Version 1

**General Certificate of Education (A-level)**
**June 2011**

# Design and Technology: Product Design PROD2

# (Specification 2550)

# Unit 2: Learning Through Designing and Making

# *Report on Moderation*

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk



Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

**Coursework Administration –**

A small number of centres failed to supply the moderators with important documentation, such as signed Candidate Record Forms or Centre Mark Sheets. This causes unfortunate delays in the moderation process, other than this the majority of centres completed the coursework administration correctly and presented their coursework samples according to the AQA instructions. There was also some evidence of errors in both the addition of marks and the transfer of totals from CRF's to Centre Marks Sheets.

**Candidate Record Forms:** ***(please refer to section 6.5 & 6.9 of the specification)***
Candidate annotation of the CRF has improved with more candidates providing good page referencing and statements indicating the specific location of work in the folder, whilst others were simply signed on the front and left the remainder blank.

Staff annotation on the final mark page continues to be varied, this section is important as it directs the moderator to where work can be seen and so justifies the marks given.

A number of both paper based design folders or those in the form of PowerPoint presentations could have been condensed considerably with better use of each A3 sheet or slide and the omission of repetitive work which addressed the same assessment criteria. With the increase in electronic folders the presentation of the work is getting much better. The disadvantage of e-portfolio is that a page in the development section now often includes a couple of scanned A3 pages reduced in size which makes understanding the pencil created design work difficult. Centres should be aware marks are gained from these initial design pages. The end result is a very glossy folder, however the design work is becoming marginalised.

Please check that electronic submissions can be easily read using standard format files and that discs are tested to ensure all folders can be opened before sending to the moderator

***The report that follows constitutes the first review of the 2011 June series and will be supported by exemplar material which will be provided later in the Autumn term.***

**PROD2- Report on the Summer 2011 component**

Centre assessment is becoming more accurate with the majority of centres rewarding their candidates accurately to the AQA standard for this unit, this applied to both single and multiple project approaches. Many centres preferring the portfolio submission as this allows them to teach candidates more varied making skills as well as giving an increased opportunity to generate different 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 which follow. 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.

**Criteria for the award of marks:**

### 1. Investigation and Clarification of Problems (8 marks)

Candidates are beginning to appreciate that filling the section with downloaded information on products, materials and processes does not earn high reward, 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.

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.

Lamps and MP3 speaker/docking stations are popular but candidates often do not include any research or investigation relating to components such as bulbs, fittings, connections, switches, power supply etc.

### 2. Development of the Design Proposal (24 marks)

Sometimes rather formulaic with a fairly "safe" approach being taken, candidates need to be encouraged to include detailed and analytical notes rather than simply providing a descriptive commentary to their work. Improving CAD work is good with some quite sophisticated evidence seen, however, this is often at the expense of good quality sketching which is often ignored as a design tool and a skill which requires practice.

On many occasions the standard of graphics was poor with oblique and isometric sketches drawn badly, there is a need to introduce and develop techniques at an early age so that there is ample time to practice these skills. CAD and physical modelling to explore ideas in a variety of media is on the increase but a disappointing number of candidates do not develop their designs with the exploration of alternative materials /combinations, sizes and proportions. Most candidates produce at least a basic working drawing, although dimensioning is often missing or inaccurate. There was often a reasonable plan for manufacture, in the best examples of these candidates show both quality control and health and safety and produce the plan in the future tense rather than a record of what has already been made.

### 3. Making and 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. Photographs included within the folders were sometimes over flattering or not of sufficient detail to show the quality of product made. When marks given are in the highest band the work should display both a varied range of different materials and a variety of processes of manufacture.

Where CAD/CAM has been used, many centres are correctly using it to compliment traditional making techniques within other parts of the product or they provide evidence of hand skills through modelling and mock-ups in the development stages. Better candidates show how their 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 good quality photographic evidence of manufacture and processes so that moderators can verify the accuracy of the marks awarded.

### 4. Evaluation and Testing (12 marks)

There is generally some evidence of on-going evaluation at sections 1 and 2 but this has to be searched for in most folders. For this to be considered to be worthy of some reward then annotation on the CRF will be needed to identify where it can be found and how it has proved to be useful. Evaluations need to be explored and applied to develop the designs into an improved idea.

Summative evaluations have frequently been disappointing, limited to a brief comparison of the finished item to the specification. Many candidates do not test the finished product in its stated environment or involve a potential client in the evaluation.

**5. Communication and presentation (12 marks)**

This is a section that is improved but remains just 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. Overall DTP and the quality of presentation is high.

**Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Please see the following link:

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

**UMS Conversion Calculator**

Please see the following link:

www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion