# 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. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

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

# School Assessment.

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity

Research Task (Investigation and Critical Analysis)

Examples of topics included regional foods, street foods, and food trucks. Trends such as ‘raw’ desserts, the impact of social media on the success of a restaurant, food allergies and intolerances, greening strategies for businesses to become environmentally friendly and the use of Indigenous foods on hospitality menus were evident.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included teacher tasks which were well constructed, based around one specific issue and clearly linked to the area of study identified
* provided an issue which allowed for differing points of view, enabling students to demonstrate *perceptive* critical analysis, linked to the research question
* used correct referencing and acknowledgment of sources through footnoting, to support analysis in the higher grade bands
* used selected quotes, data, and statistics; ably satisfying specific feature ICA3
* showed discernment in the use of the Internet, using Australian sites to source relevant information
* used subject-specific terminology to address literacy effectively.

The less successful responses commonly:

* included research tasks that were too complicated (e.g. two or three very broad statements were presented) to allow in-depth investigation and demonstration of critical analysis in relation to the performance standards for ICA
* struggled to achieve at the higher levels when presented with outdated tasks asking to form an opinion
* combined the ADC for Investigation and Critical Analysis with ADC from Problem-solving, which increased the difficulty to address the task effectively
* relied heavily on the internet, often with little relevance to a local setting
* showed inconsistent referencing where evidence of the use of primary and secondary sources was not evident
* used too many quotes, often without adequate discussion and analysis.

Action Plan (Problem-solving)

Examples of tasks included, ‘Prepare a breakfast – a meal and drink for a current cafe menu’; ‘a gourmet dessert focussing on an emerging technology’; ‘three small bites showcasing SA produce’.

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided clear instructions linked to the area of study that were more explicit in the selection of issues and astute in the discussion, resulting in well-informed decisions regarding a suitable practical activity
* provided connections to the Food and Hospitality industry when addressing the issues and justification areas
* specifically addressed the wording from the subject outline in task design (e.g. identify and discuss, make decisions about, problem solve, justify, implement)
* identified and discussed appropriate technology in problem-solving, followed by clear implementation related to the practical application.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented issues in the action plan as a recall of dot points from the task sheet
* constructed the 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
* demonstrated a poorly constructed task, where students struggled to complement it with a suitable practical activity, limiting opportunities to make strong connections between the plan and the practical
* selected the criteria for ICA 1, 2 and 3 as well as the specific features for problem-solving which made it difficult for students to provide depth in their writing to satisfy P1, P2 and P3 and achieve at the higher levels
* were not penalised for writing in excess of 500 words.

Practical Application

Many schools incorporated the use of Australian bush food or used local regional foods as a starting point for their task. Some schools addressed sustainable foods allowing students to prepare and present foods that were home grown or locally sourced.

The more successful responses commonly:

* made a strong link with the research or action plan, and was challenging, and based on a high level of skill
* provided clear evidence of the success and outcomes of the practical activity, with discriminate use of images
* identified P1 and P2 in the practical task, demonstrating ongoing and efficient techniques, quality control and management of time and resources
* used technology effectively, demonstrating high levels of skill through the many elements of the task, when P3 was addressed
* presented strong evidence of safe-food handling when P4 was identified in the task
* clearly assessed the practical task against the ADC selected, and teachers provided relevant feedback.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not align the practical activity to the identified area of study which was reflected in the choice of food practical and the student’s ability to address the assessment design criteria identified
* task design did limit student’s opportunity to achieve successful outcomes , e.g. simple meals showing minimal skill for which students were awarded high grades for all specific features of the Practical Application
* showed little or no evidence of the success of the practical activity or teacher feedback
* carried out all practicals in pairs or small groups, not consistent with subject outline
* showed lack of application and evidence in regard to preparation and presentation food skills and understanding of terminology with in the recipe
* used outdated practical proforma which did not allow students to address current performance standards
* selected all specific features, with little or no evidence from the teacher or student.

