

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

Design & Technology

Food Technology (1970/3970)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark Scheme Publication
code: UG 017824

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

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 Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2006

Publications Code UG 017824

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Index

GCSE Design and Technology: Food Technology Examiners' Reports

Unit 1970 Full Course	Foundation Tier (2F).....	1
	Higher Tier (2H).....	5
	Coursework (01).....	9
Unit 3970 Short Course	19
Grade Boundaries, Full Course	21
Grade Boundaries, Short Course	22

**GCSE Design and Technology: Food Technology
Principal Examiner's Report
Unit 1970, Foundation Tier**

General Comments

It is encouraging that most candidates continue to improve their performance. Centres still need to be aware of the need to prepare candidates for this exam by allowing sufficient time in the course to teach the specification. In addition time spent in developing awareness of the demands of different types of questions, "name", "give", "describe" and "explain", will help the candidates to be able to show their knowledge to better effect. Areas that are tested under AO1 continue to be weaker, with a lack of subject specific and technical language. Surprisingly nutritional knowledge remains weak, with very generic answers, such as "healthy", being far too common.

The paper was well received by candidates. Most were entered at the correct tier of entry and few candidates had to leave sections blank. Design questions were answered well.

Foundation Tier (Paper 2F)

The response of candidates to this paper was good with most able to answer in all sections. Marks were scored more evenly across all areas of the paper. Most candidates were entered for the correct tier of entry.

Question 1

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates. Most candidates were able to correctly identify the equipment or tool used for food preparation in the home or school kitchen. The equipment that caused the most difficulty was the peeler, often identified as an ice cream scoop, and the colander, which was identified as a sieve. It was encouraging to see that most students were aware of, or had obviously used, a food probe. Most candidates gave three correct uses of a microwave oven, although some had clearly misread the question and gave advantages instead. There was some confusion about the problems of using metal plates in the microwave oven with a large number suggesting it would explode or that the high temperatures would melt the plate. However, most understood the concepts that prevented it from working. Most candidates could answer the section on batch production in some way, although some gave advantages of batch production instead. The most common answers were "saves time" and "sell well". More able candidates responded well to the last question being able to identify two uses of the EPOS till and how the data collected would be used. Weaker candidates still knew how it worked but tended to suggest that

it could track problems and total shopping costs in the last section, rather than uses of the data.

Question 2

The first part of this question was poorly answered. Candidates often failed to give two sweet alternatives to sugar, with cream and flavourings being common errors. Their knowledge of the use of artificial sweeteners was poor, but "less calories" was the most used answer. Weaknesses in responding to "describe" questions were very obvious in (a)(iii) where candidates had some knowledge about the effects on health of sugar in the diet but failed to get the second marks by giving a linked response. Again, nutritional knowledge was very weak in relation to the NSP question, with few candidates giving more than "good for the digestion" as an answer. Answers for packaging were generally good, although some candidates failed to read the question properly and also gave plastic, which was in the stem of the question. Again, some candidates failed to focus on the environmental issues relating to packaging and wrote in a more generic way. However, most candidates gained good marks from this question. Most candidates poorly answered the last question, on modified starches. It was obvious that very few centres had taught this section of the specification but where they had there were some excellent responses.

Question 3

The standard of drawings improved again this year and few candidates failed to think of two design ideas. Candidates enjoyed this design question. The work of the best centres was methodical, with candidates going through the specification point by point. Where candidates had failed their work was poorly drawn, with few or no labels and only a limited amount of points could be deduced from the drawing alone. Where candidates are methodical they tend to use new ideas for their second design but the vast majority of candidates still tend to repeat their ideas on the second design. Few candidates named a pastry, but shortcrust, filo and flaky pastries were the most common. Evaluations continue to be very disappointing. Many candidates just repeated the wording on their labels. The best candidates started the sections by saying "This meets the specification because I have used". There were also some very good negative evaluations, which explained why the design failed, especially in relation to the protein and fat content.

