

GCSE (9-1)

Moderators' report

FOOD PREPARATION AND NUTRITION

J309

For first teaching in 2016

J309/02/03/04/05

Summer 2019 series

Version 1

Contents

Introduction3

General overview/Introduction4

J309/02/036

 Interpretation of the assessment criteria6

 Applying the standards successfully6

J309/04/057

 Interpretation of the assessment criteria7

 Applying the standards successfully7

Most common areas to improve9


 NEA 1 Scientific Investigation9

 NEA Practical Task10

Key NEA facts12

Avoiding potential malpractice13

Helpful resources14




Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Save As Other ...** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as ...** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word converter*).



We value your feedback

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by our moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements; identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation and comments on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. This report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost to other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.

General overview/Introduction

NEA Task 1 Practical Task

In this second year of entry for this specification, candidates produced work that was both wide and varied. The NEA task proved accessible to all and provided opportunities for a wide range of abilities to demonstrate their achievement. It was apparent that where teachers had a clear understanding of the specification, the appropriate guidance and support was given. Candidates benefited when they applied the knowledge gained from their NEAs to the examined unit.

There seemed to be an even spread for both the fats/shortening task and yeast this year, and most centres followed one of the tasks rather than give their candidates a choice, which is quite acceptable. The majority of candidates provided logical and appropriate investigations with a range of variables. Where candidates had focused on the fats/shortening task there appeared to be a larger range of possible variables, which sometimes resulted in work becoming confused, and made the final analysis of results muddled.

Photographic evidence was used positively to support the work, with most centres presenting their investigations as concise reports within the 2000 word count.

It should be made clear that although research should be brief, there needs to be a bibliography or references for any sources used.

NEA Task 2 Practical Task

Candidates produced work that was interesting, wide and varied. The NEA task proved accessible to all and, just like the first NEA, provided opportunities for students with a wide range of abilities to demonstrate their achievements.

As before, it was apparent that where teachers had a clear understanding of the specification, the appropriate guidance and support was given. Candidates benefited when they applied the knowledge gained from their NEAs to the examined unit.

Administration of the non-examined assessments

Samples were sent in a timely fashion. Clerical errors were minimal but when they did occur, they were dealt with promptly.

Candidates' work was well organised, although a range of information arrived with the samples including centre authentication forms; these are no longer required to be sent with the moderation sample but should instead be securely stored within the centre.

A small number of centres had registered candidates for Repository but actually posted their work, which was commented on via the report. Centres should be mindful of the correct codes when entering candidates.

Memory sticks and discs have caused difficulties for some moderators this year with regard to corrupting computers and work not being able to be viewed successfully. If centres would like to send their work electronically instead of sending paper copies, we would recommend using the Repository instead of posting memory sticks.

Postal moderation key point

Centres are reminded that portfolios should be securely fastened. Best practice is to hole punch and use a treasury tag. This is economical on weight and costs when posting. Centre name, number, together with each candidate's name and number should be clearly written on the accompanying forms.

J309/02/03

Interpretation of the assessment criteria

The annotation of candidates' work could have been much more detailed. Comments were limited on the MC1, which meant at times it was difficult to ascertain where levels had been met and criteria reached. It was more common to see candidates' work marked accurately rather than severely, with the majority within tolerance.

Applying the standards successfully

Planning

This was generally completed successfully, with work being well structured and concise and including only the relevant information. The research completed was pertinent to the chosen task and helped to make suitable choices of investigations and predictions for those investigations.

Aims were formulated either at the beginning of the portfolios or were described before each investigation was carried out.

Predictions were mostly clear and helped the candidates to focus on what they hoped to achieve.

It was encouraging to see that the majority of centres had used a range of scientific terminology – the methodology of these tasks was much improved from last year, with scientific approaches more visible and the relevant technical/scientific terminology implemented. The use of clear aims and predictions, and the use of control recipes was evident. The results collected were objectively analysed, with candidates referring back to both the research and predictions made within the planning.

It was clear that centres had carried out the investigations in as controlled environments as possible, doing what they could to ensure fair testing.

Investigation

There was some excellent evidence of accurate and thoughtfully planned work, and pictorial evidence was good. There were few changes or adaptations made and some good recording of results.

Centres had considered ways of recording the information from the investigations. The use of 'Munsall' Colour Charts, accurate labelling, measuring beakers and spoons, digital scales, stop watches and photographs were all seen within the work moderated, showing that centres are approaching this NEA with a more scientific approach. This helped the analysis and reflection of results collected.

Analyse

Many centres used a range of ways to record results, with photographs, graphs, star diagrams and tables following the marking criteria accurately. All centres had encouraged candidates to complete at least three investigations as 'good practice', but some only offered results in two formats.

