced view of information and develop an argument from a wide range of sources. In the conclusion, students should refer back to the question or hypothesis to state their position (based on the evidence presented) and evaluate their findings.

Students should ensure that the focus of their study is not too broad, as this can limit their ability to meet ICA1 to a high level. Teachers should be mindful of supporting students to ensure the issue selected is one which will allow analysis of an issue in depth.

Using focusing questions is an effective strategy in directing the investigation and presenting the research. As with crafting the research question or hypothesis, time spent formulating effective focusing questions can promote deep and purposeful inquiry. Some students presented too much material to define the issue (e.g. ‘What is a true vegan?’) at the expense of making a deeper connection with the local food and hospitality industry.

**The more successful responses**

* had a research issue with a clear link to an area of study, and this was documented or explained in the introduction, which was effective strategy to assist students to focus their research
* demonstrated that students had selected more open-type questions, which enabled them to show greater depth and analysis
* 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**

* focused on topics rather than issues
* 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.

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

Most students demonstrated competent skills in research. Where students are able to provide views of an expert in their research area, whether from a primary or secondary source, it is important that they explain the person’s position or area of expertise, as this adds depth and credibility to their findings.

It was clear that many students made an effort to obtain primary data to strengthen their argument. SurveyMonkey was a popular tool for conducting surveys and presenting results. However, there was a wide degree of effectiveness noted regarding student surveys. Students should consider the most appropriate research strategy for their investigation, selecting the most appropriate target group when conducting surveys. For example, a group of adults rather than peers is likely to be the best option if seeking information on high-end dining. Care should be taken when selecting survey participants as ‘experts’ in a particular field, e.g. a bare statement that a large percentage of survey participants believe that the rate of vegetarianism has increased doesn’t verify that this is actually the case.

If surveys are used, students should be discerning to select questions that link strongly to their overall research and focusing questions. A short and highly pertinent survey is more useful than a longer one that does not address focus questions.

While there are many reputable sites which provide valuable information, students should be wary of relying on Internet sources, as this can limit their ability to examine an issue thoroughly. Students should also be wary when using data from international settings, as the data may not apply to local food and hospitality settings. The stronger investigations related to a local context. Many valuable primary sources can be found online, for example online menus, blogs, and reviews.

Most students were able to reference their sources appropriately. When statistics and data are used to support an issue, tables, figures and/or data need to be referenced appropriately, following to guidelines on the SACE website. Students should include a reference list, including primary sources used.

**The more successful responses**

* incorporated survey results that were synthesised, clearly presented, and used with research to inform findings
* analysed data, interpreting and discussing the implication of results, which added depth
* used quotes succinctly, offering pertinent evidence followed by relevant and well-explained examples to demonstrate analysis while maintaining the student’s voice.

**The less successful responses**

* presented survey results, but often gave a breakdown of results with no discussion
* indicated that surveys or interviews had been conducted, but these were not used.

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

The vast majority of students demonstrated competent skills in literacy and used appropriate subject-specific terminology.

Numeracy skills were commonly demonstrated through the inclusion of graphs. Students should be discerning to ensure visual data is used to enhance discussion and strengthen writing. Graphs and diagrams should be large enough to be read easily, and printed in colour for clear presentation of results.

**The more successful responses**

* 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 that the information gleaned was referred to and made explicit

**The less successful responses**

* 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

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

**The more successful responses**

* evaluated evidence throughout their investigation, in addition to analysing findings in the conclusion
* showed insight and depth in the conclusions, often suggesting implications or offering future solutions.

**The less successful responses**

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

It is important that students build their argument and state their position based on evidence presented. The conclusion should relate to the research.

Students should adhere to the word-limit to ensure that markers are not restricted in reading the conclusion when marking the whole paper. Where investigations were significantly under 2000 words, this tended to reduce the students’ capacity to demonstrate a high level of analysis and develop arguments effectively.

In summary, the most successful investigations featured:

* a contemporary issue related to the food and hospitality industry, strongly linked to an area of study
* a local context, appropriate to the issue selected
* a clear hypothesis or research question
* structured analysis and discussion around focus questions
* synthesis of primary and secondary data
* evidence from a range of perspectives or stakeholders
* use of appropriate visual and numerical data, including graphs
* clear communication with a focus on careful drafting and editing
* a conclusion drawing together key aspects of evaluation
* consistent referencing and a reference list
* adherence to the 2000-word limit for a 20-credit subject.

Students should be careful to de-identify their work by avoiding use of student, teacher, and school names. Students should use the cover sheet provided by the SACE Board. Teachers should avoid any indication of their marking process on individual investigations. Teachers and students should check the Stage 2 Food and Hospitality minisite for information. Teachers must verify processes and progress of the investigation by completing a written verification for each student using the pro forma on the SACE website.

## General Comments

When teaching the subject for the first time, teachers are strongly encouraged to attend one of the clarifying forums early in the school year to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the benchmarks at each level of the performance standards. Clarifying forums for Food and Hospitality for 2017 will focus on assessment types, marking standards, and potential issues around delivery of the course.

## Operational Advice

School assessment tasks are set and marked by teachers. These assessment decisions are reviewed by moderators. It is important for the teacher grades to be evident on all student work for Assessment Types 1 and 2, using the relevant performance standards.

Teachers should familiarise themselves with the requirements for the subject from the SACE website. All student work must be retained throughout the year. Moderation materials should be selected for the students identified according to the SACE Board selection process for the collection of materials. Teachers are urged to familiarise themselves with relevant sections of the procedures in the Stage 2 Food and Hospitality subject operational information.

School-assessed work should be packaged separately for both the practical activity and the group activity, as they are moderated separately. Teachers should package work presenting a matrix showing overall grades, as well as having clear presentation of student materials: with individual tasks stapled, and with task sheets, shaded performance standards, and feedback attached. Plastic sleeves are not required.

Teachers must include an approved learning and assessment plan, as well as a set of assessment tasks with their package. Teachers should strongly encourage students to remove food orders, recipes, drafts, and other material which is not required in the assessment process.

Teachers are reminded to award an I grade rather than an E grade for non-submission of work. Teachers used the Variations — Moderation Materials form effectively when work was not completed or was missing, but are reminded to adjust student grades for work not submitted. Changes to tasks from the original learning and assessment plan need to be verified by attaching an endorsed addendum.

Food and Hospitality

Chief Assessor