

Design and Technology: Food Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J302**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J042**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2012

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Design and Technology: Food Technology (J302)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Design and Technology: Food Technology (J042)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
A521 Introduction to Designing and Making	5
A522 Sustainable Design	10
A523 Making Quality Products	14
A524 Technical Aspects of Designing and Making	19

Overview

This report provides an overview of the work seen in the written examination Units 2 and 4 and the Controlled Assessment Units 1 and 3, for candidates who took the examination during this series. It precedes a more detailed report to centres from each subject area within the Innovator Suite and highlights general issues that have occurred across the suite of specifications.

This report has been prepared by the Chief Examiner, Assistant Chief Examiners, Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators and covers all specifications within the Innovator Suite. It should be read in conjunction with the examination papers, the mark schemes, and the marking criteria for assessment given in the specification booklets.

This is the second examination series in the third year for the new Innovator Suite.

A reminder: An important point for teachers to note about the Terminal Rule in relation to this suite of specifications and re-sits: The terminal rule is an Ofqual requirement. Candidates must be entered for at least two units out of the four (full course) at the time that they certificate. ie the end of the course.

Please be aware that the Ofqual rule states that marks scored for terminal units will be the marks used in the calculation of candidate grades. Therefore, if one of the candidate's terminal units is a re-sit and the mark is poorer than the original mark, the poorer mark will be used to calculate the final grade for that candidate.

Obviously, the terminal unit marks are then added to the highest marks scored in the other units making up the certificate.

Centres are reminded that it is also a requirement of Ofqual that candidates are now credited for their accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar across all four units.

It is pleasing to see that centres and candidates have continued to respond well to the new style of examination approach. Centres are to be commended for this.

It is obvious that Centres have benefitted from previous reports and training sessions available for the qualifications.

Written Examination – Units 2 and 4

Unit 2 – For this examination series of the GCSE Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms.

The overall performance and range of results for Unit 2 was generally the same as seen in the last examination session – January 2012. It was pleasing to see that many candidates had been well prepared for the examination by Centres and clearly had a sufficient knowledge base to answer the questions. It has been encouraging to see that candidates have been able to access the higher marks.

In **Unit 2 – Section A** of the papers most candidates across the suite attempted to answer all questions, with few candidates giving no response (NR) answers. It was noticeable that, at times, candidates had not read the instructions correctly and centres would benefit from explaining the correct examination requirements to the candidates. Candidates need to be encouraged to give an answer for the multiple choice style questions even if they are uncertain that they are correct. Centres are reminded that questions 1–15 cover the grade range from A* to U.

There was less duplication of circling answers seen during this examination session.

Important: Centres need to be aware that where a candidate has provided multiple answers to a single response question, no marks will be awarded.

Unit 2 – Section B of the papers showed a greater mixture of responses and teachers need to ensure they read the subject specific reports for further detailed feedback on specific issues and individual question performance.

Important: Candidates need to be careful that they do not repeat the question in their answer or write the same answer for several questions. Similarly candidates must not use certain terms as 'stock' answers. Such answers included:

- 'Environmentally friendly' and 'better for the environment' or 'damages the environment'.
- To 'recycle' and 'recycling is good for the environment'.
- 'Cheaper', 'better' and 'stronger'.

The questions marked with an asterisk * provided candidates with an opportunity to give a detailed written answer combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response. There has been a significant improvement in the written response style question this session, with candidates giving detailed answers combining good subject knowledge with a clear, structured response.

It was noticeable this session, that where extra paper was required to continue a question response, many candidates failed to reference the question number thus compromising marks. It is important therefore, that centres teach candidates how to highlight where they are continuing an answer on a different page in the examination document.

Centres are reminded that candidates are assessed on spelling, punctuation and grammar on the banded mark scheme question.

It is also important to note that candidates need to ensure that they write legibly and within the areas set out on the papers.

Unit 4 – For this examination series of the Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms.