Question 4

This year there was a marked dip in the ability to write specification points. The best answers came from candidates who wrote in short sentences. Single word answers are often open to interpretation and do not always guide the examiner well enough to credit them. Weaker candidates also failed to link

their point and reason. Many candidates strayed from the product into areas such as packaging. Many included irrelevant points to do with health and vegetarians. The most commonly used points related to size, snack and sweetness. Quality points were very poor, often vague e.g. "it must be good quality", with few candidates focusing on the product shown. By contrast much of the rest of the question was better answered with most candidates scoring some points in each section. There was a good understanding of the function of fat in the sponge, but some candidates strayed into the pastry base instead. The most popular answer for the use of shortcrust pastry linked to its ability to mould into shape. This was then linked well and repeated in section (d). However, many candidates also failed to link the sections of the answer to the strength of the foil cases, instead talking about the ability to make the foil cases using 24/7 production. Few candidates made good links with "specification", "tolerances" and "quality" for the consistent shape required for the pastry cases. The worst answered section of this question was (e). Hardly any candidates linked stickiness and irregular shape to the problems of using machinery to place the cherries. Instead most talked about machines not placing them in the centre, firing them into the tart so hard they sunk into the icing or it being cheaper to do by hand. The last section was well answered by most candidates, although some failed to gain marks by simply identifying the different textures in the tarts, rather than linking them to a section.

GCSE Design and Technology: Food Technology
Principal Examiner's Report
Unit 1970, Higher Tier

General Comments

It is encouraging that most candidates continue to improve their performance. Centres still need to be aware of the need to prepare candidates for this exam by allowing sufficient time in the course to teach the specification. In addition time spent in developing awareness of the demands of different types of questions, "name", "give", "describe" and "explain", will help the candidates to be able to show their knowledge to better effect. Areas that are tested under AO1 continue to be weaker, with a lack of subject specific and technical language. Surprisingly nutritional knowledge remains weak, with very generic answers, such as "healthy", being far too common.

The paper was well received by candidates. Most were entered at the correct tier of entry and few candidates had to leave sections blank. Design questions were answered well.

Higher Tier (Paper 2H)

Fewer candidates were entered for the incorrect tier. Response to the paper was very positive with the more able candidates showing a wide range of knowledge and the ability to use the correct technical language. The most difficulty was with the technical questions relating to blenders in question 2 and anti-oxidants in question 4. As with the foundation tier many candidates failed to score full points on describe/explain questions as they do not link one answer to a supporting point. Instead they give several unrelated points. This type of question aims to test the understanding of candidates, not just their ability to recall information, so it is more demanding. The design question was very well received and produced a range of very interesting and well drawn designs.

Question 1

This is an overlap question between the two tiers.

This year there was a marked dip in the ability to write specification points. This was less obvious than at the foundation tier and the best answers still came from candidates who wrote in short sentences. Single word answers are often open to interpretation and do not always guide the examiner well enough to credit them. Weaker candidates also failed to link their point and reason. Many candidates strayed from the product into areas such as packaging. Many included irrelevant points to do with health and vegetarians. The most commonly used points related to size, snack and sweetness. Quality

points were very poor, often vague e.g. "it must be good quality", with few candidates focusing on the product shown. By contrast much of the rest of the question was better answered with most candidates scoring some points in each section. There was a good understanding of the function of fat in the sponge, but some candidates strayed into the pastry base instead. The most popular answer for the use of shortcrust pastry linked to its ability to mould into shape. This was then linked well and repeated in section (d). However, many candidates also failed to link the sections of the answer to the strength of the foil cases, instead talking about the ability to make the foil cases using 24/7 production. Few candidates made good links with "specification", "tolerances" and "quality" for the consistent shape required for the pastry cases. The worst answered section of this question was (e). Hardly any candidates linked stickiness and irregular shape to the problems of using machinery to place the cherries. Instead most talked about machines not placing them in the centre, firing them into the tart so hard they sunk into the icing or it being cheaper to do by hand. The last section was well answered by most candidates, although some failed to gain marks by simply identifying the different textures in the tarts, rather than linking them to a section.

