Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice 2019

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 subject outline for Food and Hospitality. It provides information and advice regarding Assessment types, the application of Performance Standards in both school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the Subject Outline for 2020 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 their tasks in line with the subject outline for 2020, they should make a strong connection throughout the task to the selected Area of Study and the Food and Hospitality industry.

When students are presented with tasks to include all possible assessment design criteria they have limited opportunity to explore the specific features for the task in-depth. Teachers should only include materials to support the Performance Standards. Additional materials such as food orders, recipes etc. should not be uploaded with student tasks for the on-line format required for Moderation.

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

An interesting range of contemporary issues was presented to students in 2019, with a noticeable increase of local issues reflecting current industry trends. Examples of popular industry trends were: sustainability and the local food supply, health food trends, veganism, social media impact on food trends, the role of social media in promoting food and hospitality venues.

Teachers should ensure Research tasks meet the requirements of the specific assessment design criteria Investigation and Critical Analysis ICA 1, ICA2, and ICA3 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 research tasks which were interesting and relevant to students, with very clear connections to an identified Area of Study within the Food and Hospitality Industry
* were provided with an issue which allowed for differing points of view, enabling students to demonstrate *perceptive* critical analysis of the contemporary issue
* responded to an issue that enabled students to display higher order thinking skills and address the performance standards at the high end.
* showed discernment in the use of the Internet, and selected a balance of primary and secondary sources of information
* used relevant subject-specific terminology to satisfy literacy effectively in ICA3
* used correct referencing through in-text referencing and a reference list to support analysis in the higher grade bands
* used selected quotes, data and statistics; ably satisfying numeracy in specific feature ICA3.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included Research tasks that were too complicated or didn’t have a current industry focus, therefore students struggled to achieve success
* posed difficulty when outdated tasks were presented to students asking them to form an opinion
* relied heavily on the Internet, with little relevance to their local setting
* referencing was inconsistent, or students failed to show evidence of a reference list; footnotes were not formatted correctly
* responses were too brief, showing inadequate discussion and analysis and little evidence of the student voice
* failed to adhere to the word limit or word count fell short of requirements.

Action Plan (Problem-solving)

The Action plan was generally a very effective part of the Practical Activity, allowing students to demonstrate problem-solving against the specific assessment design criteria problem- solving P1, P2. and P3.. Teachers should be discerning in the selection of specific features for each task, and select one Area of Study per task to allow students to discuss a range of factors and make well-informed decisions.

Examples of tasks presented in 2019:

* ‘Menu items for a High Tea menu in a new restaurant’
* ‘A lunch menu item showcasing Regional produce’
* ‘Gourmet desserts focussing on emerging technology’

The more successful responses commonly:

* responded to a well-designed task addressing the wording from the subject outline, with clear instructions linking an Area of Study to the planning and practical application
* selected highly relevant issues with strong clear connections to the Food and Hospitality industry
* 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:

* used background research as their introduction to the task, thus disadvantaging students in writing in-depth about the selected issues
* recalled issues in a series of dot points almost word for word from the task sheet
* briefly outlined issues, sometimes referring to generic factors such as time management or Year 12 standard which did not relate to the Area of Study
* struggled to complement their plan with a suitable practical activity when the task design was too complex
* used a template for every action plan. This caused limited discussion of issues as subheadings in the template were not consistent with the wording in the subject outline
* word count was often excessive where students had been directed to complete the task in a table format.

Practical Application

The Practical Application was an improved feature of the course across the majority of schools with an incredible range of industry standard food presented. Although student evidence was an outstanding feature of the work presented in 2019, the final product must also be a feature of the photo evidence.

Many schools planned tasks for students in pairs or small groups, providing opportunities for them to demonstrate success at a higher standard in their practical work. At least one practical application must be undertaken individually.

The overall grade for the practical application must reflect the grade awarded for the specific practical application assessment design criteria selected for each practical application. Most teachers provided clear evidence in shading the performance standards as well as a general comment to support the grade awarded. It is no longer necessary to provide a separate marking scheme with a long list of criteria for the practical assessment.

Teachers should take care to prepare a separate Performance Standards sheet for each task assessed, to provide students with a clear understanding of how they are being assessed.

The more successful responses commonly:

* reflected grades awarded for the practical, identifyingonly features which directly supported evidence provided by the student against the selected performance standards
* demonstrated a challenging task — based on a complex range of skills and of industry standard
* captured valid evidence throughout the task with annotated photographs and notes against selected ADC.
* demonstrated skills through competent use of technology to present many elements of the task
* presented clear evidence of safe-food handling techniques
* captured clear evidence of the final plating or presentation to demonstrate quality control.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were not aligned 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.
* failed to trial recipes they were unfamiliar with and made obvious mistakes
* used outdated practical pro formas which do not support current performance standards in providing valid evidence.

