



Chief Examiner and Chief Moderator Report

**NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Food and
Cookery
603/7014/2**

Series: Summer 2024

NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Food and Cookery (603/7014/2)

Paper numbers: P002446, P002482, P002445

This report contains information in relation to the examined assessment (EA) from the chief examiner and non-examined assessment (NEA) from the chief moderator, with an emphasis on the standard of learner work within this assessment series.

The aim is to highlight where learners generally performed well as well as any areas where further development may be required.

Key points:

- grade boundary information
- administering the EA and NEA
- evidence creation
- standard of learner work
- responses to the tasks
- Regulations for the Conduct of External and the NEA

The qualification is linear, meaning both assessments must be taken in the same assessment series and cannot be combined across different assessment series. Learners are allowed one attempt at each assessment, and there are no resit opportunities.

Grade boundary and achievement information (V Certs)

This qualification consists of two assessments: the examined assessment (EA) and the non-examined assessment (NEA).

After both assessments are completed and marked or moderated, the marks are combined to give a final mark for each learner. Where the raw marks do not reflect the required weighting of the assessment, a scaling factor is applied. For further information on grading information and scaling factors, please see the Qualification Specification.

Qualification scaled mark boundaries in this series are:

	Overall	Notional boundaries*	
		EA	NEA
Scaling factor		1	1.25
Max	200	80	96
Level 2 Distinction*	170	63	83
Level 2 Distinction	143	54	71
Level 2 Merit	116	45	56
Level 2 Pass	90	37	42
Level 1 Distinction	70	29	32
Level 1 Merit	50	22	22
Level 1 Pass	31	15	13

**The grade boundaries given for each assessment are known as 'notional grade boundaries', as they are for illustrative purposes only. Grade boundaries are the lowest mark with which a grade is achieved.*

Administering the EA and the NEA.

The EA is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#) document.

Learners must be given the resources to carry out the tasks and these are highlighted within the [Qualification Specific Instructions for Delivery \(QSID\)](#) document.

The NEA must be conducted in line with the regulations outlined in the [Tutor Guidance](#) document.

Evidence creation

EA

Learners should use the space provided to answer questions. Where answers are typed or additional pages included, the learners name, centre number, centre name and task number must be clearly visible. The additional paper must then be securely attached to the workbook.

Where assessments are completed online, centres must ensure they are familiar with the Surpass platform and have completed all testing and preparation before the assessment, to ensure learners are unaffected by technological issues.

NEA

Within the NEA there is a requirement to create a range of evidence such as a word document, annotated photographs, and a time plan. Where these requirements are specified in the task it is important that they are adhered to, they are not optional and form an integral part of the task. These requirements are reflected in the Mark Scheme and will have been awarded marks accordingly.

Standard of learner work

EA

Overall, it was pleasing to see that learners of all abilities were able to demonstrate a good level of understanding in a range of areas such as food hygiene, allergies, and food choice. The multiple choice and short answer questions were broadly attempted by all, in comparison to the extended response questions which learners tended to find the most challenging and did not always attempt to answer.

The questions that learners found more challenging were the ones that required learners to apply, analyse or evaluate knowledge and understanding. Learners need more exposure at answering these types of questions. Those learners that were successful tended to plan their answer, using common writing strategies such as point, evidence and explain/link will help structure learner responses and help them to access the higher mark bands.

It was also clear that there are knowledge gaps, and misconceptions when it came to raising agents and the different B group vitamins that centres will need to address moving forward. Out

of the learners that did attempt question 25, it was clear that they did not know enough about the different B vitamins to awarded the higher marks.

NEA

Overall, it was good to see that the tasks proved accessible to learners across the level 1 and level 2 spectrum. Some good responses were seen and supported in many instances with a good range of annotated photographs that demonstrated a range of technical skills across the practical tasks.

Learners responded well to the tasks that required them to plan or cook dishes in response to a task.

Where tasks required learners to evaluate and analyse their choices, or the dietary needs of a health-related question, some learners tended to describe rather than evaluate. Not all included what improvements could be made to the outcome. Some learners did not identify what their response lacked, for example, the relevant nutritional content to support the choices they had made. Not all referred to the brief in their responses, which specified key requirements for learners to consider for each task.

Not all learners included their research notes, and some exceeded the four sides of A4 specified. In some instances, the required evidence for each task was not uploaded, for example annotated photos required for tasks 2 (a), 3 (b) and 4 (a) or a time plan required for 3 (a). In some instances, evidence for entire tasks was missing. There were instances where evidence was missing. All required evidence must be uploaded using the Student evidence upload checklists to support which can be found with the live assessment materials.

Responses to the assessments

EA**Question 1**

A multiple-choice question which was generally well answered by learners.

Question 2

A multiple-choice question which was very well answered by learners.

Question 3

A multiple-choice question which was generally well answered by learners.

Question 4

Learners generally answered this answer correctly. Marks were also awarded for those learners who answered soil/ground.

Question 5 (a)

This question was well answered however some learners commented that manufactured food products are cheaper but did not include 'than buying all the ingredients separately' and therefore were not awarded full marks.

Question 5 (b)

A generally well answered question as most learners were able to explain three actions that the head chef should include in a risk assessment.

Question 6 (a)

A very well answered question, it was clear that learners of all abilities could recall and apply knowledge of cross-contamination.

Question 6 (b)

Whilst learners were able to provide different examples of correct food hygiene, they found it challenging to describe other parts of the food safety act and therefore this question was not as well answered in comparison to others.

Question 7

A multiple-choice question which was well answered by learners.

Question 8

A multiple-choice question which was well answered by learners.

Question 9

A multiple-choice question which was well answered by learners.

Question 10

Several learners wrote the answer 'bridge' or 'claw' however these are techniques used to hold the knife safely and not a skill. Centres should address this misconception with learners.

Question 11

This was a generally well answered question with learners being able to explain the two factors.

Question 12

Learners found this question challenging as several learners suggested altering the original ingredients rather than adding additional ingredients such as chicken or serving with rice.

Question 13

Learners were more confident at suggesting improvements, but some struggled to recall the different sensory attributes.

Question 14

This was an extended response question based on raising agents, with all learners not attempting this question. A high number of learners referred to yeast as being the raising agent used in cakes. Some learners could confidently recall and show understanding of the different types of aeration, but the majority struggled to achieve the higher marks through lack of analysis and evaluation.

Question 15

A multiple-choice question which was generally well answered by learners.

Question 16

A multiple-choice question where many learners were not able to recognise that vitamin D helps prevent rickets.

Question 17

A multiple-choice question where a high number of learners failed to recognise that sugar is a simple carbohydrate.

Question 18

This was a well answered question with the majority of learners able to state one way to reduce food waste when buying ingredients.

Question 19

Learners demonstrated good recall and were able to apply knowledge and understanding.

Question 20

This was a well answered question with many learners able to identify a factor that could impact food choice and provide a reason.

Question 21 (a)

Learners generally answered this question well and they were able to explain two dietary choices.

Question 21 (b)

Some learners did not discuss specific ways that Hannah could adapt her cooking and made generic comments such as eat more vegetables.

Question 22

Some learners struggled with this question and tended to recall knowledge of salt rather than apply their knowledge and understanding to evaluation and analysis.

Question 23

An extended response question with most learners attempting this question and were able to identify the effects of being dehydrated but did not have the ability to recall knowledge. A big misconception was that water provides energy.

Question 24

This was an extended response question with several learners not attempting this question and those that did, did not always read the question fully and made recommendations for replacement foods rather than evaluating the shopping choices. Most learners struggled to identify that overall, the shopping list did not fully meet the nutritional needs of a toddler.

Overall, this question and the following question were good opportunities for marks but which very few learners were able to access. Overly brief responses, lack of understanding and analysis, and answers lacking depth and detail were significant factors in learners being unable to access higher band marks.

Question 25

An extended response question with several learners again not attempting this question. It was very evident that learners lacked knowledge of the B vitamins and therefore struggled to be awarded higher marks. Quite often learners focused on the fact that Lorcan was a vegan and focused on the issues that this could cause rather than the deficiencies that could have been caused by the lack of B vitamins.

NEA**Task 1**

Most learners were able to identify an appropriate range of changes to be made to the pie to make it healthier. Many learners were able to provide relevant reasons for their choice, or removal of ingredients, or changes to the cooking methods. The inclusion of nutritional information relevant to the amended dish ranged from excellent to minimal or in some instances none. Learners were also required to consider why the amended recipe was healthier for someone who follows a balanced diet and the 8 UK government healthy eating tips. These aspects were not always referenced in the learner responses.

Task 2 (a)

Learners demonstrated a range of technical skills to produce their amended recipe, some showing creativity and innovation. The presentation varied from excellent to needing improvement.

Some learners included an excellent range of annotated photographs that provided a clear story board of the preparation and cooking of the amended dish. Not all learners included sufficient, or indeed any annotated photos of the key stages of making the amended dish, which is a specific requirement of the task. The standard of the annotations varied, some being detailed and explaining both which processes and techniques were being carried out, as well as the demonstration of safe and hygienic practices, and in each case explaining why, which demonstrated their understanding.

Task 2 (b)

This was an evaluative task, and the standard of the learner response varied considerably. Some learners were able to demonstrate excellent analysis and evaluation of their own preparation and cooking skills they had demonstrated to produce the amended recipe. They could clearly describe how their choice of ingredients impacted upon their amended dish and its nutritional content. In some cases, learners tended to describe what they had done and did not suggest any aspects for improvement in an evaluation.

Task 3 (a)

Many learners were able to choose a 2-course menu that was suitable for children aged 5 to 10 that fulfilled the requirements of the task and the brief. Others chose inappropriate choices such as very spicy food or food that was not very nutritionally sound for the age group.

Learners were asked to create a time plan within a 2-hour continuous time frame. Some learners produced appropriately timed plans that showed sequencing and dovetailing and included sufficient detail to be a working document for the learners to refer to when cooking the menu. Other learners did not include a time plan or instead simply provided a method without timings and cooked each dish in a linear fashion.

Some of the time plans exceeded the specified 2 hours, which is not allowed. Some were less than 2 hours which could have meant the dishes either lacked the skills needed for this task or that this was insufficient time to cover the complete menu.

Some learners created time plans for other practical tasks that were not required. No marks could be awarded for these.

Task 3 (b)

For this task learners, if they felt it appropriate, could amend their time plan. Very few did.

Learners were also required to cook the 2-course menu and provide annotated photos of the key stages of each dish. Some learners demonstrated an excellent range of technical skills to produce their 2-course menu showing creativity and excellent presentation skills. Other learners struggled to present their dishes to a good standard.

Some learners included an excellent range of annotated photographs that provided a clear story board of the preparation and cooking of their menu. Not all learners included sufficient (if any) annotated photos of the key stages of making the menu, which is a specific requirement of the task. The standard of the annotations varied. Some were detailed and explained processes and techniques that were being carried out. Some learners explained what safe and hygienic practices were but also why they were, demonstrating an understanding of their actions. Some learner annotations were descriptive, not analytical and very brief.

Task 3 (c)

This task required the learners to evaluate and analyse their time plan and their application of their preparation and cooking techniques, used to create their menu and their presentation skills, to include the overall outcome of their completed dishes.

There were some good responses to this task with some learners showing an ability to analyse and evaluate both their time plan and their own preparation and cooking techniques. Learners

identified aspects for improvement as well as how the completed dishes could be improved. For other learners, some, or all elements of this task were challenging. Responses were descriptive and did not include evaluative comments or many suggestions for improvement.

Task 4 (a)

Learners were required to choose, plan and prepare a suitable cake or dessert using canned, frozen, or dried fruit or vegetables. They were also required to annotate photographs of the key stages of the chosen dish explaining the preparation and cooking techniques being used and why.

Learners at the higher end of level 2 were able to choose an appropriate dish that met the requirements and showed good understanding of the dietary needs of a diabetic. They were able to annotate their photos explaining why they had chosen the preparation and cooking techniques.

Some learners chose dishes that were not very suitable for a diabetic or did not adhere to the requirements of the task or brief.

Many learners did not include the recipe they were using so it was difficult to know how appropriate the recipe was for a diabetic, particularly as learners were often substituting sugar for sweeteners suitable for a diabetic. Some dishes were quite simple and did not demonstrate a good range of technical skills or a high standard of presentation. Again, some learners did not include staged annotated photos of their dish or very few.

Task 4 (b)

This final task required learners to evaluate the nutritional content and suitability of their chosen dish for someone with type 2 diabetes. Learners were also required to evaluate the outcome of the completed dish in terms of the requirements of the cafe owner as specified in the brief.

The more able learners demonstrated an ability to analyse and evaluate the dietary requirements of someone with type 2 diabetes, nutritional understanding and how suitable their choice was, as well as referring to the requirements of the cafe owner. Some learners did not fully understand the requirements of a diabetic and did not evaluate their choice and nutritional content but described it. To obtain more marks, learners should include references to the brief.