Evaluation

Evaluations often included a summary of their findings and suggestions/recommendations for future cooking. This section highlighted the more able candidates who were able to show a good understanding of the task, giving constructive and informative comments to show if their predictions were correct. Candidates who had a good interpretation found it easier to produce the evaluation and the comments included were constructive and informative.

J309/04/05

Interpretation of the assessment criteria

As with the first NEA, on average, the annotation of candidates' work could have been much more detailed. It would be beneficial if some reasoning behind the marks awarded was clearly provided even if only on the MC2 sheets. There was an even response to the choice of tasks and both presented some excellent planning and practical work.

Applying the standards successfully

Planning

For the obesity task, we were looking to see that students had modified recipes to reduce the calories and compared the original recipe to the 'healthier' alternative. This had not always been completed though and some centres had simply chosen lower calorie dishes, meaning no nutritional comparisons were evident.

In some centres, more understanding of the task would have helped planning, analysis and evaluation. Research was generally well summarised and relevant, but was not always referenced – although there was a marked improvement on last year.

A variety of skills and techniques were evident within choices of practical work. Seasonality and provenance considerations were briefly included. However, in some instances it seemed that candidates were more concerned about showing of a range of skills rather than answering the task, which resulted in poorer choices of practical work being selected.

Costing was completed together with nutritional analysis. These aspects were not always fully applied to the task. Time plans were considerably more detailed this year and dovetailing was evident. Attempts to include safety, quality and hygiene points were clear, if brief at times.

Methods of working

A large majority of candidates demonstrated admirable personal preparation and organisation in their work area when undertaking the three hour practical task.

Excellent photographic journals of candidates carrying out their practical dishes were included. It was helpful when centres included annotation to justify the marks being given.

Skills and cooking

Pictorial evidence helped to justify this mark although again there was limited annotation to help justify the judgement made. Centres had clearly understood this assessment criteria and students showed a range of medium/high level skills. Skills such as jointing a chicken, skinning fish, making mayonnaise, making pasta, a range of sauces, sweet doughs, flaky and choux pastry, meringues, and complex presentation skills were all evident within work moderated, which was a pleasure to see.

Presentation

Styling and presentation of the finished dishes was very varied – some candidates had clearly decided to 'show case' dishes with garnishing, decorating techniques and whole table styling.

Portion control was much improved, and candidates' creativity was evident.

Analyse and Evaluation

Evaluations provided clear differentiation between candidates. Those that provided a comprehensive review of their work discussed results from their sensory analysis and then recommended improvements and changes, which were supported with examples. All aspects of their practical work were reviewed and consideration was given to everything. Conclusions were drawn which linked back to the original task.

Some centres who completed the fruit and vegetable task had compiled questionnaires for younger people to answer and used these within their evaluations to great effect.

Most common areas to improve

NEA 1 Scientific Investigation

The reports should include appropriate, relevant and well-planned investigations. Three to four variables are sufficient. These practical investigations should be carried out under set, controlled conditions to make sure fair and accurate results are obtained.

Candidates should produce a clear plan and follow it throughout the task. They must show they have carried out a wide range of testing, with the results of the investigation clearly recorded and a wide range of formats should be used. 'Wide range' should be interpreted to mean at least three.

Candidates' evidence should show they have clearly understood the scientific principles that bring about the functional and working characteristics of a food commodity.

A comprehensive analysis that includes a range of opinions and viewpoints should be included.

Conclusions should be drawn explaining what has been discovered.

Planning

Some research did not include an explanation of shortening, including how it could be affected when making pastry. This resulted in limited success criteria being explained, criteria which could have been used in predictions and referred back to within the results analysis.

Aims should be evident at the beginning of the investigations. Centres should be encouraged to produce detailed plans as this positively contributes to the work and enables candidates to focus on what they are hoping to achieve and how they are going to record their findings.

Reasons for choice were slightly disappointing as candidates did not link up the research with their planned investigations and in some cases lacked clear understanding.

The approach to this task was much improved from last year though, with a scientific approach more visible and the relevant technical/scientific terminology implemented. Most centres had encouraged candidates to include a 'control' recipe but few candidates actually explained the purpose of providing this as part of their variables.

Some centres did not always carry out a range of investigations though; sensory analysis can only be classed as one investigation.

Planning of the practical session varied greatly between centres and was a weaker area, with candidates often needing more accuracy to achieve a scientific approach.

Investigation

Many centres had used a limited range of formats, which prevented candidates accessing the top mark band. The most popular formats were star profiles, photographic evidence and tables.

