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Introduction

This document has been prepared by the Chief Examiner and Principal Moderator; it is designed to be used as a feedback tool for centres in order to enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document is referred to when planning delivery and when preparing candidates for City & Guilds Technical assessments.

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance in both the synoptic assignment and theory exam. It highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat assessments in the 2017 academic year. It will explain aspects which caused difficulty and potentially why the difficulties arose.

The document provides commentary on the following assessments;

- 6103-031 Level 3 Supervision in Food and Beverage Services - Synoptic assignment
- 6103-030/530 Level 3 Supervision in Food and Beverage Services - Theory exam
  - April 2017
  - June 2017
Qualification Grade Distribution

The grade distribution for this qualification during the 2016/2017 academic year is shown below:

Please note City & Guilds will only report qualification grades for candidates who have achieved all of the required assessment components, including Employer Involvement, optional units and any other centre assessed components as indicated within the Qualification Handbook.
Theory Exam
Grade Boundaries

Assessment: 6103-030/530
Series: April 2017

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment;

Assessment: 6103-030/530
Series: June 2017

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graph below shows the distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment:

6103-030/530 June 2017
Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Candidates achieving Grade</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Pass rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades
Chief Examiner Commentary

6103-030/530 Level 3 Supervision in Food and Beverage Services - Theory exam

Series 1 – April 2017

The paper consisted of questions that covered elements across all of the units with 60% on the core units relating to supervisory skills and 40% on food and beverage units. The questions required candidates to apply knowledge and understanding to a range of scenarios to enable them to apply theory to practice whilst building on prior knowledge from Level 2 qualifications.

Candidates did not appear to have been sufficiently prepared for the theory examination resulting in a low level of knowledge and understanding being demonstrated. The responses were of a level 2 standard rather than what would be expected for a level 3 qualification.

There were issues with misinterpreting the question due to candidates not reading it correctly and in particular, not understanding the requirements of the command verbs. I.e. describe, explain. In the majority of cases the candidates were listing points and not relating their responses to the scenarios.

Spelling and grammar are not marked in this examination, but it is worth noting that many technical terms were misspelt throughout the exam. A poor level of spelling and grammar was displayed for level 3 learners, resulting in some responses being difficult to understand.

More marks can be achieved by considering the allocation of marks for each question and how the marks could be earned.

The responses for the extended response questions were very poor, learners did not appear to understand the requirements of these questions and the opportunity provided to ‘discuss’ strategies for question 8 and ‘propose with justifications’ for question 15 were not used, they either focussed on one aspect or listed points.

Many candidates did not understand what was meant by the command verb, but marks were awarded where correct knowledge was demonstrated.
The June paper is the second exam in the series that candidates have undertaken but not all candidates that sat the April paper chose to sit the June paper indicating candidates that had achieved a pass grade were not encouraged to improve their grade.

There were mixed levels of responses across the paper but a number of candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the responsibilities of an employer relating to Health and Safety and the content of a pre-service briefing.

Centres do not appear to have taken on board the examiner comments as candidates were still providing one word answers and listing points rather than adhering to the command verbs explain/describe. This resulted in marks being awarded for examples that were relevant but candidates were not achieving the full marks for their responses.

There appears to be gaps in knowledge across all centres in particular relating to effective training and development, principles of stock control, restaurant sales information and beverage service with some candidate responses of a level 2 standard rather than level 3 demonstrated by the knowledge applied. Furthermore, candidates continue to not read questions correctly as indicated by a number of incorrect responses that do not relate to the context of the question.

Candidates would gain more marks when completing the extended questions by answering them in depth or addressing all of the points that are required for a discussion. In some cases candidates are listing examples with no explanations, justifications or suggestions. Centres need to encourage candidates to practice this type of question to develop their skills and ensure they are able to provide a more thorough response that demonstrates their knowledge and understanding and the candidates’ ability to bring it all together.

