



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Design and Technology: Product Design (3-D Design) 1551**

PROD2 Learning Through Designing and  
Making (Coursework)

## **Report on the Examination**

*2010 examination – June series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **General**

Generally centres completed the coursework administration correctly and presented their coursework samples according to the AQA instructions, for some it must be pointed out Centre Declaration sheets are important and should be signed by both staff and candidates.

### **Candidate Record Forms: ( please refer to section 6.5 & 6.9 of the specification)**

A relatively small number of centres sent CRF forms that were unsigned by the candidates which resulted in them being returned to the centre.

Candidate annotation of the CRF varied widely with some candidates completing them well, with good page referencing and statements pointing to the evidence in the folder, whilst others were simply signed on the front and the remainder left blank.

Staff annotation was equally varied in quality and their benefit to the moderation process. The purpose of this section is for staff to indicate where work can be seen and so justify an award of marks.

It is pleasing to note that assessments for the majority of centres were carried out accurately to the AQA standard for this unit, this applied to both single and multiple project approaches. Many centres prefer the latter as this allows them to teach candidates more varied making skills as part of the portfolio of work as well as giving an increased opportunity to generate design ideas. Centres that delivered the coursework through one project often gave candidates a theme/context to work from, such as "in the style of", a decade or designer/architect. This approach gives a focus for research which often leads to successful outcomes as well as introducing design theory for the written papers to follow in later units. It is important that work which might be perceived to be generic should be kept to a minimum as it is important to be able to differentiate between candidates of differing ability.

A number of both paper based portfolios or those in the form of PowerPoint presentations could have been condensed considerably by better utilisation of each A3 sheet or slide and the omission of repetitive work which was of the same standard and addressing the same assessment criteria.

### **Assessment Criterion 1: Investigation and Clarification of Problems (8 Marks)**

Research at AS remains a concern with some candidates filling the section with download information on products, materials and processes. The better candidates are putting more effort into primary investigation- in particular disassembly of products, materials testing, measuring and conducting interviews rather than producing simple questionnaires which are often found to be padding out the section with only limited value to the design specification. Moodboards must be annotated by the candidate to show how they provide a source of inspiration. Specifications are improving with a little more detail than in previous years but few are produced as a summary to this section and as a detailed checklist for the section which follows.

### **Assessment Criterion 2: Development of Design Proposal (24 Marks)**

Design development appears to be improving as candidates become more accomplished with ICT skills and DTP programmes. Unfortunately this is often at the expense of good quality sketching which is often ignored as a design tool and skill to be practiced. CAD and physical

models to explore ideas in a variety of media is on the increase but a disappointing number of candidates really develop their designs and explore alternative materials/combinations, sizes and proportions. Most candidates produce at least a basic working drawing, although dimensioning is often missing and a reasonable plan for manufacture. In the best examples of the latter, candidates show quality control and health and safety and produce the plan in the future tense rather than a record of what has already been made.

### **Assessment Criterion 3: Making / Modelling (24 Marks)**

The making and modelling at AS level seems to be of a similar quality to last year but is frequently over rewarded, in some cases with an expectation that a visit to clarify the award will not be made. For the award of the higher band of marks a varied range of materials and process of manufacture will be required to be seen.

Where CAD/CAM has been used, many centres are correctly using it to compliment traditional making techniques or provide evidence of hand skills through modelling and mock-ups. More centres seem to be documenting how QA is applied in the making process through the use of photographs- showing where measurements are checked, templates and jigs used, and so on. Candidates should be encouraged to provide evidence of manufacture and processes so that moderators can verify the marks awarded. There is a need for candidates to produce better quality photos and larger-close up shots to show the detail and finish of outcomes.

### **Assessment Criterion 4: Evaluation and Testing (12 Marks)**

There is generally good evidence of on-going evaluation in the folder at sections 1 and 2 as both summary of research and the selection of designs / materials etc through consideration of prototypes and the reasons for rejection of specific ideas. If this is considered to have been worthy of reward then annotation on the CRF will be needed to identify where it can be found. Summative evaluations have been disappointing in many cases limited to one or two sheets comparing the item to the specification and relying upon the candidate's own viewpoint. Many candidates do not test the finished product in its stated environment or involve a potential client in its evaluation .

### **Assessment Criterion 5: Communication and Presentation (12 Marks)**

This is an area that seems to have been a little over marked by some centres. For the top mark range it is expected that candidates would use a wide range of communication methods to develop their designs and that quality of written communication is of a very good standard with few if any errors. As already stated the quality of free hand sketching is vary varied and annotation to often being simply a description of what can be seen in the drawing rather than to suggest possible materials, manufacture and how the idea could be applied to the design solution.

### ***Mark Ranges and Award of Grades***

Please see the following link:

<http://www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html>