

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2011

GCSE Design & Technology
5TT01 Textiles Technology
Controlled Assessment

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027 or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Moderators' 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/>

June 2011

Publications Code UG027714

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

Candidates are expected to design a textile product having: determined their brief; researched the topic; generated some initial designs; reviewed them against their brief; sampled, tested and developed the product to a final design proposal.

Candidates are expected to plan, make and review the production of a textile product.

Both these aspects can be completed as one whole or two separate parts. Most candidates elected to design and make one product.

There was some ambiguity over the titles to select from as the printed specification had been published with two set of task options. So there is no further confusion the correct version is published on the website link below.

<http://www.edexcel.com/quals/gcse/gcse09/dt/Textiles/Pages/default.aspx>

Candidates presented a wide range of variations on most of the topic headings. The most popular topics seemed to be natural forms; however the relevance of the theme to the final product was sometimes a little ambiguous.

The sustainability topic offered some creative outcomes, which were not always well made. Making a quality product from this base can be more difficult than from new materials. Very few candidates seem to select Morphing products as a task; if they did it was appropriately fitted into the child's play theme as well. Sports fashion was not very popular overall; however it did seem well-liked among the male candidates.

The CMRBs are removed from candidate portfolios during the moderation process. Candidates are therefore strongly advised to include their centre number and candidate number on their portfolio; this avoids portfolios getting muddled and enables moderators to ensure they are returned to the appropriate centre. Page referencing the CMRB is very useful to the moderator, particularly if the assessor wishes to highlight evidence for a criterion that might be out of chronological order. Likewise annotations are a valuable means of the moderator understanding why an assessor may have awarded a mark.

Design Activity

Analysing the brief

Some candidates tended to provide a lack of detail in this section. Mind-maps were a helpful aid to focus thoughts and start to think out problems however the problem 'finding' activity wasn't always rounded off. Candidates would benefit from summarising the mind-map and explaining what they now realise they need to 'discover' about their target audience and brief: what they need to research.

Research

Candidates generally performed well on the research. Those students that performed particularly well tended to:

- research into their target audience with a questionnaire that included thoughtful questions raised from their analysis of the brief;
- generate a tear sheet (often referred to as a mood board / theme board) of -
 - products similar to that which they were going to design which were currently on the market, annotating notes on source, cost & materials used

and/or

- images that could be used as a source of design inspiration (annotations were included to justify their inclusion);
de-construct an actual product similar in fabric type and complexity to the one they were intending to design rather than work from photographs, this enabled them to identify the construction methods used in production;
- research into a sustainability issue that was appropriate for the product they were designing (e.g. designing casual child's play outfit, tear sheet research would show that many products on the market were made from a cotton based fabric so then exploring cotton production and the use of pesticides would be value research).

Specification

Most candidates appear to understand the value of writing the specific and often wrote suitable justifications to their points, linking back to what they have discovered in their research. Some candidates do write lots of points which must have been difficult to track through the design and review process. Candidates may wish to consider the value of so many and limit the number to approximately 10 measurable, justified and quality points.

Initial Ideas

A wide range of imaginative, realistic and workable ideas were presented by the candidates. Those candidates that performed particularly well tended to annotate their ideas in subheadings so one could clearly see that 'processes' and 'techniques' had also been considered.

Review

Candidates tended to use tick boxes to check their ideas against the specification, this was adequate for achievement of lower marks. When objective evaluative comments were included they tended to lack critical or constructive user group feedback. Candidates should be encouraged to seek constructive criticism and then use this to develop their ideas.

Communication

A good range of appropriate techniques were generally used.

Development

A range of sketches and experimental work was included. There was a tendency to use this section as a 'practice run', making a toile as a means of understanding a process rather than developing an idea. Those candidates that focused on a couple of particular details in the design, sampling and testing different solutions for each and then reviewing which they would use and explaining why tended to perform particularly well. A good example of this would be if a candidate were designing a football T-shirt. In this section they might test several different print techniques and review them against wear, visibility and cost.

Final Design

The sketches were generally clear but candidates should be encouraged to include technical details necessary to make their products. Those centres that tended to achieve well in this sub-section appeared to use a centre devised template where all candidates filled in the different boxes showing their understanding of what fabrics, component parts, processes and techniques were needed to construct the product. Using a commercial pattern envelope as a template would be a good starting point for this.

Make Activity

Production Plan

It is worth centres noting that there is no longer a need to conform to the legacy specification requirements. One plan is required; it can either be a flow chart, written list of commands or a table. This should be a plan, and therefore show forethought rather than being written retrospectively with some consideration to the amount of time needed to make each part. Best practice was evident when candidates were not repetitive with too similar

quality control checks that were specific in detail, for example rather than writing 'check seam allowances are even' they wrote 'check seam allowances are 1.5cm wide'.

Quality of manufacture & Quality of outcome

Candidates produced a wide range of different outcomes. The tasks were generally challenging and many candidates provided a wide range of photographs that justified the marks awarded by the assessors. The moderation process is more challenging when there is a lack of quality photographic evidence. There is a suggestion of 3 images to be placed on the CMRB: these are likely to include a view from the front or back (or reverse) and the inside. Higher achieving candidates are likely to include additional images of them making the product, often in diary form to quantify the teacher witness statements.

Health and safety

This is a teacher observed assessment. Some candidates spent time producing a page to demonstrate their understanding of health and safety: this was unnecessary and centres may wish to question the value of the time spent doing this during the controlled assessment activity.

Testing and evaluation

Those students that used IT facilities to support them in the presentation of this page tended to use of the English language with more accuracy. Many candidates were able to identify a range of suitable tests to evaluate their product. These tests often included user tests with the product being worn or used by someone in their target audience; specification tests to check against criteria, e.g. the size / measurements on their final design sheet; and target audience surveys. Those candidates that were most successful asked their target audience questions that encouraged constructive criticism that they could then consider when writing their evaluation.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UG027714 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