Centres do not appear to have taken on board the changes in assessment for the Technical qualifications resulting in poor performance across both the April and June papers. Candidates lacked the examination techniques to answer the question papers fully by not understanding the command verbs or considering the allocation of marks and how they could be attained. Furthermore, the performance in the extended questions was poor with the majority of candidates only achieving marks in the lower band as they were unable to demonstrate the depth of knowledge required. Candidates should be prepared for future theory tests by understanding what the expectations are with different command verbs so they can better demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding across all topics within this qualification.
Synoptic Assignment

Grade Boundaries
Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel;

Assessment: 6103-031
Series: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total marks available</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass mark</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit mark</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction mark</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distributions of grades and pass rate for this assessment;

Principal Moderator Commentary

The synoptic covered a broad range of topics across the qualification with the requirement for candidates to recall knowledge and demonstrate understanding by applying theory to practice, bringing it altogether and attending to detail to meet the brief.

The interpretation of the brief across centres was varied and in some cases, did not appear to adhere to the guidance or task instructions. The uploading of evidence was not always complete and numerous individual documents were uploaded by some centres, some of which were not relevant as evidence.

A01 – A good range of knowledge from across the qualification was demonstrated by candidates through the completion of task 1 where they produced an event plan. Some candidates relied on centre templates for the documentation required to plan the event, whilst this is acceptable it is not encouraged as candidates can then be restricted in their planning.
A02 - Understanding across the bands was shown by candidates applying their knowledge of the requirements for planning, implementing and evaluating an event to the synoptic tasks. There were some gaps in the understanding of the requirements for planning a successful event and whilst some candidates produced templates for documentation these were often not completed or updated throughout the event process. Evaluations tended to lack depth in a number of cases and focussed on the quality of the food and not the actual supervisory aspects and how this contributed to the success of the event.

A03 – A wide range of events were planned and implemented by candidates with varying levels of success. How centres interpreted the brief did impact on some candidates and subsequently disadvantaged them in carrying out the practical element of the assessment. Where centres have managers running the restaurants this also meant candidates did not have full control of the event which restricted their ability to fully supervise. It is advised that in future, restaurant managers limit their involvement to allow candidates to be assessed fully against the criteria.

A04 – Candidates were able to demonstrate bringing it all together through the practical element of the event which often highlighted any omissions in the planning process with the weaker candidates. Candidates were able to experience the feasibility of their ideas and evaluate the outcomes from their research and planning.

A05 – Candidates that attended to a high level of detail were more successful in the implementation of their event and were subsequently awarded higher marks. It was apparent with the weaker candidates that not all aspects of the planning process had been considered and resulted in overlooking some key requirements.

A06 – Some candidates completed extensive research prior to completing task one which was reflected in the detail of their planning and creativity of their events. Where candidates produced limited evidence of research their events lacked creativity and they relied on what they knew and played it safe.

A07 – A high level of creativity was demonstrated by learners achieving marks in the higher mark bands from the planning stages through to the implementation of their event and they were not afraid to try something different. The lower level candidates relied on conventional ideas to stick with the familiar and were awarded marks appropriately.

A08 – Candidates demonstrated a range of communication skills including written documentation for planning and evaluations; verbal communications with their team, customers and third parties; non-verbal communication to support their leadership style. Weaker candidates lacked confidence when communicating with teams for pre-service brief and post service de-briefs and relied on customers’ written instructions.

For future synoptic assignments centres need to ensure they are clear on the requirements and instructions to ensure candidates are not disadvantaged in any way with fair assessments carried out and evidenced. Detailed written descriptive narratives are required to support the judgements made on the practical element which is not seen by moderators who are reliant on this evidence. Discussions between the marker acting as the client and the candidate on their plans for the event should be recorded to further evidence this activity has taken place. Timing for the completion of the assessment should be adhered to with the assignment brief being issued at the correct time to allow task 1 to be completed in a two-hour session and not over a number of weeks.