

Appetizer Skills Beyond Recall: A Competency-Evidence Audit for Grade 9 Cookery

Rhomer Gonzales

Abstract

This study examined whether a 20-page Grade 9 cookery workbook on appetizers provides evidence of the competencies it intends to develop. A structured document analysis mapped stated outcomes, lesson content, practice tasks, answer keys, and the culminating performance task against principles of constructive alignment, authentic assessment, and competency-based training. The workbook contains four lessons on kitchen tools and equipment, cleaning compounds, appetizer classification, and storage techniques. Its visual tool guides, short practice sets, localized appetizer prompt, and requirement to document work can support independent review. However, the assessed evidence is dominated by 77 selected-response, matching, identification, labeling, and word-reconstruction items, compared with one practical task. Several outcomes use performance verbs, yet most lesson checks verify recognition or recall. The culminating task is internally inconsistent: it asks learners to prepare appetizers but one target specifies a simple sandwich; its five stated percentage weights total 130%; the performance bands omit portions of the 0-100 range; and broad terms such as relevance and presentation are not anchored in directly observable product or process evidence. The activity also relies heavily on photographs, which cannot by themselves verify sanitation, sequencing, temperature control, knife technique, or independent performance. No field-test data, scorer agreement, learner outcomes, or validation records were supplied, so effectiveness cannot be inferred. The article proposes an evidence chain that links each competency to a task, observable performance conditions, product and process criteria, feedback, and reassessment. It also presents a three-stage

assessment package consisting of a mise-en-place check, monitored production, and a short oral or written justification. The workbook offers a practical foundation, but publication and classroom adoption require re-aligned outcomes, authentic practice within every lesson, a defensible analytic rubric, model responses, accessibility improvements, and staged content and user validation.

Keywords: cookery education; competency-based assessment; authentic assessment; constructive alignment; appetizers; document analysis

Introduction

Competence in cookery is demonstrated through coordinated action. A learner selects and handles tools, organizes ingredients, controls contamination, follows a sequence, monitors quality, and presents a food product under defined conditions. Knowing the name of a utensil is useful, but it is not equivalent to using that utensil safely and accurately. Instructional materials intended for technical and vocational learning therefore need an explicit chain from occupational expectations to practice, observation, judgment, feedback, and reassessment.

Constructive alignment requires intended outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment evidence to point toward the same form of learning (Biggs, 1996). Authentic assessment adds a second requirement: the task, context, performance, criteria, and judgment should resemble the capability being claimed (Gulikers et al., 2004). In competency-based training, assessment is referenced to specified standards and should integrate knowledge, practical skill, and attitude rather than treat course completion as proof of occupational ability (Knapp & Ali, 2020).

The Philippine cookery curriculum includes use of kitchen tools, occupational health and safety, cleaning and maintenance, and preparation of appetizers among its learning areas (Department of Education, 2022). TESDA training regulations serve as the basis for competency-based curricula, instructional materials, and assessment tools and define how a qualification is developed, assessed, and

recognized (Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.). A classroom workbook need not reproduce a national assessment, but its claims and evidence should be compatible with the performance orientation of the field.

The source examined here is Workbook in TLE (Cookery) 9: Quarter 1 - Appetizers, prepared for Grade 9 learners at Ilocos Sur National High School (Lita, 2023). It presents four lessons and a culminating home- or school-based practical activity. This article audits the workbook as an instructional artifact. It does not evaluate the teacher, school, author, or learners, and it does not claim that the workbook caused any learning outcome.

Purpose and Research Questions

The study asked four questions: (1) What competencies and learning evidence are represented in the workbook? (2) How closely do lesson activities and assessments align with the action implied by the stated outcomes? (3) What strengths and validity risks are visible in the culminating performance task and rubric? and (4) What revisions would create a clearer, fairer, and more authentic evidence system for Grade 9 cookery?

Methods

Design and Corpus

A structured qualitative document analysis with descriptive counts was conducted on the complete 20-page PDF. The corpus included the cover and foreword, competency statement, 19-item pretest, four lesson sequences, all lesson tasks, the culminating performance task, its rubric, and the answer key. Images were reviewed as instructional elements, while visible text was extracted and checked against rendered pages.

The four lessons address tools and equipment, cleaning compounds, appetizer classifications and canapé parts, and storage techniques and containers. A lesson-level assessment item was counted when the learner was asked to supply or select one answer. The three labels required for the canapé diagram were counted separately. The practical preparation was counted as one integrated

performance task regardless of the number of photographs requested. These counts describe the artifact; they are not learner scores.

Table 1

Workbook Corpus and Assessment Inventory

Component	Count	Primary evidence
Pretest	19 items	Word reconstruction and multiple choice
Lesson 1: Tools and equipment	15 items	Jumbled words, recognition, and matching
Lesson 2: Cleaning compounds	15 items	Multiple choice, matching, and identification
Lesson 3: Appetizer classification	13 items	Multiple choice, definitions, and diagram labels
Lesson 4: Storage techniques	15 items	Multiple choice, true/false, and container identification
Culminating task	1 task	Prepared product plus photographs
Total short knowledge prompts	77	Predominantly recognition and recall

Analytic Framework

Each intended outcome was coded by the principal action it demands: remember, explain, select, perform, or value. Each task was then coded by the evidence it actually elicits: selected response, short constructed response, diagram labeling, product, observed process, or reflection. Alignment was judged as direct when the task required the intended action under relevant conditions, partial when it sampled prerequisite knowledge, and absent when no assessable evidence was requested.

The performance task was audited for purpose, scenario, resources, safety conditions, learner agency, process evidence, product evidence, criteria, score interpretation, feedback, and reassessment. Rubric criteria were examined for observability, distinctness, weighting, level progression, and consistency with the task. Brookhart's (2018) emphasis on appropriate, task-relevant criteria informed the rubric review.

Procedure and Trustworthiness

The analysis proceeded in four passes. The first reconstructed the workbook's instructional sequence. The second inventoried outcomes and assessment evidence. The third traced every rubric criterion to a visible learner action or product feature. The final pass checked internal consistency, answer-key coverage, navigation, source attribution, and publication readiness. Claims were retained only when tied to a visible component of the supplied PDF.

The analysis was conducted by one reviewer on one version of the document; no inter-rater coefficient was calculated. The item inventory can be reproduced from the stated counting rule, but judgments about alignment remain interpretive. The proposed redesign is a curriculum model to be tested, not evidence that the revised format will automatically improve achievement.

Results

Instructional Architecture

The workbook is compact and easy to enter. A foreword explains that it is intended for independent learning, the cover identifies the quarter and topic, and each lesson uses a predictable pattern of targets, content, and short tasks. Color-coded tool cards and food images make otherwise abstract names concrete. The lessons progress from preparation resources to cleaning chemicals, appetizer forms, and storage, then culminate in food production.

The sequence nevertheless treats most content as discrete vocabulary. Tool cards generally provide a name, picture, and single function. Chemical categories are followed by recognition exercises. Appetizer types and canapé components are learned through definitions and labels. Storage is assessed through definitions of refrigeration, cold storage, chilling, and container descriptions. The workbook therefore supplies declarative foundations but limited coached rehearsal of selecting, sequencing, monitoring, correcting, or explaining a kitchen decision.

Table 2*Alignment of Lessons, Intended Capability, and Elicited Evidence*

Lesson	Implied capability	Main printed evidence	Priority revision
Tools	Select and use tools safely for mise en place	Names, pictures, functions	Tool-selection case and observed handling
Cleaning	Choose and use cleaning compounds appropriately	Category recognition	Label reading and safe process demonstration
Appetizers	Identify, assemble, and explain appetizer components	Definitions and labels	Design-and-assemble micro-task
Storage	Store products safely in suitable containers	Definitions and container names	Scenario-based container, label, and condition choice
Integration	Prepare and present appetizers	One photographed product	Plan, observed process, product, defense, and reassessment

Assessment Evidence

The pretest contains seven reconstructed words and 12 multiple-choice items. Lesson 1 has 15 short items; Lesson 2 has 15; Lesson 3 has 13; and Lesson 4 has 15. Across the pretest and lesson checks, 77 scorable prompts rely on recognition, recall, matching, labeling, or short identification. There is one integrated performance task at the end. The numeric contrast does not mean that every paper item lacks value; prerequisite knowledge matters. It shows that the workbook repeatedly samples what learners can name while rarely sampling what they can do.

Several targets exceed the evidence collected. Learners are expected to discuss mise en place and safety, explain chemical uses, value the importance of spread, apply storage techniques, and prepare appetizers. Yet the lesson checks do not require a mise-en-place plan, a justified chemical selection, a safe cleaning sequence, a storage decision supported by product conditions, or an explanation of how ingredients and spread affect canapé quality. The practical task is expected to carry nearly all performance evidence without prior task-level scaffolding.

Culminating Task and Rubric

The culminating prompt has meaningful strengths. It asks learners to prepare ingredients available in the locality, gather appropriate tools, follow procedures, wear basic protective clothing, produce a presentable output, and document the process. This creates space for contextualization and gives the instructor artifacts to discuss with the learner. A practical product is more closely aligned with cookery competence than an additional written quiz.

Internal inconsistencies weaken interpretation. The heading asks for a range of appetizers, but one learning target asks for a simple sandwich. The rubric lists five percentage weights - 15, 20, 30, 25, and 40 - that total 130 rather than 100. Four performance columns use five, four, three, and two points, while the printed grade bands cover 90-95, 85-89, 80-84, and 75-79; scores from 96-100 and below 75 are not represented. The criterion labeled relevance refers to a guide being relevant, valid, and reliable, which is not clearly connected to the food product.

Some level descriptors change only through vague frequency words such as always, most of the time, and sometimes. Confidence is repeatedly scored even though confidence is difficult to infer reliably from a photograph. Presentation receives a large weight but lacks anchors for portioning, structural stability, color, neatness, service ware, garnish function, or suitability for service. Food safety is not a distinct criterion, so an attractive product could earn a strong score even when the process includes unsafe practices.

The required photos provide useful documentation but incomplete evidence. A still image cannot establish how long hands were washed, whether a surface was sanitized at the correct concentration and contact time, whether raw and ready-to-eat foods were separated throughout, whether ingredients stayed within safe temperatures, or whether the learner independently corrected an error. Photos should supplement, not replace, direct observation, a short video sample where appropriate and consented, a process log, or an oral defense.

Discussion

The workbook's central design issue is not a lack of activity; it is a break in the evidence chain. Content names relevant objects and categories, outcomes often imply performance, and the final activity requests a product, but the middle of the sequence contains little guided performance. As a result, the instructor has limited evidence about when a learner moved from recognition to controlled action.

A stronger design would make every lesson contribute an authentic micro-performance. In the tools lesson, learners could select a tool for a specified cut, demonstrate grip and transfer, and explain a rejected alternative. In the cleaning lesson, they could read a product label and assemble a safe clean-rinse-sanitize-air-dry sequence. In the appetizer lesson, they could design and assemble a balanced canapé. In the storage lesson, they could choose a food-grade container, label it, state a storage condition, and justify the decision.

These micro-performances can lead to a three-stage culminating assessment. Stage 1 is a *mise-en-place* conference and readiness check; Stage 2 is monitored production with process checkpoints; Stage 3 is presentation plus a brief justification and self-evaluation. The evidence package should include a plan, observation notes, product evidence, a scored rubric, learner reflection, and a reassessment record when a critical safety or quality criterion is not met.