Question 2

This question caused many candidates a lot of problems and often produced disappointing answers. The vast majority were unable to score full marks for the first part of the blender question. Too often they just listed parts of the jug blender and "lid" on its own does not answer the question sufficiently. Some candidates gave advantages of using a jug blender instead of safety features. Many safety features were based solely on electrical safety. Hand blender answers were often repetitive so candidate achieved only a single mark for a combined answer. Very few mentioned the fact that it is easy to transport with references "to easy to store", "easy to clean" and "work in small areas" being the most popular answers. There were very few good responses to section (a)(iii). Most candidates scored very few marks on this question. The most popular answer related to being able to leave the blender working on its own. Again, few candidates gained both marks for each part because they do not link or justify the first statement. Generic answers to do with time saving were often used but did not relate it sufficiently to the jug blender to gain credit. Some candidates continued to compare the two blenders and completely missed the point about its potential use for small businesses. In contrast the sections of this question relating CIM and CAD/CAM were generally well answered. Most centres now display a sound working knowledge of industrial processes. 2D design was well explained but almost entirely linked to previewing the product. There were some well worded answers that related to "viewing the product all round" and "viewing it without making, thus reducing wastage/saving the cost of making up a batch". Where bacterial modelling had been studied there were some excellent answers that used impressive technical terminology. However, candidates still confuse bacterial modelling with monitoring and fail to use the predictive potential correctly.

Question 3

This question provided a generally impressive response. Many centres had clearly taught their candidates good exam technique. Preparation work was in evidence and this helped these candidates to avoid the common mistake of repeating design solutions in their second design. Annotation was generally less wordy, with the better candidates underlining the key words from the specification. Better designs also showed an exploded view of the tamper evident system and method of re-sealing the tops. Where drawings were weaker it was not always clear to see how these systems worked and labelling often just referred to "tamper evident". The most common fault was to reference nutritional labelling as a legal requirement. Not all candidates understood that certain material e.g. plastic and glass were also able to prevent the flavour from changing. Evaluations continue to improve with the best evaluations occurring when the candidates are more critical of their designs, or justify their decisions thoroughly. Single words or very short sentences do not give enough detail. The positive responses to the question meant that negative evaluations were less in evidence, but where they were used it was often quite effective.

Question 4

The first parts of this question were well received by most candidates and gave them the opportunity to show good subject knowledge. Nutritional knowledge was sound, but candidates on a higher paper are expected to be specific and generic terms like "healthy", "not get fat" and "not get illnesses when you are older" are too wide for a second mark. A large proportion of candidates could name three nutrients in the milkshake but "vitamins" was not sufficient in its own right for a credit. Good adaptations were seen on the recipe with many able to give precise information as to the nutritional improvements. Understanding of the use of the UHT process was variable. Where candidates had a good working knowledge they were able to give precise temperatures and link it well to bacterial control. Emulsifiers were less well understood with some candidates still linking answers to bacteria rather than textural qualities. Knowledge of the use of anti-oxidants and modified fats was not well known. Where it was a good range of answers were given. Many candidates linked the modified fats with cholesterol but few gained both of the marks as details were sketchy. A surprising number of candidates failed to gain any marks on the section relating to factory farming. By far the most common answer related to animal cruelty, but few made the connections either with the need for cheap sources of food or widespread disease. References to vegetarian issues were a common mistake. The final section was misread by many candidates who talked in general terms about the effects of GM foods, rather than focussing on environmental issues. However, almost all candidates could talk knowledgeably about cross-contamination and the possible development of super weeds.

GCSE Design and Technology: Food Technology
Principal Moderator's Report
Unit 1970, Coursework

General Comments

There continues to be a steady improvement in the performance of many centres. It is evident some centres have read last years E9 and Principal Moderator's report and/or attended Inset training.

Apologies, therefore to centres that the following points don't apply to, but unfortunately there are still a significant number of centres that need points, discussed previously, highlighted again.

- Photographic evidence continues to improve and is now generally very good, all centres supplied photographs with the majority of their candidate's portfolios. The best form of photographic evidence is when centres provide a range of manufacturing photographs as well as good views of the final product. Photographic evidence is very useful for key features 'select and use' and 'work safely.'
- Unfortunately some photographic evidence provided did not always support the teacher's assessment of the quality of the finished product. 'Make product(s)' awards were reduced when the finished quality of the product did not match the expected quality from the mark awarded by the teacher examiner.
- Adherence to the 18-20 page guidance continues to improve. Very few centres allowed candidates to overrun by many pages.
- Folders are getting more manageable every year though some centres are still using heavy folders, which add to delivery costs and manoeuvrability.
- Moderators reported that centres sent the appropriate sample pieces of coursework, i.e. requested coursework and additional pieces to make up a representative selection from the centre.
- Some centres are still allowing candidates to produce final products more suitable to KS3 work than KS4 work and marking the finished products too highly. It must be remembered that this course is an assessment of KS4 capability and as a result KS3 tasks are by their very nature less demanding, consequently they do not give full access to some of the assessment criteria.
- Standardisation within centres appeared to have been completed well this year in most centres.
- Some centres continued to overestimate their candidates' performance in one or more assessment criteria, generally criterion 2, 4, 5 and 6, whilst some centres continue to underestimate their candidates' performance in some assessment criteria, criterion 3 in particular.

