edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2010

GCE

GCE Design and Technology (AS): Food Technology (6FT01) Paper 01 Creative Skills Portfolio

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask the Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

Summer 2010

Publications Code US023724

Principle Moderator's Report Summer 2010

GCE AS Design & Technology – Portfolio of Creative Skills

Food Technology Unit 6FT01

General Observations

In year two, most centres have continued to make good progress with the specification and there were a range of levels of outcome from very good to weak. It was obvious where centres had been to training or used exemplar material as the work was better organised with a greater degree of clarity between the three different sections. Interesting work was presented on topics such as ready to eat foods, gastro pub, multicultural cuisine, luxury food, fusion foods, celebrations and festivals.

Administration

- Almost all work arrived on time, most CABs and Optems were completed correctly, but there were still several arithmetic errors or incorrect transfers from CAB to Optems.
- Annotation in the CABs varied from excellent to non existent. There were examples of page references in the annotation having little relevance to the numbering on the script. There were some scripts without any page numbers and others had numbered each task separately.
- Some scripts were submitted unbound, some in paper clip, some loose and others unidentifiable as they were without any name, candidate number or centre number. For each candidate, all three tasks should be submitted as part of a portfolio of creative skills, bound together with logical page numbering and clearly identified to the candidate and centre.
- CABs should not be attached to scripts.
- Several scripts contained flaps. A number had several pages in one poly-pocket. This is not acceptable and makes moderation very slow.
- Where internal moderation was undertaken in centres with marks altered, it was difficult to decide which mark the final mark was awarded by the centre because a number of marks existed for each assessment criterion.
- It was difficult to agree centre marks for product manufacture when the photographs submitted in the CABs were of ingredients or components of the product.
- Centres could choose to submit work on A4 or A3, with many using A4 very effectively. It is beneficial to choose and use just one format (A3 or A4) if possible.
-

Product Investigation Task

This task produced the level of work expected for AS level. Many candidates had been guided effectively for the demands of this part of the portfolio of creative skills. It would benefit centres to use the headings

from the assessment criteria e.g. Technical Specification, Advantages/Disadvantages, Comparison with Similar Product, Alternative Ingredients, Environmental Considerations, Selection of Manufacturing Processes, Advantages/Disadvantages, Alternative Method of Production, Environmental Considerations, Quality Control Checks, Relevant Standards, Quality Assurance System. This would act as a check list to ensure that all the criteria have been covered. Choice of product was an issue for some centres because where the product lacks component parts or has a very brief ingredient list it could be harder to meet all the specification points, as descriptions are limited. Quite a lot of work presented for manufacturing, environment and quality was extremely generic. This information must be applied to the product. This section was also better where photographic evidence was used to support work. This would include a photograph of the chosen product that is being investigated and one of the existing similar comparison product. A photograph of the product disassembly was also useful.

Criterion A

Generally a good section, candidates showed good justification in the technical specifications. Where they had followed the headings in the assessment criteria, candidates were able to keep their work well organised and avoided repetition of information. Some contrasting products chosen for comparison were either too similar (two value branded apple pies) or too different (apple pie and a cheesecake) and this caused problems when comparing with the original product. Many candidates chose to tabulate this information and this was highly effective, with a concise summary of the main findings presented at the end of this section.

Criterion B

The disassembly of the chosen product allowed candidates an opportunity to understand the component parts and structure of the product. Many candidates worked out the % contribution of each component and justified its inclusion in the product. Many centres chose to tabulate information using the headings ingredients, advantages, disadvantages, alternative ingredients and environmental issues. This was allowed students to be focussed on each ingredient, component and/or material, whilst presenting information in a concise format. Generic information cannot be credited with marks, if there is no obvious application to the chosen product investigation. Alternative ingredients were suggested, but often needed more justification. Words like ‘improve texture’ could have been expanded upon to include an explanation.

Criterion C

Candidates must identify the method of production for the chosen product, and then state one alternative method of production that could have been used in the manufacture of the product. An evaluation should then follow using advantages and disadvantages of the selection of the manufacturing processes used in the product. It is not acceptable to merely list the method or processes. Some centres downloaded and annotated relevant pictures to illustrate manufacture, or used flow diagrams to show the different processes and production methods used to manufacture the chosen product. Where an evaluation existed for this section, candidates

could access the higher marks. Some centres chose to cook a similar product in their test kitchen and compare it to mass production; others used small scale batch production in the school canteen kitchen as an alternative method of production. Both were effective. Information on the environmental issues was variable, with some candidates using generic and unrelated information. However, those centres that explored CO2 emissions, use of energy to power machinery, water consumption, and use of standard components on the production line to reduce production processes and applied them to their chosen product were largely successful in this section.