The rubric should separate critical from compensatory criteria. Critical safety failures - such as dangerous chemical mixing, uncontrolled cross-contamination, or service of an unsafe product - should trigger stop-and-correct action rather than be averaged away by presentation. Other dimensions can be scored analytically: preparation, tool control, sequence, resource use, product quality, presentation, explanation, and clean-down. Criteria should describe observable quality rather than personality or generalized confidence.

Table 3***Proposed Three-Stage Competency Evidence Package***

Stage	Learner task	Evidence retained	Decision
1. Readiness	Plan appetizer; select tools, ingredients, sequence, and controls	Mise-en-place sheet and teacher check	Ready, revise, or defer
2. Production	Prepare under stated time, resource, and safety conditions	Observation checklist, process sample, and corrective actions	Meets, approaching, or not yet
3. Product and reasoning	Present product; explain choices; evaluate outcome	Product record, analytic rubric, and reflection	Competent or targeted reassessment
Reassessment	Repeat only unmet components after feedback	New evidence linked to criterion	Updated competency record

Revision and Validation Priorities

Revision should begin with a competency map. Every target needs an assessable verb, performance condition, expected product or process, and criterion. Items that only verify terminology should remain as low-stakes checks and should not be treated as sufficient evidence of competence. The appetizer-versus-sandwich inconsistency, the rubric weighting error, incomplete score ranges, typographical errors, and mismatches between prompts and answer keys should be corrected before classroom publication.

A second pass should add demonstrations, worked examples, practice checklists, feedback, and opportunities to try again. Teachers need notes about available-equipment adaptations and alternative evidence for learners with limited connectivity or who cannot submit photographs. Accessibility review should verify meaningful heading structure, readable contrast, alternative text for instructional images, live rather than image-only text, labeled tables, and instructions that do not depend on color alone.

Validation should proceed in stages: cookery expert review; assessment and language review; safety review; learner cognitive interviews; instructor usability testing; accessibility checks; and a small pilot. Pilot evidence should include completion time, task interpretation, criterion-level scores, scorer agreement, common

errors, learner feedback, and the quality of reassessment. Only after these steps should effectiveness or reliability claims be considered.

Limitations

This study analyzes one workbook version and does not observe its classroom use. Teachers may already provide demonstrations, feedback, and safety controls that are not printed in the document. No learners were tested, no scores were obtained, and no comparison condition was used. Counts describe prompts rather than cognitive demand in actual use, and the proposed assessment package requires local adaptation to facilities, ingredient access, school policy, and current competency standards.

Conclusion

The Grade 9 appetizer workbook provides an accessible visual introduction to tools, cleaning compounds, appetizer forms, storage, and a localized practical task. Its dominant evidence, however, is recall: 77 short knowledge prompts precede one performance task whose purpose, weights, score bands, and criteria are internally inconsistent. A publication-ready revision should align each outcome with an authentic micro-performance, preserve prerequisite knowledge checks as formative evidence, rebuild the culminating task around process and product evidence, establish safety as a critical criterion, and use a coherent analytic rubric with feedback and reassessment. The resulting workbook would make the claim of competence more transparent to learners, instructors, and reviewers.

References

- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32, 347-364.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2018). Appropriate criteria: Key to effective rubrics. *Frontiers in Education*, 3, Article 22.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2018.00022>
- Department of Education. (2022). *Cookery (curriculum guide)*. DepEd Learning Resources Management and Development System. <https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/detail/15905>
- Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(3), 67-86.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676>
- Knapp, J., & Ali, Y. (2020). *Competency-based training (CBT): An introductory manual for practitioners*. International Labour Organization. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/competency-based-training-cbt-introductory-manual-practitioners>
- Lita, H. A. (2023). *Workbook in TLE (Cookery) 9: Quarter 1 - Appetizers* [Unpublished instructional workbook]. Ilocos Sur National High School.
- Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (n.d.). *Training regulations*.
https://www.tesda.gov.ph/Download/Training_Regulations