

GCSE



Chief Examiner's and Principal Moderator's Report Food and Nutrition

Summer Series 2019



Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2019 series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Component 1	Food and Nutrition	3
Component 2	Practical Food and Nutrition	6
Contact details		10

GCSE FOOD AND NUTRITION

Chief Examiner's Report

Component 1 Food and Nutrition

Overview

This was the first paper to be examined under the Revised Specification. The paper was suitable for a broad range of ability levels, as a wide range of question styles and command words were used to encourage differentiated responses. The majority of questions were attempted by candidates and a large proportion of candidates used additional paper, particularly for the longer response questions. Despite the relatively high number of questions being asked, there was little evidence that candidates struggled to complete the examination in the allocated timeframe (2 hrs).

As has been noted in previous reports, the candidates who attained the highest marks were generally those who were able to most accurately interpret the command words within the question and to act upon them in a highly competent manner. Where candidates failed to attain higher marks, this was generally as a result of failing to apply the command word within each question. In addition, there was clear differentiation between candidates who were competently able to apply their answer to the specific lifecycle group being addressed within certain questions, whereas candidates attaining lower marks provided more general answers. It is therefore essential for future exam series that candidates are appropriately prepared to respond to the more challenging details within questions if they are to attain the highest marks available.

One additional point to note is that a greater proportion of factual recall questions were answered poorly in this paper than in previous series. It should be emphasised that candidates are required to display skills across all three Assessment Objectives in each paper, and so examination preparation should focus on ability to answer both short and long response questions with a high degree of competence.

- Q1 (a) – (f)** These questions were generally well answered by the majority of candidates. The most challenging of the multiple choice questions appeared to be 1(f), where a large number of candidates were unable to identify the recommended percentage of daily energy to be provided by carbohydrate.
- Q2 (a) (i) & (ii)** These questions were answered accurately by the majority of candidates.
- (iii)** This question was regularly misinterpreted by candidates, as the focus was predominantly on the role of water rather than the importance of hydration.
- (b)** This question was handled with mixed success. Those who failed to access full marks incorrectly interpreted the question and provided a general response on the functions of fat.
- Q3 (a)** This question was not answered well on the whole. Candidates tended to focus on the role of Bord Bia as an organisation and were also preoccupied with the traceability of foods. Weaker responses merely rewrote the wording on the label. In order to perform more successfully, candidates would have needed to focus more clearly on how food is produced under Bord Bia guidelines.

- (b)** This question was answered with mixed success. There was evidence that some candidates had revised this aspect of the course thoroughly, however, for the majority of others it was clear this topic had not been a prime focus in their preparations.
- (c)** This question was very well handled, with the vast majority of candidates identifying and explaining barriers to effective consumption.
- (d)** For the most part, candidates failed to explicitly discuss shopping apps in this question, with the majority providing general responses relating to online shopping. This limited the marks available to most candidates.
- (e)** Again, the focus of this question was not acknowledged by many candidates. Candidates who attained full marks were able to provide a detailed discussion on shopping economies that was accurately applied within the context of families. However, the majority of candidates failed to apply their response to families, and so awarding of marks was limited here.
- Q4**
- (a)** This question was accurately answered by the majority of candidates.
- (b)** Very few candidates were able to answer this factual recall question accurately.
- (c)** This question was answered accurately by most candidates.
- (d)** This question was answered with mixed success.
- (e)** This question was well answered by many candidates, with detailed and accurate explanations being provided.
- Q5**
- (a)**
- (i) & (ii)** These questions were answered accurately by most candidates.
- (iii)** Very few candidates were able to accurately identify the term 'estimated average requirement' and so marks were limited in this question.
- (iv)** This question was answered with mixed success. Candidates who failed to access full marks tended to make stereotypical judgements regarding male energy needs that were inaccurate, such as males being more physically active than females.
- (b)** This question was answered with mixed success. Those who achieved full marks were able to provide competent explanations relating to energy balance.
- Q6**
- (a)** For the most part, candidates were able to access full marks more easily when responding about calcium and vitamin D as their answers remained specific to older adults. Fewer candidates attained full marks in relation to carbohydrate, as their answers were not focused on older adulthood.
- (b)** The majority of candidates failed to acknowledge that focus on sedentary lifestyles was a key element of this question. Responses were therefore very general in relation to meal planning for older adults, and did not take account of suitable meals for those who are sedentary.
- (c)** This question was generally well done, with the majority of candidates appropriately using the skill of evaluation within the context of the question.
- Q7**
- (a)** This question was answered correctly by the majority of candidates.
- (b)** The majority of candidates were able to answer this question in detail and in a competent manner. Those who failed to access full marks provided a general discussion on the importance of a healthy, balanced diet and failed to relate their answer to type 2 diabetes.