Individual Evaluation Report

The more successful responses commonly:

* reduced the number of evaluation tasks, in line with the current subject outline
* presented concise evidence of the practical application and then articulated the processes and outcomes, satisfying E1 at the insightful level
* addressed not only ‘what happened’ but also ‘why’ and suggested improvements
* demonstrated effective links to the research or the planning when E3 was identified in the task
* explained how the chosen practical addressed the area of study
* explicitly outlined E2 (technology) in the task when it was to be addressed
* limited the number of ADC in the evaluation, providing students with an opportunity to address the criteria in-depth within 500 words

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented an evaluation for every task, with all four specific features being assessed
* only addressed processes and outcomes, and failed to reflect on contemporary trends or the area of study
* wrote a recount of the practical task rather than a reflective discussion
* were heavily scaffolded with specific headings, limiting opportunities to achieve at the higher levels
* failed to draw links to the research or action plan.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity

Group Decision-making (Collaboration)

The more successful responses commonly:

* presented a task addressing not only an Area of Study but also a strong healthy eating focus
* submitted the group decision-making and planning for *all* students in the group, and all were awarded the same grade for planning
* 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, through to a practical task based on a healthy menu, linked to the area of study
* had clearly defined work plans and delegated group roles in table form
* 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 limited identification of issues and planning
* overlooked the healthy eating focus
* reflected different grades awarded by the teacher for the group plan
* failed to present a copy of the group plan or had different plans for the same group
* were too complex for the number of students in the assessment group (e.g. a 3-course meal for 30 guests, with two students in the group)
* used tables to address justification and decision-making, inflating word count.

Group Practical Application

Some examples of group practical activities included: a culturally themed lunch for guests, 3-course meal for Governing Council; a ‘Tasting Australia’ breakfast; express ‘lunch in the city’; a High Tea trolley for invited guests; Biggest Morning Tea, A themed Food Truck; a new coffee shop, and a sustainable café.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated amazing quality with tasks planned to support local community events or large catering exercises
* addressed ‘healthy eating practices’ throughout the planning and the practical activity and used innovative ways to demonstrate this, e.g. the inclusion of a nutrition information panel on food prepared for sale
* were discerning in selecting images to demonstrate the stages and final outcome of the group practical
* were based on a task that engaged students and involved the community
* submitted clear evidence of the Practical Application, effectively done with images and annotations to explain processes against the performance standards.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were often incomplete due to absences of group members and/or lack of prior practice of skills and use of equipment
* had too much practical evidence at the expense of providing quality in all parts of the task
* practical skills lacked complexity.

Collaboration

The more successful responses commonly:

* addressed healthy eating effectively in planning and menu decisions to satisfy C2
* showed clear evidence of discussion about the whole process of collaboration
* captured evidence of collaboration e.g. images, white boards with preparation lists.

The less successful responses commonly:

* showed limited evidence of collaboration, but teacher grades did not always correlate
* demonstrated limited visual evidence and written comments
* showed little or no evidence to support C2 (healthy eating).

Individual Evaluation Report

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

The more successful responses commonly:

* captured an honest appraisal of group and individual performances
* 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
* showed insightful evaluation, particularly addressing in-depth evaluation of trends and appraisal of technology/sustainability, clearly linked the area of study
* often provided guest feedback to use in their evaluation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented a recount of what they did, often only focussing on individual efforts
* indicated the group performance by the inability of group members to cooperate
* challenged students when required to address too many aspects in the evaluation
* mostly focussed on E1, failing to address the remaining performance standards identified.

# 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:

* Should the food offered at major sporting events follow healthy eating guidelines?
* To what extent are food and hospitality businesses adopting “green” or eco-friendly practices?
* Are food delivery services helping fuel a growing interest in gourmet fast food?
* Are chefs coping with the increasing demand of dietary requirements from diners?

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
* 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

The more successful responses commonly:

* incorporated survey or interview results that were synthesised, clearly presented, and used with secondary research to inform findings
* structured analysis and discussion around focus questions
* added depth by analysing data, interpreting and discussing the implication of results
* used quotes succinctly, offering pertinent evidence followed by relevant and well-explained examples to demonstrate analysis while maintaining the student voice
* 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
* 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.

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.