Administration

Generally, centres followed Edexcel's administration procedures with few difficulties. Moderators reported that a minority of problems were encountered in the following:

- addition errors in Candidate Mark Record Booklets (CMRBs)
- errors when transferring marks from CMRBs to OPTEMS
- no identification of page numbers in annotation column in CMRBs
- candidate numbers not on/incorrect on CMRBs
- no names / centre numbers / candidates numbers on coursework once CMRB's removed
- candidate authentication on CMRBs not signed, although accompanying note often attached explaining students non attendance at school by April/May 2006.

Criterion 1

Identify needs, use information sources to develop detailed specifications and criteria.

Needs

Most centres gave candidates a board or school set task. Tasks were generally suitable, many relating to present healthy eating advice. It is essential though for each candidate to analyse and expand on given tasks if set by the centre. They need to individualise the task and justify the needs for the product they will be designing and identify a particular market group. A given brief with no candidate input cannot be credited any marks.

A lot of centres addressed this key feature very successfully, candidates producing detailed and realistic briefs from a broad set task.

Information

This key feature was done well by the majority of candidates. Centres had generally not allowed their candidates to spend a disproportional amount of time producing repetitive or excessive amounts of information. Information sought, recorded and used well, include product analysis- shop surveys and product disassembly, questionnaires/market research, and selective background information on possible materials, components, means of construction and processing techniques.

Sufficient information should have been acquired to enable the candidate to write a detailed design specification for their proposed product.

Specification

Candidates must create the specification points themselves to gain marks. Centre given and / or generic specification points are classed as teacher intervention and cannot be credited to candidates. Less able candidates may, however, need a guide or help to write suitable specification points but this teacher intervention must be acknowledged when awarding a level of achievement.

A few centres continue to mark their candidate's performance generously. A frequent omission from specifications is a point referencing cost, either to make the product or a selling price. Budgetary considerations are essential for a high mark to be awarded.

Some specifications were also limited in that they often bore little resemblance to the 'needs' of the product or the research findings discovered by the candidate. It should be noted that good specification points usually link directly to this information. Careful analysis of research/ 'information' is needed prior to writing the specification.

To gain a high level mark candidates must produce a specification that contains descriptions relating to all of the following requirements of the product:

- **form**, e.g. portion size, type of ingredients, environmental issues, scale of production etc;
- **function**, e.g. type of product and it's purpose;
- **user requirements**, e.g. nutritional contribution, shelf life, means of preservation, reheating etc;
- **budgetary (cost) constraints**, e.g. price range, manufacturing and marketing costs.
- each description must contain more information than a simple statement.

Criterion 2

Develop ideas from the specification, check, review and modify as necessary to develop a product.

Ideas

Ideas was generally well addressed although there was a tendency for some candidates not to evidence the link between the proposed ideas and the specification points already identified. Such examples of work could only gain the very lowest marks in the low level band.

To gain high level marks candidates need to present a range of realistic initial ideas. These should address form, function, user requirements and budgetary constraints as detailed in the specification.

It was pleasing to note the number of centres that encouraged candidates to model their ideas and assess their value in regard to the set brief. Candidates enjoy modelling their initial design ideas and many centres provided excellent evidence in their portfolios of modelling and testing their proposed ideas against their design specification points.

An area some centres still need to address is to ensure the range of ideas suggested is diverse in respect of incorporating a variety of ingredients and processes and the dishes require KS4 rigour to make. A disappointing number of centres allowed candidates to suggest ideas more suited to KS3 than KS4, this can limit the candidate's access to higher level marks later in their coursework.