Analyse

The analysis and evaluation sections definitely displayed the differentiation between candidates, as they showed their understanding of the investigations they had completed. Results were discussed with varying degrees of accuracy. There was limited evidence of students using the control recipe to compare their results and many did not link their results back to research completed or predictions made, with few attempting to include varying viewpoints.

Where unexpected results had occurred through the investigations carried out, few went on to explain why, and link it to what should have happened and why.

Evaluation

This was a weaker area where many candidates tended to repeat the analysis of their results rather than applying their findings back to the original hypothesis and the research carried out. Few applied their knowledge by suggesting how this might help in the future, or drawing clear conclusions as to their chosen commodity.

Often the evaluative comments were merged and intermingled with the analysis and quite a few candidates lacked a clear summary at the end of the whole investigation. This would have clarified their thoughts.

NEA Practical Task

Trialling and testing of ideas within the planning section is not required. This ultimately affects the marks given in the planning section, as candidates do not address nutrition, costing or food provenance and seasonality adequately.

Planning

There was a good range of dishes selected initially but reasons for choice and justification for the dishes chosen could have been better. Very few candidates mentioned the target groups, which made it difficult to carry out meaningful analysis of the nutritional data collected.

Although seasonality and provenance considerations were included, these could be developed further to show a clearer understanding and application to their chosen dishes. Statements such as 'I will buy my eggs locally' were common.

Costing was completed, together with nutritional analysis, but was not always discussed in relation to the chosen task.

Attempts to include safety, quality and hygiene points were in many time plans but not always comprehensively, while a number of candidates missed these areas out completely. This needs to be addressed in future submissions within the time plans.

Some centres included a plan of work to show how they were going to use their time for planning, execution and evaluation, which is not required for this specification.

Methods of working

This section would have been helped by more annotations from teachers, but the marking itself was mainly acceptable.

Presentation

For some candidates, the presentation of their three dishes was rather plain and basic. Portion control was not always clear and there was limited annotation from the teacher regarding the sensory results produced by candidates. A small number of candidates had not provided a complete dish e.g. soup with bread, curry with rice, vegetables with chicken, etc.

An A4 coloured picture of the three final dishes together was not always provided, making it difficult to see the final standard of practical work produced.

Analyse and Evaluation

This section was varied in content and quality. Many candidates did not discuss results from sensory analysis collected, and those who did discuss results did not always suggest improvements. Practical work was reviewed but few considered all their work or linked it back to the original task.

Often the evaluation involved a descriptive account of what they did rather than relevant evaluative comments, using the judgements found from the work completed. Limited conclusions were drawn and more suggestions as to how their work could be improved, with specific examples, could have been included.

Key NEA facts

NEA 1 Scientific investigation

Centres should select one of the two NEA set tasks, released every year on 1 September.

All practical activities must be carried out in the classroom environment.

The investigations do not require a whole recipe to be used or a final product produced.

The scientific investigation should be no longer than 2000 words – this includes any statistical evidence, graphs and photographs.

NEA 2 Practical Task

Centre should select one of the two NEA set tasks, released every year on 1 November.

No trialling of dishes is required.

A range of complex skills should be undertaken across the three dishes. It is not a requirement that all three dishes illustrate high level skills.

All three completed practical dishes must be completed within three hours, in the classroom.

A picture of the three final dishes should be provided. Centres are recommended to include one A4 colour photograph of the final three complete dishes.

Avoiding potential malpractice

What can be done?

Read and act on any updates from OCR.

In large departments, make sure all teachers have a good understanding of the standards.

Make sure that all record keeping is up to date.

Explain the NEA set tasks and the requirements for each section.

Make sure that any practical investigations are recorded at the time that the activity is carried out.

Make sure that all practical work is carried out within a three hour time frame.

Ask for clarification and/or assistance if needed. OCR will happily support you when requested.

Encourage candidates to take responsibility for their progress, give constructive feedback and signpost the criteria for them.

Helpful resources

[OCR GCSE Food Preparation and Nutrition Student Book](#)

ISBN: 9781471867491 Publisher: Hodder Education

[OCR GCSE Food Preparation and Nutrition Student eTextbook](#)

ISBN: 9781471867132 Publisher: Hodder Education

[OCR GCSE Food Preparation and Nutrition Course Companion](#)

Publisher: Zig-Zag Education

[My Revision Notes: OCR GCSE Food Preparation and Nutrition](#)

ISBN: 978-1-4718-8700-0 Publisher: Hodder Education

<https://www.nutrition.org.uk/>

British Nutrition Foundation

www.ifst.org/lovefoodlovescience

Institute of Food Science & Technology

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

activeresults

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. Available for GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level*
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

*To find out which reports are available for a specific subject, please visit ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/

Find out more at ocr.org.uk/activeresults

CPD Training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here: www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Support Centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2019** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge
Assessment

