2023 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 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

As in 2022, a number of schools utilised the subject adjustments available for Food and Hospitality. When

addressing these adjustments, teachers should ensure specifications are met for both the overall number

of tasks and requirements for Assessment Types 1 and 2.

Assessment Type 1: Practical Activity (50%)

An individual evaluation report must be included in at least two practical activities. At least one practical application must be undertaken individually.

Action Plan

The action plan structure allows students to demonstrate effective problem-solving, supporting the appropriate selection of a practical activity.

Topics used as a task focus in 2023 were varied and addressed issues related to the role of social media or technology in dessert bars, environmental influences including the use of local produce and contemporary trends such as tapas style foods and grazing platters.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used a relevant area of study from the subject outline as a focus for planning, providing a sound basis for students to discuss relevant factors and leading to an informed decision
* presented well-structured actions plans, clearly aligned with the relevant specific features of the assessment design criteria, particularly P1 and P3
* were discerning in the selection of factors for discussion, allowing for clear and very relevant justification.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not link to an area of study, or address the main topic identified in the task
* listed generic factors such as lessons available, equipment and time available without focussing on the specific issues related to the area of study selected for the task
* used a table format to present the action plan, often restricting discussion of specific issues relevant to the task. When this format was repeated in the second action plan, the issues listed were frequently identical to those in the first task
* appeared to have decided on a recipe or dish, and then tried to align it to the task instead of using the issues as a basis for selection.

Research Task

Research tasks addressed current issues such as including economic and environmental sustainability, minimisation of food waste and food bank programs and the popular role of social media in promoting hospitality venues.

Examples of other topics developed for research tasks in 2023 included the sustainability of fine dining, the use of native Australian foods, the role of social media or technology in Instagram-worthy desserts, the trend to sustainability and the use of plant-based foods and local produce.

The more successful responses commonly:

* utilized relevant primary and secondary sources to support critical analysis, showing correct citation conventions
* used student voice to demonstrate a deep level of understanding and analysis of the issue, with a clear link with an area of study
* selected appropriate diagrams, images, graphs, quotes and statistics that were referred to in-text and correctly labelled, addressing literacy and numeracy in ICA3 and providing a deep understanding of the topic.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited critical analysis. This was particularly evident when responding to ‘closed’ research questions, or when the task was too complex
* used a limited selection of relevant sources
* were unable to relate or connect to a selected area of study
* provided a description of trends (when this was the focus) rather than a detailed critical analysis
* struggled to provide evidence of effective research and added personal opinions together with their own experiences without supporting references.

Practical Application

Practical application was an outstanding feature in a number of schools with evidence of high quality food preparation and presentation. Practical evidence is an important feature of the practical task and should be included to allow students to demonstrate the specific features being assessed in their practical activity.

Some schools incorporated tasks featuring seasonal foods for contemporary menus, foods for mobile food trucks, signature desserts, celebration cakes and foods for tasting platters. A few schools experimented with native Australian foods, providing students with an opportunity to demonstrate creativity, with a focus on sustainability.

The more successful responses commonly:

* developed a challenging practical activity with a clear food and hospitality industry focus, linked to prior planning or research
* reflected discerning and appropriate use of technology, allowing students to demonstrate skills in responsible production and management, and meeting presentation at a high standard
* demonstrated a high level of technical skill and creativity
* provided explicit evidence of products made and details of processes undertaken through photos and annotations linked to the specific features identified in the task.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* selected a practical task which was not challenging or did not meet relevant criteria
* displayed minimal practical evidence
* did not align with or reference an area of study
* showed weaknesses in processes carried out, with limited evidence of management of time or effective use of technology.

Individual Evaluation Report

It was evident that most teachers had reduced the number of specific features, allowing students to address the selected specific features in depth to suit the task description.

Most students reflected on the processes and outcomes against E1 effectively. However, E3 and E4 were sometimes limited in scope. When E2 is selected, it should be explicitly outlined in the evaluation task to support students to address it.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated strong links to the research or planning when the number of specific features was reduced, allowing students to show depth and understanding
* reflected on their performance with a concise but strong discussion of practical outcomes, supported with clear understanding of processes
* included reasons as to why elements were successful (or not) in their reflection
* were able to reflect on and suggest links to the area of study
* provided detailed responses as to how the final product linked to the task, together with relevant suggestions for improvement.

The less successful responses commonly:

* gave a recount in their reflection rather than explaining the action that took place and the outcome as a result
* followed a generic format limiting opportunities to address specific features of the task at higher levels
* addressed processes and outcomes but struggled to reflect on contemporary trends or the area of study.

Assessment Type 2: Group Activity (20%)

In this assessment type students should work in groups to meet a teacher directed challenge to support healthy eating practices. In addition, each group activity must relate to an area of study and include -

* group decision making (including documentation of tasks allocated)
* a group practical application
* an individual evaluation report.

Group Decision-Making

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed depth of understanding of the task requirement by addressing the specific features P1 and P2
* demonstrated high levels of collaboration and planning to support healthy eating and addressing the selected area of study to achieve success
* were able to apply their teamwork, taking into account the experience of group members and their ability to work together
* presented a clear outline of their planning and tabling roles of group members.
* demonstrated strong links in the discussion to support healthy eating practices, followed by a practical task based on an appropriate menu, linked to the selected area of study.

The less successful responses commonly:

* used action plan templates from AT 1, limiting opportunities to show collaboration and present a plan demonstrating AT2 features
* overlooked the healthy eating focus in the planning and selection of the group practical task
* selected a task which was too challenging for the class size and/or skill level of students.

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 assessment design criteria.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated outstanding quality in practical tasks, validated with appropriate evidence
* demonstrated high levels of contemporary skill, with links to healthy eating to cater for and achieve success in serving high-quality food in a safe environment
* addressed healthy eating practices in both food selection and preparation

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited practical evidence of processes and outcomes against selected specific features
* selected menus which limited opportunities for students to demonstrate a range of practical skills expected at Stage 2 and/or produce foods with a healthy eating focus
* struggled to show sufficient evidence of the practical activity to support the grade awarded.

Collaboration

Collaboration (C1 and C2) is intended to be used within AT2. Collaboration should be addressed at each stage of the assessment and students are encouraged to address C1 and C2 in their practical evidence..

Without a focus on healthy eating, teachers are unable to make a valid assessment against the specific feature C2.

The more successful responses commonly:

* provided clear evidence of the group practical activity, including comments and images
* showed clear evidence and development of collaboration, individual and group roles
* provided examples of leadership at the decision-making, planning, trials and production and service of healthy food for the targeted group.

The less successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated limited visual and written evidence of practical outcomes or reflections in the evaluation to demonstrate group collaboration across the task
* showed little evidence of collaboration in planning, photos, annotations or evaluation.

Individual Evaluation Report

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

Students were generally successful in reflecting on individual processes and outcomes, but some struggled with evaluating the effectiveness of the group performance.

The more successful responses commonly:

* reflected strongly on both individual performance and that of the group, linking their task to their healthy eating selection, area of study as well as incorporating feedback from guest reviews where applicable
* discussed how collaboration improved their result eg they didn’t just state what each person did but explained how it helped
* capably addressed healthy eating, from the planning and menu decision, through to the practical application and final presentation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not address healthy eating, particularly when it was not a key focus in the instructions for the task
* provided an account of what happened during preparation and serving rather than addressing their performance at the individual and group level
* addressed successes or weaknesses of their own efforts but failed to adequately reflect on the group performance
* showed difficulty in evaluating the task effectively when all specific features for evaluation were selected.

General Feedback

Discerning selection of the specific features of each of the Assessment Design Criteria for each assessment task helped to ensure tasks were able to be completed within specifications for word count.

Students need to be aware that incorporating analysis and evaluation into tables or text boxes does not exclude it from the word count.

Recipes and food orders are not required for submission.