Section D

Candidates suggested a good range of quality checks, but these must be specifically related to the product with a description of each quality check. It is far better to choose and describe two/three quality control checks linked to the chosen product than produce a long list of unrelated quality control checks. The main relevant standards and quality assurance were weak areas with most responses being generic and taken from secondary research with no reference to the chosen product.

Product Design Task

Work for this task frequently showed creativity and flair. Many candidates demonstrated high level design and development skills and good communication techniques with application of knowledge and understanding relating to food, nutrition and product development. The most successful centres did not over complicate the process and avoided unnecessary industrial work. Most candidates included practical development work, though very occasionally this was extremely superficial. Most final products showed significant differences to the original idea. Good photography aided communication.

Section E

Most candidates presented a collection of initial ideas that were workable, realistic and fully addressed the design criteria. From this, a good range of design ideas with detailed annotation, linking to the understanding and working characteristics of ingredients, components, techniques and processes could be presented. This supported the modelling/making work. Content varied enormously, but where candidates could demonstrate a detailed understanding, it allowed candidates to make good design decisions, leading onto a review of the selection (3-4) food products that had been made/modelled and evaluated at the design idea stage.

From this, development intentions could be communicated and explored with clarification and refinement for individual components, skills or techniques within a food product. Low level developments ranged from superficial changes with minor ingredients or as single practical tasks, and therefore did not make any significant changes for the final design proposal. From which it was not possible to compare or contrast developments.

An effective final design proposal was only possible if developments had been justified with valid conclusions. The final design proposal must be objectively evaluated against the design criteria in order to justify the design decisions taken. Some centres continue to include background information, mood boards and questionnaires, which are not needed in this task. There was some good third party testing and feedback evidenced, with an evaluation against the design criteria. Several centres included a detailed manufacturing specification for their final proposal with excellent technical information.

Section F

A wide range of communication techniques were shown, including scanned images (please identify source of image where possible), photographic evidence, CAD cross section or exploded drawings, nutritional analysis and costing, where relevant. There was some evidence of sketching but this continues to be a weak area. Students are increasingly showing annotation to convey ideas and development of work, with good explanation and detailed technical information. Most candidates made their design ideas and photographic evidence was used to support marks in this section. Black and white photographic images are unhelpful and do not illustrate the dishes well. It is essential that photographic evidence of practical work includes the candidate name.

Product Manufacture Task

The quality of work submitted for this task varied enormously. Most centres chose to do a separate manufacturing task, which resulted in either a range of different practical items being made for this task or a wide range of skills and techniques presented for one complex high level food product. By working on three separate discreet tasks, candidates could present a **wide range** of skills, techniques for different food products, thus producing an effective portfolio of creative skills. This is the best way forward.

However, some centres chose to continue the product design task into the manufacturing task and submitted a number of additional practical items that would be suitable for the combined option, as well as the final design proposal from the product design task. This was acceptable only if a range of **different** skills and techniques were shown within the range of food products. Testing needed to be different to the sensory testing conducted in section E, if this mode of delivery was being used.

Where centres only used the final design proposal from the previous task (product design task) for the making section (product manufacture task), they were awarding marks twice. This is unacceptable and candidates could not access marks beyond the lowest band of marks. Centres are

therefore seriously disadvantaging their students if they continue to follow this course of action.

Some centres produced some outstanding practical work, demonstrating skill, flair and creativity in their making. In other centres, practical work was simplistic with limited making skills or attention to detail.

Section G

Production plans were generally very good with consideration of realistic time scales and deadlines for the scale of production. Some students included thumbnail pictures as part of the production plan, which were effective and clear. Occasionally timings were not always evidenced, but when included were generally accurate and relevant.

Section H

Making varied enormously in terms of quality, technicality and complexity. Some centres did not produce a discrete range of products in this section.

Quality finish and demanding high level skills and techniques continues to need focus for GCE AS level. Photographic evidence, although better continues to disadvantage some students, presentation of practical work using high level finishing techniques is another opportunity to demonstrate accuracy and precision.

Many centres had clearly followed advice from training and exemplar material, by selecting food products where candidates could demonstrate accuracy and precision when working with a variety of ingredients/components/processes and techniques. These candidates were awarded with high marks where the evidence was apparent in their coursework.

Section I

An interesting range of tests were evidenced by some centres. This included a range of different sensory tests, storage life tests, transportation testing, viscosity tests, and tolerance testing against a manufacturing specification and nutritional analysis where relevant to the design brief.

Candidates must describe and justify a range of tests that will be carried out to check the performance or quality of the products. This must not be retrospective. However, responses were disappointing where testing was simplistic or superficial. Many candidates continue to simply evaluate their work against the design criteria, with subjective comments or a brief summary of work completed for the task.

Relevant, measurable points of the design brief/criteria must be objectively referenced, to achieve the top box marks.

Further copies of this publication are available from
International Regional Offices at www.edexcel.com/international

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.com/ask or on + 44 1204 770 696

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH