Website Exemplar GCE (A2) Graphic Products Unit: 6GR04

Topic: Student Study Area

Note		
Α	RESEARCH ANALYSIS	A client is identified; analysis is detailed, with input from the client. Research is selective yet detailed enough to cover all key aspects. Clear evidence of a real investigation taking place. The top assessment range is acceptable in this case.
		3-4 mark range
В	SPECIFICATION	The specification is clear and realistic, it is connected to the research undertaken and there are some measureable points, although many will be measured through questionnaire/opinions. No 2d offered in the specification though. The points are justified but their link to sustainability issues are a little tenuous, however it still needs to be assessed within the higher mark category.
		4-6 mark range
С	DESIGN	Ideas presented are workable, different realistic. It would be nice to see a greater range but we are treated to a great deal of detail and sub-systems are explored. The work has to have the lack of range taken on board and the fact that there is no 2d element explored, however the top assessment range should be available.
		7-10 mark range
С	REVIEW	Client view is evident, there is personal evaluation too, The candidate has fully addressed specification in the review, this is a well completed section and deserves to be marked in the highest assessment range. 3-4 mark range
С	DEVELOP	Some interesting modelling and trialling taking place & CAD is used effectively, upon reading the work there feels like there is progression taking place. Technical input is good. The work initially feels like top assessment category material. However there is no real final proposal, just a plan that doesn't really match the outcome entirely and it also lacks client feedback and no 2d development work so the work has to be assessed within the middle mark range. 4-6 mark range
С	COMMUNICATE	The work is beautifully presented and demonstrates a wide variety of techniques and processes. Information about the proposal missing though and a third party would have trouble making this. The work still deserves to be assessed in the top range.
		4-6 mark range
D	PLANNING	Detailed schematic plan is offered, there is an order of events listed and quality control is offered. The timings lack detail. The Gantt chart has a retrospective feel to it and does not address the detail in the flow chart. However the work offered is still a high level response and should be assessed in the top mark range.
		4-6 mark range
Е	TOOLS/EQUIPMENT	Tools not evidenced in the folder this is only a minor issue though. This is an accurately and well made product, demonstrating a wide range of individual hand skills to a high level of performance.

		There is evidence of a good level safety awareness Despite these positive points the candidates work has no 2d element as part of the manufacturing aspect, this can be assessed in the top range as the work is very good, but must have some adjustment for this missing element. 7-9 mark range
Ш	QUALITY	Materials listed in detail in folder and justified for choice. Processes tend to be retrospectively covered in the photo diary and are not so well justified. The lack of 2d should be assessed here as well as the previous section. There is a lack of final proposal to match the final outcome against so this needs to be borne in mind also, although it will only be a minor issue. As the outcome is so well made it would be unfair to assess the work outside the higher assessment criteria, but it does come close. 11-16 mark range
E	LEVEL of DEMAND	A demanding 3d outcome, with a wide range of skills evidenced Precision and accuracy is demonstrated in the production of the final product, a mark in the top range is appropriate. 7-9 mark range
F	TEST & EVALUATING	Tests are evidenced but not justified. User group feedback is used and some LCA is attempted but not focused on the final product. The top assessment criteria is appropriate but only just. 7-10 mark range.