Develop

Some excellent work was produced for this key feature. Some centres had guided their candidates carefully and enabled them to access the high level band of marks. Development work was seen to follow a logical sequence, which led to a final product. Development work with pasta, pastries, sauces, flours, fats were all seen addressing development of nutritional value, flavour, appearance, cost and portion size. Less able candidates had been given proformas to record their development work on and the sub headings used by centres carefully guided the candidates work.

Unfortunately a number of centres failed to address this criterion at all, candidates merely made an initial idea again and presented it as a final product. It must be remembered that to access the marks in this section, initial ideas must be **developed**, this means 'changed' or 'moved-on' in the light of the evaluation of those initial ideas. Marks are only available for new information, no marks are available for simply repeating the initial idea or for suggesting, and not actually carrying out development ideas.

Review

Review was generally marked accurately by centres. To satisfy the high level of this key feature, 'Ideas' need to be reviewed as they develop against the previously identified needs and design specification points. All reasoning must be explained when reducing the range of initial ideas down to a more selective group. Thorough testing against other specification points is needed, e.g. nutritional analysis, calculation of cost, review of time needed for preparation, user views on general acceptability of dishes, shelf life concerns etc, to access the higher level mark band.

Candidate observation / opinion can be used as evidence and justification, but high marks cannot be awarded solely on the review of this limited evidence.

Criterion 3

Use written and graphical techniques including ICT and CAD where appropriate to generate, develop, model and communicate.

This criterion was harshly marked by many centres. Candidate's presentation and communication skills have improved a lot in recent years. Marks were adjusted accordingly by moderators.

Written Communication

Many candidates communicated information clearly and in a logical and well-organised manner, although the use of specialist vocabulary continues to be used infrequently. An area where candidates can easily incorporate technical language is in describing the function of ingredients used in products, or when detailing the manufacturing processes relating to their product especially in an industrial situation.

Other Media

The differentiation in this key feature lies within the skilfulness and accuracy shown by the candidate when presenting information. Candidates displayed suitable means of recording information, such as photographs, cut and paste items, tables, pie charts, bar charts, flow charts, brainstorming bubbles etc but to gain the top level mark it is important the candidate aims to clearly and accurately communicate necessary information.

ICT

Some excellent ICT was seen from many centres. Less able candidates seem to produce more creditworthy work when they word process it and / or when they use ICT graphics to present results. The use of nutritional analysis computer programmes produced valuable information as well as helping to address this particular key feature. The use of digital images of modelled food products was fairly common this year and the quality of such images has improved considerably.

Criterion 4

Produce and use detailed working schedules, which include a range of industrial applications as well as the concepts of systems and control. Simulate production and assembly lines using appropriate ICT.

Marks allocated in criteria 4, 5 and 6 refer to work directly related to making the final finished product **only** and not previous trial ideas and development work.

This was an area of confusion for some centres.

Systems and Control

Most centres addressed this key feature this year although some centres had misunderstood the requirements of this assessment criterion.

The centres that did correctly address this criterion generally did so in the form of a table or flowchart. Either method is suitable. Candidates should be encouraged to think in the form of input, process, output and feedback. A recipe and method for manufacture of the final product can be written out in table form incorporating each of these headings. (Timings, HACCP and quality control points can be added and the table can be used for a schedule also.) Alternatively, a flow chart can be used preferably incorporating the generally recognised symbols for input, process and output, and feedback. It is essential for candidates to provide a key for the symbols they use for input, process, output and feedback.

If candidates failed to mention feedback in their systems and control diagram, only a low level mark could be awarded, as the assessment criterion requires an explanation of feedback to gain the medium level mark.

To achieve a high level mark candidates must produce an outline plan, systems and control diagram / table for the manufacture of the final product that explains the input(s), the process(es), the output(s) and feedback of that activity and show where the feedback will be used to trigger performance / quality control check(s).

Schedule

This key feature was generally very well done. Many less able candidates found it easy to gain marks when centres had required candidates to write out the details for making the final product in the form of a time plan, prior to doing the final 'make'. Centres that did not encourage pupils to do this, and let them rely on the information given in the ideas and development section, disadvantaged their candidates as it was not always obvious which recipes and methods / schedules were being used. It must also be remembered that candidates can only be credited once for information given.

