



# **Moderator's Report**

## Principal Moderator Feedback

### Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCSE  
In Design & Technology (5TT01)  
Textiles Technology  
Paper 01  
Creative Design and Make

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 5TT01\_01\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Candidates are expected to Design & Make a textile product.

This activity can either be two separate projects or a combined design or make activity.

The most popular task titles this year were Natural Forms and Designer Dressing with some using Child's Play and Sustainability. The least popular title was Sports Fashion. It was popular for candidates to design one product and make another.

Centres are reminded again of a few practical details that aid the moderation process:

- Good quality, in focus photographs of the final product are crucial; when dark fabric is used the photograph might need editing to improve the visibility of the features. It is essential we see reference to the inside of the products, especially when candidates are aiming for the very high marks.
- Every single page of candidate work needs clearly labelling with their candidate number and centre number. A lot of work was again left unlabelled this year; CMRBs are removed from the portfolios and should not be the only form of identifying who the portfolio belongs to you.

**Analysing the Brief:** There was growing confidence in what was required for this criterion, candidates were being more explicit about: what product they will analysis and why; what benefits the task will have on the project; and what information they need to find out and why. This criterion was often assessed within exam board guidelines.

**Research:** This criterion is continuing to improve in value to the candidates' design process with high band evidence generally including an in-depth product analysis which explores not only the aesthetic values of the product but also the functional and practical aspects of the item, for example the care needs and sustainability choices the designer made. This students that did not follow a centre set of tasks but those they had determined from their Analysis and which had value to the design process were most successful.

**Specification:** There was a growing understanding of the value of practical specification points which could be judged and measured as part of test and evaluate. Some candidates still tended to concentrate their points on aesthetic values or the inclusion of features like zips, which could be observed as being included, rather than being tested, for example through ease of access into the product.

**Initial Ideas:** Candidates presented some interesting and practical design ideas, with thought out construction and fabric choices that demonstrated understanding of textiles. Those candidates that communicated well visually with strong annotations met high band criteria. Where annotation

was a little weak, and assumptions would have to be made to make the product, for example where there was limited understanding of the back of a product, assessment decisions often sat in the mid band, or low high band.

**Review:** Candidates enjoyed to praise their own and work of others', making many comments subjective. Those candidates that considered the views of others' objectively, considered sustainability in a practical and thoughtful way and used the review process to justify their progression into development generally achieved full marks.

**Communication:** This criterion was generally assessed within exam board guidelines, where evidence appeared to be leniently assessed was often due to sketches not being drawn as products or sewn samples that lacked accuracy. For example toy animals and cushions being drawn as animals or simple decorated squares, rather than a sewn item they were meant to represent, and seam samples having uneven allowances and rough scruffy edges.

**Development:** Candidates appeared to really be 'owning' this process, in comparison to other years. Candidates were more often producing samples that they felt would be worth investigating with good justifications and value for the design process. Those candidates that achieved in the high band were selecting important aspects of their design to explore and presenting a range of solutions before making decisions based on user feedback.

**Final Design:** This criterion appeared to be generally assessed within exam board guidelines and the mid to higher marks were generally accessible across the grade bands.

**Plan:** This criterion was generally assessed within exam board guidelines, with candidates showing a growing understanding of what specific quality control measures are.

**Quality of Manufacture/Quality of Outcome:** These criteria were generally assessed within exam board guidelines, with teachers making fair judgements about quality and finish.

**Health & Safety:** This is a centre assessed mark.

**Test & Evaluate:** Candidates often demonstrated good evaluative skills but there is still reliance on simple observational 'tests' and 'wash and wear' for practical testing. Those candidates that did really well often objectively considered the functionality of the product and what it was designed to 'do', beyond look pretty and be worn at a party.