- Q8** (a) This question was answered with mixed success.
(b) This question was generally well answered by the majority of candidates.
- Q9** (a) As above, this question was well done by most.
(b) Candidates did not always focus on the context of the question. There was often reference to both kitchen and personal hygiene which were not credited under the mark scheme.
(c) This question was largely well done, with the majority of candidates being able to discuss the general purpose of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme.
(d) This question was not well answered. The majority of candidates incorrectly included the Food Standards Agency in their answer, which had been named in the previous question.
- Q10** This question allowed for a high level of differentiated response. Candidates achieving full marks were able to use subject specific terminology in relation to the factors, and discussed three very different factors in detail. However, weaker candidates were also able to access this question with ease, with most providing a full page response in relation to three valid factors.
- Q11** Again, this question performed well. Almost all candidates were able to suggest and justify relevant dietary and lifestyle advice in relation to reducing dental caries risk. Those who accessed higher marks were able to convey their answer with greater fluency of written communication.
- Q12** This question was particularly effective at allowing candidates of all abilities to demonstrate their nutritional knowledge and understanding. Almost all candidates were able to accurately correlate the listed ingredients with main nutrients provided, and could provide discussion on their role in the body. However, candidates who failed to attain full marks were not able to make effective correlations with the lifecycle group of adolescence.

Principal Moderator's Report

Component 2 Practical Food and Nutrition

Iron Deficiency Anaemia

Overall there was a very good understanding of the process across centres. The marking in the vast majority of centres was in line with the standards set at the Agreement Trials and consequently there were very few adjustments to centre marks. The vast majority of centres adhered to the word limits on Parts A, B and E (allowing for +/- 10%) and included a total word count.

The following points were noted by the Moderation team:

PART A: Research and Viewpoints

On the whole this was a strong area of the task with candidates producing some very specific and informative research in relation to iron deficiency anaemia. It should be noted that in order for candidates to access Band 4 marks they need to gather research from **more than four different types** of source eg. textbooks, magazines, newspapers, leaflet, TV programmes, Youtube, internet etc. Using a number of websites to gather information would only be considered one type of source. Sources need to be clearly referenced in the text and in a bibliography. It would be helpful if, when annotating candidates' work, teachers indicated not just the number of sources but the type of source being used eg, S1 newspaper, S2 leaflet.

The emphasis in this section should be on the research with a lesser emphasis on the viewpoints. The handling of viewpoints varied considerably between centres with some briefly stating the viewpoint without analysis or omitting their own viewpoint.

Candidates must collect the viewpoints of **two** people on the **same** topic. Questions should be designed to elicit viewpoints rather than test someone's knowledge of a topic. The viewpoints should be **analysed** i.e. candidates should attempt to compare the viewpoints and explain why they may be held as well as including their own viewpoint.

PART B: Justification of Choice

This was a strong area of the controlled assessment with the majority of centres using the specified headings from the Teacher Guidance materials (available to download from CCEA microsite) i.e. relevance to title, nutritional analysis, aesthetics, skills involved, time and ingredients available.

It is important that candidates indicate on a menu page the dishes and accompaniments that they have chosen. In a small number of centres candidates referred only to starters, main course, dessert etc.

In discussing the relevance to title, candidates should identify how the dishes they have chosen are suited to the title or adaptations they may have made to ingredients to make them suitable to the title.

The nutritional analysis should be the **main focus** of the justification of choice with candidates identifying the nutrients provided by their dishes and the function of these nutrients in the body/relevance to title. Only nutrients in the specification should be discussed with a particular focus on those that are relevant to the title – in this case iron and Vitamin C. Candidates are required to make reference to, and quote figures from their nutritional analysis in the Appendix. Marks for this section should take account of the detail and accuracy of the information presented. It was noted by the Moderation Team that there were often discrepancies between the figures quoted and those in the Appendix.

When discussing skills, candidates should identify the higher level skills that they will be able to display when making their dishes. Aesthetically they should justify their choice based on the range of colours, flavours and textures their dishes will include when finished.

In relation to time available candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the time required to prepare and make each dish and consequently the sequence they will need to follow to complete them all at the same time. Candidates should be encouraged to widen their discussion around ingredients available to include issues related to food provenance, food waste, local and seasonal food, organic produce etc.