To gain the high level mark candidates need to produce a time plan relating to production / manufacture of the product that includes consideration of some of the making processes, materials (functions of), time projections and of where / when quality control will be applied.

Time is an integral part of a schedule and must be included for any marks to be awarded in this key feature.

Industrial Application

Some excellent work was seen in this key feature.

It should be noted that a good HACCP chart / table relating to the making of their own product guarantees a high level mark and candidates do not need to produce copious quantities of other related industrial applications.

A common problem in this key feature is that candidates continue to produce very generic HACCP charts and manufacturing production plans rather than carrying out research and applying information to their chosen design idea. No marks can be awarded for a non specific HACCP chart copied from a book. Packaging, mass production, scaling and costing up were considered by many candidates.

Criterion 5

Select and use tools, equipment and processes effectively and safely to make single products and products in quantity. Use CAM appropriately.

This criterion has the highest weighting of marks and it is important that the necessary quantity and quality of evidence to support the marks awarded is provided in the folio.

Select and Use

Many candidates produced excellent evidence of 'select and 'use' this year and teacher/examiners marked this key feature more realistically on the whole.

To satisfy the high category, candidates were required to provide explicit evidence of their ability to 'select' and 'use skilfully', tools, equipment and processes whilst manufacturing of their product. Products must be appropriate to meet the demands of KS4 to access the medium to higher mark levels. Candidates producing only KS3 products often had their marks adjusted.

Evidence for 'select' was successfully presented by some candidates through 'systems and control', or the 'schedule'. Photographs and detailed teacher annotation was also provided by a few centres. In order to satisfy the high category, candidates must include in their design folios the kind of explicit evidence already described, and teacher annotation, where offered, must be both detailed and as a support to that already included by the candidate.

Some centres produced tables indicating equipment and methods chosen for use, together with the reason for choice and then any particular safety points that needed to be borne in mind, ready for addressing the third key feature in this criterion.

Evidence for 'use skilfully' was presented by many candidates in the form of good quality photographs which showed evidence of the skill and accuracy

with which the range of tools, processes and equipment have been used to make the product.

Make Products

This key feature was enthusiastically addressed by candidates, and while an increasing number of centres are marking accurately a number of centres are still over marking candidates finished products.

Care should be taken to guide candidates in their final choice of product to ensure they have the opportunity to demonstrate their competency at KS4, failure to do so will limit their access to marks.

Lack of suitable developed design proposals to make and test the products against was also a problem in some centres. The assessment criteria state that candidates must “make a high quality product which relates fully to the features of the design proposal” to achieve the highest band of marks. This means that candidates must evidence the making of a product that meets most of the quality requirements of their final design proposal, i.e. sizes, tolerances, finish, function and relates fully to the features of their final design proposal (which may include modifications made in light of experience gained during the making process).

Work Safely

Safety relates to physical safety and well being, not bacterial / food poisoning safety aspects. Some centres continue to over mark this key feature. To access the high level mark candidates must detail most of the safety precautions, which relate to both themselves and to others with respect to specific materials or tools or equipment or processes to be used when making their product. Only a low level mark can be awarded for teacher observation alone and if this is to be credited the CMRB must be annotated with sufficient detail by the teacher.

Written / tabulated evidence contained within the ‘Schedule’ by adding simple risk assessments may be used, as may annotated photographic evidence.

Criterion 6

Devise and apply tests to check the quality of candidate’s work at critical control points. Ensure that candidate’s products are of suitable quality for the intended use. Suggest modifications that would improve candidate’s performance.

All three key features in this criterion relate to work associated with the completed final product only. Centres are not always clear on this point.

Tests and checks

An increasing number of centres evidenced excellent testing and checking of final products, whilst a few centres still failed to address this key feature at all.

Some centres had again allocated marks for 'testing and checking' that had been undertaken at the 'ideas' and 'development' stages rather than at the completion of the design process at the end of the portfolio. Marks can only be awarded for testing and checking of the final product. Testing and checking recorded earlier in the portfolio will have been marked already and cannot be credited again. Centres must ensure they do not double credit work.

Many candidates used taste tests as their sole form of testing and checking.

To access the high level mark candidates need to develop and use appropriate testing techniques to check the product against all aspects of the specification. To do this, candidates need to devise tests to suit the needs of their product and carry out these tests on the product, whilst they are making it, to check its quality against the measurable points of the specification. (The importance of a detailed design proposal / product specification evolving from the criterion 2 cannot be emphasised too strongly.)