Individual Evaluation Report

* Teachers must ensure a minimum of two Evaluations are undertaken across the 4–5 practical tasks.
* It was evident that most teachers had reduced the number of Specific Features, allowing students to address the criteria in greater depth.
* Most students capably reflected on the processes and outcomes against E1, however E3 and E4 were often limited in scope. E2 (technology) should be explicitly outlined in the task if it is to be addressed in this report.

The more successful responses commonly:

* explained how their chosen practical linked to contemporary trends and Area of Study identified in the task
* presented a concise reflection on the practical application, supported with clear articulation of processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level
* 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
* reflected explicitly on the technology used when this was a feature of the task, e.g. technology used in food preparation or packaging of food for sale.

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 in depth
* focussed on processes and outcomes but failed to show evidence of a link with planning or research, and related contemporary trends
* provided a summary of processes for completing the practical activity.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

Evidence of healthy eating practices was a pleasing feature of the group activities in 2019. It was encouraging to see that most teachers had designed group activities which engaged students with manageable tasks.

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

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

The more successful responses commonly:

* engaged and challenged students, involving a local community function with a hospitality focus
* achieved success through selection of a smaller event rather than a large catering exercise
* presented a detailed plan addressing an issue rather than just catering for an event
* provided evidence in planning to support healthy eating practices, followed by a practical task based on a healthy menu
* collaborated to support team work as an integral part of planning
* defined clear work plans with detailed delegated roles, presented in table format

The less successful responses commonly:

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

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 2019 were:

* a contemporary food truck reflecting multi-cultural food choices
* a formal dinner for a local community group
* a high tea for invited guests
* a picnic hamper for an identified community lunch
* sports day lunch or brunch

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated outstanding quality in practical tasks to support local community events
* managed large-scale catering activities effectively by dividing the activity into sections for students within a whole class
* addressed healthy eating practices within their food selection and preparation
* demonstrated use of a wider range of newer technologies, leading to improved food presentation
* demonstrated tasks of high quality through clear practical evidence.

The less successful responses commonly:

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

Collaboration

Collaboration (C1 and C2) is intended to be used within Group Tasks. This area showed 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.

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:

* selected a practical activity which did not support healthy eating practices
* demonstrated limited visual and written evidence to support collaboration
* limited or no involvement in discussing 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. Teachers should select only the specific features which are relevant to the task.

The more successful responses:

* captured an honest appraisal of group and individual performances, addressing the specific features selected for the task
* capably reflected on both group and personal performance
* reflected on issues addressed in their Group Decision-making prior to the practical
* showed insightful evaluation, particularly addressing contemporary trends and appraisal of technology/sustainability
* were clearly linked to the identified Area of Study.

The less successful responses:

* presented a recount of what happened, often only addressing what worked and what didn’t or individual efforts
* discussed the inability of group members to cooperate
* struggled with evaluating the effectiveness of the group performance
* demonstrated limited evaluation of the task effectively when all specific features for evaluation were selected

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

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

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 is Instagram driving food trends in the food and hospitality Industry?
* To what extent is the food delivery craze having a negative impact on traditional dining?
* Plant based eating is transforming menus and delivering a greater variety of offerings in the food and hospitality industry.

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 following specific features of the assessment design criteria for this subject are assessed in the investigation: investigation and critical analysis — ICA1, ICA2, and ICA3 and evaluation — E4.

The more successful responses commonly:

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

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on topics rather than issues
* had unclear or only superficial links to the food and hospitality industry, for example diet related disease where the research focussed on nutrition rather than how the food and hospitality is responding, or an analysis of beverages, again with the focus on nutritional data or comparing water to sport drinks
* were not strongly or clearly 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.
* used focus questions that were too broad or were not clearly linked to the overall research question or hypothesis

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

The more successful responses commonly:

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

The less successful responses commonly:

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

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

The more successful responses commonly:

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

The less successful responses commonly:

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

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

The more successful responses commonly:

* evaluated evidence throughout their investigation, in addition to analysing findings in the conclusion. Students who did this tended to have a clear and in-depth final conclusion
* showed insight and depth in the conclusion, often suggesting implications or offering future solutions.
* explicitly addressed their main issue and research questions and reflected on results
* adhered to the 2000-word limit for a 20-credit subject and 1000words for a 10 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.