

GCE PRODUCT DESIGN (AS)

Exemplar Commentary 1

Title: Anna G the Cork Screw

Unit: 6GR01

The portfolio is divided into three discernible parts and separated clearly. It is well presented in a structured and formulated manner. The work clearly addresses the mark scheme.

Product Analysis.

Criteria A:

The candidate does not choose products that are significantly different, but the addition of a third product has enabled us to consider additional evidence. In the assessment of function the candidate appears to ignore the basic function of removing wine corks and the close proximity of an acid based substance such as wine. However the information submitted is that of a high performing candidate and is clearly in the top assessment criteria, the lack of some basic analysis in function and a tendency towards the similarity of products leads us to allow marks range of 4-6

Criteria B:

The work here is generally well presented, but there is a consistent failure to justify materials suggested, with reference to quality and performance. This said there are some references to them in the body of text that is offered as advantages and disadvantages. There is also a rather weak environmental input and this allayed to the lack of specifics in the materials choice warrants a mark reduction in this section. **(Mark Range 7-9)**

Criteria C:

There is a lot of very clear technical information in this section; it is clearly a top answer with access to the top box. Although no alternative manufacturing method (for the body) is offered, other than injection moulding. The advantages and disadvantages are largely covered, but the environmental aspects of the use of these manufacturing sections are weak and repetitive. **(Mark Range 7-10)**

Criteria D:

Quality control checks are considered and loosely justified, but there is no real focus to the specific manufacture of this item. There is a detailed input on QA hence mark range of 4-6 are allocated.

Product Design.

Criteria E:

A simple design criterion is offered with a straightforward specification. A wide range of well communicated design ideas are offered, which demonstrate maturity and understanding of the basic principles. Each design is modelled using CAD and the basic shapes are explored to a wide range of ideas. There is some work on the detail of sub-system design but it tends to be a little bit superficial for access to the top mark criteria though. The development of the final design is largely overlooked and tends to jump to the solution from the initial explorations. This said the candidate has modelled and does attempt to work out how the lamp will adjust, so some development work can be credited in the initial design stage. The final design is evaluated against the specification. The work is detailed enough to access the top assessment criteria, but there are missing aspects so we have to make a decision about the position of these within the box. There is a degree of detail missing and some important aspects of development, so marks at the lower end are appropriate. **(Mark Range 13-18)**

Criteria F:

There is not sufficient information to make this product from the final drawings offered. We have no cutting list of material justification. The annotation lacks clarity for some of the sub-systems. This said a wide range of techniques have been used, including ICT, with succinctness and accuracy. Annotation of the design work is sufficient to access the marks in the highest assessment criteria. **(Mark Range 9-12)**

Criteria G:

At first the candidate offers a detailed flow chart as a planning document. There is however no time offered and a complete lack of the setting of deadlines. Later we see time added in the form of a Gantt chart, but this retrospective. So taking into account that the candidate has offered a detailed listed sequence but no time, we should allocate a **mark range of 4-6**

Criteria H:

There is material justification and we can see from the evidence provided in the photographic record that a great detail of work has been put into the manufacture of this very detailed product. The box construction is demanding and well executed, although it is disappointing to see that the external aspect of the box has no graphic applied to it and appears unfinished because of this. The phone itself as a product model appears to function similar to a real phone and is not the usual prototype model. The unfinished aspect and the lack of another product would normally expect this kind of submission to be assessed around the mid/top box assessment but the level of demand and crispness of outcome would allow us to push this mark higher to a **mark range of 13-18**

Criteria I:

Third party testing is evidenced apparently, but despite the title, it appears not to have any evidence of this. The specification is evaluated but the tests are not explained or justified, however relevant tests appear to have been undertaken, a mark of 3 or 4 could

probably be justified here, but we will err on the side of generosity and allocate a mark range of 4-6