# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2024 Food and Hospitality Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

This subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 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. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

The Subject Renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025; these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 subject assessment advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct.

Many 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.

Action plans addressed a variety of topics for focus in 2024, including issues related to the role of social media in the food and hospitality industry, environmental influences such as the use of local produce, and contemporary trends such as small plates and grazing platters.

The more successful responses commonly:

* utilised a relevant *area of study* from the subject outline as a focus for planning. This provided students with a sound basis to discuss relevant factors, which informed their decision-making
* 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 relevant justification
* showed understanding of how the implementation strategies linked to success in the practical application.

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/time available and required equipment 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. This often restricted 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.

Research Task

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

Examples of other topics developed for research tasks in 2024 included the sustainability of dining-out in today’s market, the use of native Australian ingredients, the role of social media/technology in Instagram-worthy desserts, the use of plant-based foods, and local produce.

The more successful responses commonly:

* utilised relevant primary and secondary sources to support critical analysis, including 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
* made clear connections with the *area of study* which underpins the research task.

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
* did not 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.

Evidence of practical application 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. This can be evidenced through photographs, a student checklist, or short video(s) or a student statement. Ideally, photographs should be annotated to support the evidence being presented.

Some schools incorporated tasks featuring seasonal and/or regional foods for contemporary menus; foods for events, such as fairs, signature desserts, celebration cakes; foods for small plates, grazing platters, brunch, desserts; foods for a specific purpose, for example, a menu for a function or dietary needs; and foods featuring native Australian ingredients.

The more successful responses commonly:

* developed a challenging practical activity with a clear food and hospitality industry focus, linked with the *area of study*
* reflected discerning and appropriate use of technology, allowing students to demonstrate skills in responsible production and management, and to present their creations to a high standard
* demonstrated a high level of technical skill and creativity
* provided explicit evidence of practical application using annotated photographs/images. This included final presentation of the food product and details of processes undertaken 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 the relevant criteria
* displayed minimal evidence of practical application
* did not align with, or reference, an *area of study*
* showed weaknesses in processes carried out, with limited evidence of effective time and/or resource management and/or 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, when E2, E3 and E4 are selected, they should be explicitly outlined in the evaluation task. This is to ensure students are supported when addressing the specified features. It is important that students understand the focus of E2 for the specific task.

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated strong links to the research or planning when the number of specific features was reduced, allowing students to demonstrate their depth, and understanding
* reflected on their performance with a concise but strong discussion of practical outcomes, supported with a clear understanding of processes
* evaluated, and suggested links to, the *area of study*
* provided detailed responses as to how the final food practical linked to the task, including relevant suggestions for improvement.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* gave a recount in their reflection rather than explained the action that took place and the outcome as a result
* followed a generic format which limited 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
* were descriptive with no links to the *area of study* and the purpose of the task.

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 effectively, considering the experience of group members and their ability to work together
* presented a clear outline of their planning and identified the roles of group members
* demonstrated strong links in the discussion to support healthy eating practices, followed by a practical task based on an appropriate choice, linked to the selected *area of study*.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* overlooked the healthy eating practices focus within the planning and selection of the group practical task
* selected a task which was too challenging for the size of the group and/or skill level of the individual students
* did not relate or connect with the concept of healthy eating practices in regard to the teacher-directed practical task
* listed generic factors such as lessons/time available without focussing on the specific issues related to the selected *area of study* and the healthy eating practices focus.

Group Practical Application

Each student should submit clear evidence of the Group Practical Application. Most students did this effectively with selected annotated images 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 the 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.

Individual Evaluation Report

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

Students were generally successful in reflecting on their 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 and group performance, linking their task to their healthy eating practices selection and the *area of study*
* discussed how collaboration improved their result i.e. they did not just state what each person did but explained how it contributed to the quality of the outcome
* capably addressed healthy eating practices, from planning through to practical application and final presentation.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not address healthy eating practices, particularly when it was not a key focus in the instructions for the task
* provided an account of what happened 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 performance of the group as a whole
* demonstrated difficulty in evaluating the task effectively when all specific features for evaluation were selected.

Collaboration

Collaboration (C1 and C2) is intended to be used within AT2. Collaboration should be addressed at each stage of the assessment task 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 annotated images
* presented clear evidence and development of collaboration, individual and group roles
* provided evidence of initiative and leadership within the group.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided limited visual and written evidence of practical outcomes or reflections in the evaluation to demonstrate group collaboration across the task
* presented little evidence of collaboration in planning, annotated images/photographs, comments, or evaluation.

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, food orders, food costings and time plans are not required for submission.

A few tasks were presented that did not involve selecting food to demonstrate practical skills. These tasks failed to address the essence of the practical activity, and the student was unable to demonstrate specific features of the practical task. This resulted in those specific features being unable to be assessed appropriately. The intention of the task is to present a food-related practical.

# External Assessment

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* assisting students to identify areas of interest. Mind-mapping current local, national, or global issues and trends from information gathered through the engaging with media, guest speakers, industry visits etc is an effective strategy to help identify potential areas of investigation. Students are encouraged to develop their own 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 identified in the subject outline
* ensuring that students manage their time to research, collect resources and receive drafting feedback.
* ensuring a word count is included and not exceeded.

Assessment Type 3: Investigation

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* in the subject outline and explained this in the introduction to provide a focus for the investigation
* articulated and maintained a clear, strong, direct, and attainable link to the food and hospitality industry
* refined and focussed the issue to ensure the scope of research was manageable (not too broad) and developed a clear hypothesis or research question
* developed clear and relevant focus questions, enabling a focussed, structured, and concise response
* demonstrated that students had selected more open-ended questions, which enabled them to show greater depth and analysis. For example, use of ‘To what extent…’ facilitates students to develop a comparison, articulate a balanced view of information, and develop a strong argument
* demonstrated critical analysis through 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
* demonstrated the ability to think critically by thoroughly analysing data and information. 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 arguments with evidence from multiple sources, made their own predictions and presented recommendations based on both primary and secondary data
* featured original primary research including surveys, interviews, or observations.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* focused on topics rather than issues or issues that 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, a diet-related disease where the research focussed on switching to a vegan diet as a solution, rather than how the food and hospitality industry responds to this trend
* used focus questions that were either too broad, too narrow, or were not clearly linked to the overall research question or hypothesis
* had no clear introduction to the topic (no focus questions or links to the *area of study*)
* used closed questions starting with ‘What…’ for all three focus questions leaving little opportunity for valid discussion and analysis
* diverged from the topic during the discussion
* stated lots of facts/information without any explanation of the impact(s) on the industry.

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 representing a range of perspectives or stakeholders
* utilised the views of experts, through primary or secondary sources, and explained the persons position or area of expertise adding depth and credibility to their findings
* added depth of understanding by analysing data, interpreting, and discussing the implication of results. These students 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
* were discerning in the use of internet sources. Data which was related to a local context such as online menus, blogs, podcasts, and reviews was often more effective than data from international settings which may not apply to local food and hospitality settings
* referenced sources appropriately using recognised referencing conventions and used a variety of research methods to inform their argument. All methods were reflected in their reference list
* used relevant images to support discussion and referenced these appropriately
* effectively graphed results, followed with appropriate discussion.

*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, where a survey of the public may be used to gauge opinion, the student would use this to incorrectly represent evidence from an expert. In addition, some surveys were limited to peers only and not representative
* used resources that were not the most relevant. For example, statistics from other countries where the information did not connect to the claim or point being made
* selected and pasted graphs from the internet without any discussion
* wrote from a personal perspective rather than based on research
* made tenuous 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 more successful responses commonly:

* used industry specific terminology, relevant to the food and hospitality industry
* presented a logical flow of ideas with minimal repetition. Students appeared to have carefully drafted and proofread their work
* had presented high quality visual data, such as graphs, which were well labelled and explained. This ensured the information gathered was analysed and clearly referred to in the body of the report
* ensured that information contained in graphs was clear, legible, and accessible (easy to read)
* were written using nominalised language
* used linking sentences in paragraphs to relate back to the topic and focus questions.

*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
* inserted tables, graphs or diagrams that were blurry, 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 to the narrative in the body of the work
* lacked referencing as well as sourcing of references relevant to the issue.

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 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 less successful responses commonly:*

* presented a short or minimal conclusion
* presented no 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
* relied on generic Google searches that resulted in superficial information.