User views are an important factor when tests and checks are undertaken, where possible, users should be employed to do the testing.

Evaluate

There was some excellent evaluation of products by some centres. Accurate marking of candidates' standards was noted in these same centres.

As with tests and checks some centres had mistakenly credited marks for evaluative comments made in 'Ideas', 'Develop' and 'Review' sections in criterion 2. The assessment criterion states that candidates must evaluate the final product using evidence from the test results and considering user views. Evidence of the candidates using their test results and the views of a user to evaluate the product must be presented and the evaluation should relate to measurable points of the specification. Evaluative comments must be objective and statements should be supported with evidence from tests and checks.

Modification

Again this key feature was addressed well by some centres but as with the previous key features some centres had credited modifications previously marked in the 'Ideas' and 'Develop' sections. This key feature demands that candidates use the results from evaluating the final product to suggest and justify modifications to the product. To access the high level mark candidates need to present more than one modification, each arising from a different evaluation point. Each modification should contain sufficient detail to show how it would improve the performance / quality of the product and include reasoning to justify the proposal.

GCSE Design and Technology: Food Technology
Unit 3970, Foundation Tier
Unit 3790, Higher Tier
Unit 3790, Coursework

Introduction

The low number of entries for the short course makes it difficult to provide comments on the performance of the candidates. However, the comments made on the full course common questions or elements are relevant and helpful for the short course and should be read in conjunction with any general comments provided below.

General Comments: Foundation and Higher Tiers

Many of the comments relating to the full course hold true for the short course. Centres still have a tendency to enter far too many candidates for the higher tier. This often disadvantages the candidates, as they would perform better on the foundation tier. As with the full course centres need to spend time on exam technique, raising awareness of how to tackle questions that ask for descriptions or explanations so that their candidates score full marks more often. It is evident that many centres fail to teach their candidates the contents of the specification, relying on knowledge gained from undertaking the coursework. This seriously disadvantages them in the written paper and weaknesses in knowledge of technical terms and food preparation methods are even more obvious than in the full course.

General Comments: Coursework

There were a pleasing number of centres entered for the Short Course in Food Technology this year.

As last year a lot of Short Course portfolio work was of excellent quality, and would have scored well, had it been entered for the Full Course.

A lot of work was excellently presented in a concise and detailed form. Centres are to be congratulated on their candidates' performance.

The Edexcel approved Task Sheets proved to be a success, as they tended to give candidates a better focus and helped them structure their folios.

The detailed comments included in the Full Course report are pertinent to the Short Course too and it is recommended that the Full Course report is read in conjunction with these brief statements.

GCSE Design & Technology: Food Technology
(Full Course: 1970)

Grade Boundaries - Summer 2006

Overall Grades

The figures given below are the minimum subject marks required for each overall grade in the summer 2006 examinations.

(Foundation Tier out of 100)

C	D	E	F	G
52	42	32	23	14

(Higher Tier out of 100)

A*	A	B	C	D	E
78	68	58	48	37	31

Component Marks

The figures given below are the minimum marks required for each component grade in the summer 2006 examination.

(Coursework 01 out of 102)

A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
92	80	68	56	45	34	23	12

(Paper 2F out of 88)

C	D	E	F	G
43	35	27	20	13

(Paper 2H out of 88)

A*	A	B	C	D	E
54	47	40	33	24	19

GCSE Design & Technology: Food Technology
(Short Course: 3970)

Grade Boundaries - Summer 2006

Overall Grades

The figures given below are the minimum subject marks required for each overall grade in the summer 2006 examinations.

(Foundation Tier out of 100)

C	D	E	F	G
51	41	31	22	13

(Higher Tier out of 100)

A*	A	B	C	D	E
78	67	56	46	36	31

Component Marks

The figures given below are the minimum marks required for each component grade in the summer 2006 examination.

(Coursework 01 out of 84)

A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
76	66	56	46	37	28	19	10

(Paper 2F out of 44)

C	D	E	F	G
20	16	12	9	6

(Paper 2H out of 44)

A*	A	B	C	D	E
26	22	18	15	11	9

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order CodeUG 017824 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

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