It was encouraging to see improvements in candidate performance across the Innovator suite this session. The following improvements were noted:

- Candidates appeared to be better prepared to 'tackle' the questions than in previous sessions.
- Candidates managed their time effectively, most attempted all of the questions and there were fewer No Response (NR) answers recorded.
- A better standard of response to the Quality of Written Communication questions was seen.
- More candidates demonstrated high levels of knowledge and understanding and were able to access the higher marks.

It was encouraging to see however, that most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the technical aspects of designing and making across the specifications.

Important Note: Candidates need to:

- **Read through the complete question before attempting to answer.** The examination includes sufficient reading time for candidates to focus on the key points to address in their answers. It was pleasing to see that some candidates produced a 'plan of action' before giving their answer to the questions with a high mark allocation.

- **Look carefully at the mark allocation and available space for their answers.** Candidates need to be aware that there is a relationship between the space available and the length and quality of the expected answer, and thus the mark allocated.
- **Have a better understanding of the different command words used throughout the exam paper in order to respond appropriately to the questions.** Across the suite there were many answers that lacked detail and clarity. Terms such as ‘cheaper’, ‘quicker’ and ‘easier’ were often used and meant very little without qualification or justification.
- **Become familiar with the quality of written communication questions marked with an asterisk*.** These questions provide candidates with the opportunity to give detailed written answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce structured, **coherent** responses and accurate spelling. Simply repeating the same point several times will not lead to the award of marks. A list of bullet points does not represent an adequate answer and will compromise the higher marks. Practice of this type of question which carries [6] marks is strongly recommended.
- **Respond to specification and/or bullet points accurately.** In design type questions this is important if the candidate is to achieve the maximum marks available.
- **Make sketches large and clear enough to convey meaning.** It is equally important that notes should be clearly written and reinforce what appears in the sketches.
- **Make their answers clear and technically accurate.** In questions that require candidates to produce sketches and notes, it is essential that answers are made as clear and technically accurate as possible. Marks may be compromised through illegible handwriting and poor quality sketches.

Controlled Assessment – Units 1 and 3

This examination series has seen portfolios for all subject specialisms being submitted for Unit 1 and Unit 3 both through postal and repository pathways. Most centres have been prompt in the dispatch of documentation to OCR and moderators, which is to be commended. **It is important that Centres return the request for portfolios within three days.**

Centres are reminded to forward form CCS160 in particular to moderators. It is helpful if centres also include a record of the marks allocated to each candidate, for each of the marking criteria sections.

Important Note: Candidates producing paper portfolios should be entered for postal (02) moderation. Candidates producing their portfolio on a CD or memory stick should also be entered for postal (02) moderation.

Centres must ensure that if candidates are entered through the repository (01), the portfolios must be uploaded via Interchange and **NOT** sent through to the moderator on a disc. The preferred format of files presented for this type of moderation needs to be PowerPoint, PDF or Word, with work saved in ONE file only and numbered, not as individual sheets saved in different files.

In general, Centres have been successful in applying the marking criteria for both Units 1 and 3. Centres are reminded to apply the mark scheme on a ‘best fit’ basis which may mean allocating marks across the assessment grid. Marks should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions.

It was still evident that a significant number of portfolios, particularly for Unit 1, resembled the legacy format, especially in terms of the excessive research and inappropriate critical evaluation.

It is important that centres encourage candidates to organise the portfolio according to the different marking criteria strands as it enables the candidates to produce work that clearly shows an understanding of the controlled assessment requirements. Portfolios should be clearly labelled with the Candidate and Centre name and number, with the unit code and title also evident. (*Specification – 5.3.5 Presentation of work*) This is particularly important when the Centre submits work via the OCR Repository, where individual files are used to store portfolio work. Centres need to ensure that candidates clearly label each file using the marking criteria section headings; this facilitates a more effective completion of the moderation process.