When a task was presented that did not involve selecting food to demonstrate practical skills, it failed to address the essence of the practical activity, and specific features of the practical task were unable to be demonstrated or assessed appropriately. The intention of the document is to present a food-related practical.

External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

It was pleasing to see students address a wide range of contemporary issues affecting the food and

hospitality industry in the Investigation. A number of students followed up topics with a local focus, including

new issues such as regional food security and availability, and the impact of inflation and staff shortages

on hospitality menus. Other issues such as the impact of single use plastic bans, the use of social

media in the industry, management of waste, ghost kitchens, the use of Australian native ingredients and

locally sourced farm to table foods remained popular and were embedded in topics investigated by students.

Teachers may elicit more successful responses by:

* assisting students to identify areas of interest. Brainstorming current local, national or global issues from information gathered through the media, guest speakers, industry visits etc is an effective strategy to provide a broad picture of potential areas of investigation. Students are encouraged to develop original ideas and individual perspectives.
* ensuring students select an appropriate contemporary issue as the focus for the investigation It is essential the issue is clearly linked to the food and hospitality industry and to one of the Stage 2 Food and Hospitality areas of study from the subject outline.

*ICA 1: Investigation and critical analysis of contemporary trends and/or issues related to the Food and Hospitality Industry.*

*The more successful responses commonly:*

* selected an issue with a clear link to an area of study from the subject outline, and explained this in the introduction providing an effective focus for the investigation
* articulated and maintained a clear, strong and direct link to the food and hospitality industry
* refined and focussed the issue to ensure the research scope wasn’t too broad and developed a clear hypothesis or research question
* developed clear and relevant focus questions, enabling a focussed and structured response
* 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
* 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
* used a variety of research methods to inform their argument
* supported claims with evidence from various sources, made their own predictions and presented recommendations based on both primary and secondary data.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on topics rather than issues or were not linked to an area of study from the Food and Hospitality subject outline
* had unclear or only superficial links to the food and hospitality industry, for example diet related disease where the research focussed on nutrition (eg veganism) rather than how the food and hospitality is responding to this trend
* focussed on a food topic, without making links to the food and hospitality industry, for example issues related to food ethics
* used focus questions that were too broad (or too narrow) or were not clearly linked to the overall research question or hypothesis
* used ‘what’ as a question stem for all three focus questions- leaving little opportunity for valid discussion and analysis
* presented obvious information that required little or no analysis, such as the history of energy drinks or daily nutritional requirements.

*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
* 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 was related to a local context such as online menus, blogs and reviews was often effective than data from international settings which may not apply to local food and hospitality settings
* referenced sources appropriately and used a variety of research methods to inform their argument with all methods reflected in their reference list
* used relevant images to support discussion and referenced these appropriately.

The less successful responses commonly:

* presented information with minimal interpretation and discussion, showing research rather than analysis
* used survey results to validate points inappropriately, for example a survey of the public may be used to gauge opinion but does not reflect expert evidence (eg some surveys were limited to peers only)
* used resources that were not the most relevant (e.g. statistics from other countries so the information did not connect to the claim or point being made)
* indicated surveys or interviews had been conducted, but these were not used
* outlined interview responses in question and answer style, without discussion or analysis of results
* relied on one or two sources of information only and generalised points from these sources
* wrote from a personal perspective rather than based on research
* made limited links to the food and hospitality industry, even though the broad topic selected was focussed on food.

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

The most successful responses commonly:

* used appropriate terminology, relevant to the food and hospitality industry
* appeared to have carefully drafted and proofread their work, presenting a logical flow of ideas with minimal 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).
* were written using nominalised language
* used linking sentences in paragraphs to relate back to the topic and focus questions.

The least 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
* inserted tables, graphs or diagrams that were blurry to difficult to read and had limited value
* did not include any numerical data or statistical information
* used casual language and features such as pictures that were not related back to the narrative in the body of the work.

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

The most 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
* used contemporary references, both primary and secondary.

The least successful responses commonly:

* presented a short or minimal 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
* struggled to link the conclusion to the original question or hypothesis.