PART C: Planning (ingredient lists, equipment lists, shopping list and costing)

Whilst the planning sections tended to be a strong area of the controlled assessment, in order to achieve top band marks or indeed full marks in this section, candidates' work must be '**detailed and accurate**'. In some centres there were a significant number of obvious inaccuracies or omissions in ingredient lists, equipment lists and shopping lists and yet candidates were being credited with full marks in this section. Centres are reminded of the following:

- Ingredient lists for each dish should be in metric measurements **only** with all quantities shown.
- Equipment lists **per dish** should be a complete list of all equipment and utensils required to make the dish **including serving dishes** e.g. large, white square plate. Specific details should be provided on equipment lists e.g. rather than saying 'knife' candidates should be specifying type e.g. vegetable knife, cooks' knife etc.
- Shopping lists should be a combined list of **all** foods included on the ingredient lists in the quantities required (not full packets, bottles etc) and placed under the correct heading according to **where they would be found in a supermarket** – fruit and vegetables, dairy, meat/fish, bakery and grocery e.g. tinned fruit should appear under grocery not fruit and vegetables; fresh herbs should be placed in the fruit and vegetable section and the bakery section is for baked goods and not those used for baking such as flour which should be placed under grocery.
- A costing summary should be included to show total cost per dish/accompaniment as well as a cost per portion. These should accurately reflect the breakdown of costs in the Appendix. It was noted by the Moderation team that there were often discrepancies between the costing summary and figures quoted in the evaluation or Appendix.

Timeplans

The standard of timeplans has greatly improved and this was a strong area of the controlled assessment. They should be detailed and incorporate the methods of each dish in a logical sequence with evidence of dovetailing so that dishes are ready at the same time. Colour coding by dish is a useful technique to use (though not essential).

The timeplan should be in **15 minute intervals** over the **3 hour practical session** and should include all activities involved in the preparation, cooking, serving and washing up of the 3 dishes.

PART D: Organisation and Management, Skills and Final Outcomes

The standard of practical work in evidence was very good overall with centres taking cognisance of the need for candidates to demonstrate a range of higher level skills within their chosen dishes in order to achieve top band marks (e.g. bread making, separating eggs, whisking egg whites, pastry making, sauce making). In a very few centres candidates were awarded Band 4 marks when a limited range of skills was demonstrated.

In most centres final outcomes were well presented but some awarded marks for a highly competent finish when the photographic evidence did not reflect this e.g. full marks awarded when it is clear that food was overcooked, soups were too thick etc. The marks for this section are divided across 3 areas – appearance, aesthetics and overall final presentation of serving table. **The marks awarded for the final presentation should reflect the table layout and decorations, and should be separate from the appearance marks which should focus on the appearance of the finished dishes.**

Photographic evidence in the form of one overall COLOUR photograph is also essential and should be taken close to the final outcomes. Individual photographs of each dish are not necessary.

Whilst the marks awarded by centres for organisation and management were accepted, moderators may have adjusted marks for skills if it was clear that a candidate had not 'demonstrated a wide variety of skills appropriate to the task'. Likewise, if it was obvious from the photographic evidence that the final outcomes did not reflect 'a highly competent outcome' and a 'highly competent standard of finish and presentation' then moderators will have adjusted accordingly.

PART E: Evaluation

Evaluations on the whole were well done with most centres using the headings from the Teacher Guidance – Research and Viewpoints, Justification of Choice, Planning (which should include an evaluation of the costing outcomes) and Practical Activity and Final Outcomes – in order for candidates to identify their strengths, weaknesses and suggest improvements.

Presentation

There are 4 marks available for Presentation and these should be allocated as follows:

Bibliography (2 marks)

2 marks for an accurate bibliography including recipe sources;

1 mark for an incomplete/basic bibliography; or

0 marks for no bibliography submitted.

Organisation of report (1 mark)

To include an Appendix for the nutritional analysis summary and costing breakdown. Please note the requirement to include a footer of candidate and centre number will no longer be required.

Copious pages of nutritional analysis should not be included in the Appendix but rather should be summarised into one table showing only nutrients relevant to the specification.

Word counts (1 mark)

To be shown at the end of Parts A, B and E as well as a total word count at the end. These should be within the +/- 10% tolerance for the mark to be awarded.

General Points to Note

Teacher annotation is essential to indicate how a teacher has arrived at the marks awarded. Suggested abbreviations for annotation include S = strength, W = weakness and SI = suggested improvement.

Please note the Candidate Record Sheet for the practical examination must either be submitted as a hard copy with the samples to include comments on the practical activity or can be completed online with teachers recording their comments on the eCRS.

When submitting work for moderation the total mark awarded to each candidate should be shown on the front cover of their work using the standardised pro forma (available to download from the CCEA E-Moderation microsite.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- **Specification Support Officer: Nola Fitzsimons**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2235, email: nfitzsimons@ccea.org.uk)
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Dorothee Wagner**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2218, email: dwagner@ccea.org.uk)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