Important: Centres are also reminded to ensure that the OCR cover sheet is included with each portfolio of work, **outlining the theme and the starting point chosen by the candidate.**

JCQ documentation on Controlled Assessment (September 2011 – August 2012) clearly states that any guidance given to candidates must be clearly recorded. *4.5.2 When marking the work, teachers/assessors **must not** give credit in regard to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the specification and **must** give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). **This includes providing writing frames specific to the task.** (eg outlines, paragraph headings or section headings).* In light of the information given above, Centres need to take care when using writing frames in the controlled assessment portfolios.

Many candidates included a bibliography or referenced their research sources, which was pleasing to see. **It is good practice to ensure that candidates acknowledge sources of information used for the development of their portfolio work.** *5.3.2 Definitions of the Controls* section in the specification states: “*The teacher must be able to authenticate the work and insist on acknowledgement and referencing of any sources used*”.

Centres are to be reminded that the ‘*controlled assessment task must NOT be used as practice material and then as the actual live assessment material. Centres should devise their own practice material using the OCR specimen controlled assessment task as guidance.*’ *Specification – Section 5.2.2 Using Controlled Assessment Tasks.*

Resits – Centres must remember that the theme, starting point and research aspects of the portfolio can be maintained. However, the remaining portfolio and final prototype should be redeveloped for submission.

It is a requirement in the Making criteria that candidates “*demonstrate an understanding and ability in solving technical problems*”. **Centres must therefore ensure that problems encountered are written into the record of making, for the higher marks.**

4.1 ‘Schemes of Assessment’ clearly states that “*A Minimum of two digital images/photographs of the final product showing front and back views*” should be evident in the candidate portfolio. **It is the centre’s responsibility to ensure that photographs are evident, are of a good quality and are of the candidate’s own work.**

A521 Introduction to Designing and Making

General Comments

Centres continue to encourage their candidates to organise their portfolio into separate sections according to the assessment criteria and present their work more concisely. However, some candidates are still including work which is not required.

The majority of portfolios were labelled clearly with both the candidates name and number and had the required OCR mark sheet.

Electronic portfolios (entered on the portal)

Some candidates seemed to have spent too much time on the IT element to the detriment of the portfolio.

Moderators do not look at these on a white board therefore the print needs to be in an appropriate size. Care also needs to be taken with the colour of the background – a white font is difficult to read on a red or purple background.

Some centres' marks, still required adjustments because the levels of response in the Assessment Objectives had been interpreted too leniently. However, there were fewer large adjustments this year.

Some centres continue to award higher attaining candidates top marks, when in fact the work didn't really show great capability and depth of involvement. Words such as 'appropriate', 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical' which appear in the top mark band, were not really adhered to.

Recipes are now being adapted/modified during the Designing section of the portfolio in many centres, but too often the ideas were not explained or creative. Candidates should be encouraged to use their own ideas creatively throughout the whole design and make process.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many centres had done this particularly well but others failed to submit this evidence with the work. There should be photographic evidence of the practical work along with written teacher comments. This is particularly important for the low attaining candidates where there is little written evidence in their portfolio. **A separate cover sheet containing reference to the assessment criteria applied is required by OCR.**

The use of writing frames and pre-printed sheets was more evident this year. It is important that high achieving candidates are given the opportunity to show flair and creativity in approaching the assessment criteria.

It is also important that candidates are given the opportunity to show individuality when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

Assessment Criteria

The level of response is an important part of the mark scheme and should be carefully considered when assessing candidates work. The levels should equate to the quality of the evidence, the capability and depth of involvement that has been employed to produce what is on offer. Within an Assessment Criteria the quality of evidence to fulfil a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfil a similar level of response at a higher level. The capability and depth of involvement must be evident to gain the marks at the higher level.

Many centres are now encouraging candidates to clearly label the chosen Theme/Product and the starting point at the start of the portfolio. Candidates should develop a new product that meets an identified aspect of current healthy eating guidelines.

Cultural Understanding

This section was generally better this year but many centres are still too generous when awarding marks.

- Candidates had collected and presented information on how changes in society, including cultural issues have influenced the products available today but many candidates are still not linking the information to their chosen theme.
- Information on healthy lifestyles continues to be better than the section on cultural understanding. Sometimes this section could be presented a little more concisely and linked more closely to the chosen theme.
- Some candidates continue to complete mind maps to highlight issues but then gave no explanation or meaningful conclusions/reflections on them.
- Some centres are still over generous when marking this section because of lack of independent analysis.
- Acknowledging sources of information by the candidates was slightly better this year.

A high level of response to this section would include:

- **Chosen product/theme and starting point clearly stated at the start of the portfolio.**
- **Considering how changes in society, including cultural issues have influenced the range of food products available today in relation to their chosen product/theme.**
- **Evidence of how wise choice of food products can promote healthy lifestyles.**
- **Information being presented concisely and the sources acknowledged.**

Creativity

- Questionnaires continue to be the most popular method used to identify the needs of the user/target group/a nutritional focus but there continues to be evidence of irrelevant questions, graphs which were not analysed and/or the Design Brief not arising from the findings of research. Centres credited candidates with full marks when there was little supportive evidence for the choice of the design brief and when a precise design brief had not been given. The Design Brief must include one nutritional focus. Some candidates did not justify their choice of target group and/or nutritional focus and some candidates had established a design brief before carrying out any research. There was less evidence this year of candidates choosing more than one nutritional focus, but candidates who chose five a day as their nutritional focus, found it difficult to carry out the work required in this area throughout the portfolio, unless they focused on the fibre content of their products. Some candidates still continue to present their design brief as a long and wordy “mini-specification”.
- Questionnaires that lacked focus did not allow candidates to identify the qualities respondents require from a new product. This resulted in existing products not being evaluated against identified needs and the design brief and the design specification at the beginning of the Designing Section not being developed from analysis of research. A number of centres credited candidates with high marks when analysis of the questionnaire results was very superficial.
- The standard of work regarding the evaluating of existing products continues to vary tremendously. Some candidates did not use their identified needs, others used pro-formas with the same identified needs throughout the centre, whilst others, clearly understood the requirements of the assessment criteria and used their own identified needs.

Most candidates had evaluated four products in the form of a table but there was more evidence this year of candidates not drawing any conclusions from the results, nor evaluating one product in detail. Where evaluation of one product in detail is taking place, some candidates continue to offer very limited and superficial comments or the evaluation tends to be a description of the product rather than an evaluation. Some candidates still chose inappropriate products to evaluate that do not match their task, whilst others had evaluated four products in detail which is not required. Evaluation of packaging is not required.

- Many candidates had used one method of research to identify and record relevant data to help design a creative innovative product. However, the data was not always presented concisely. Some candidates had included data which was irrelevant, whilst others had no evidence of data.

A high level of response to this section would include:

- **Carrying out research eg questionnaires/interviews/available statistical data to identify the qualities required for the design of a creative, innovative food product/target group/a nutritional focus that the portfolio will focus on;**
- **Providing a detailed analysis of the results in order to identify the needs of the user/target group/nutritional focus which then leads to a clear and precise design brief;**
- **A design brief that includes 1 one nutritional focus.**

Example of a concise and precise design brief: - Design and make a low in fat ready meal aimed at families.

- **Critically evaluating existing products against the needs of the intended user(s) – four products in chart form with a conclusion and one product in detail;**
- **Relevant data which is edited and presented concisely. All sources of information should be acknowledged.**

Weaker candidates tended to make very little reference to results of research resulting in rather vague briefs and superficial evaluation of existing products. This would be regarded as a low level of response.

Designing

- The quality of design specifications continues to vary widely. Some candidates produced very detailed design specifications, other design specifications were far too brief and in some cases, teacher led. Some candidates included criteria that were not measurable. There was more evidence this year of candidates including a nutritional focus – a requirement of this controlled assessment. There are still some centres which list several nutritional needs and often these candidates fail to discuss them all in the follow on work.
- There continues to be evidence of the design specification not reflecting the findings from research in the Creativity Section of the portfolio.
- The use of proforma sheets for the planning and evaluating of products limited candidates' creativity and initiative and tended to result in repetitive responses. Pro-forma sheets for this section of the portfolio were still evident this year.
- Some candidates continue to choose products that show little or no skills or only allow them to show the same skills.
- Most candidates chose four products to trial and showed adaptations/modifications to the original recipes. However, adaptations/modifications although recorded were often not explained and in many centres lacked creativity. Some candidates tended to focus on changing the nutritional focus rather than the many other ways of adapting products.
- Many candidates had listed the practical skills required for the making of each product
- Detailed annotated diagrams, sketches, equipment lists, methods, time plans or flowcharts are not required for this section.

- Some candidates had trialled and tested a wide range of interesting solutions. There was good evidence of star diagrams/profiles and rating charts but marks were lost if these results were not always explained or conclusions drawn. Conclusions from testing did show good differentiation of candidates work and marks.
- Detailed evaluations of ideas against the specification, continues to be the weakest area in this section for many candidates. Evaluations were often cursory with only a ticked chart and this cannot be considered a detailed evaluation. Some candidates had evaluated each solution but then failed to make any reference to the specification. Other candidates had evaluated the making of the products rather than the product itself. However, many candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Most candidates now carry out nutritional analysis using an appropriate computer programme but a significant number still fail to refer to the data with regard to their nutritional focus, when evaluating their trialled products. Some candidates quote incorrect factual information eg lowering the fat content by not using sugar. A few candidates did not show any reference to a nutritional focus, a requirement of Unit A521.
- Reasoned decisions with reference to ingredients and equipment for the final product (prototype) was well done by many centres, but some candidates failed to apply relevant nutritional data according to their nutritional focus when giving reasoned decisions. Too many centres are awarding high level responses for nutritional knowledge in the making section, when there was little evidence of independent analysis in relation to the candidates' nutritional focus in both the trialling work and when giving decisions relating to the final product (prototype).
- Some candidates are still including reasons for choosing final product idea and rejecting the remaining ideas, which is not required in Unit A521.

Marks for the application and understanding of nutritional knowledge according to the chosen nutritional focus are awarded to the Making Section.

A high level response to this section would involve:

- **A detailed design specification reflecting research findings from the Creativity section of the portfolio.**
- **Proposing a wide range of appropriate solutions – listing a range of ideas before choosing four ideas to trial.**
- **For each product to be trialled – listing ingredients and practical skills, adaptations clearly explained and justified to produce creative and innovative ideas, nutritional analysis according to the chosen nutritional focus, evidence of testing by three tasters, detailed evaluation against the specification, and nutritional focus using results from testers as evidence, discussion of improvements taking into account users views.**
- **Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.**
- **Giving reasoned decisions for ingredients, equipment for the final product (prototype), applying relevant nutritional knowledge and understanding.**

Making

- Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that some centres continue to credit candidates with high marks without evidence of this range of skills.
- The use of digital cameras allowed candidates to include photographs of their work. Centres are reminded the minimum requirement is a photograph of the final product.
- In many centres, flowcharts had been correctly marked and candidates had clearly identified the processes involved. Nutritional analysis of the final product was evident in many candidates' portfolios.
- To achieve high marks for practical work candidates need to select and use appropriate ingredients and equipment, work safely, hygienically and skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills) and produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes.

A high level response to this section would be:

- **Producing a detailed flowchart which clearly shows all processes required for the making of the final product (prototype).**
- **Showing thorough understanding and application of the chosen nutritional focus throughout the portfolio.**
- **Being resourceful and adaptable with materials, foods and equipment.**
- **Selecting and using appropriate ingredients and equipment.**
- **Working safely, hygienically, skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills)**
- **Produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes.**

Evaluation

- Many candidates provided evidence of testing of the final product (prototype) but conclusions, were often superficial and unsupported, resulting in the evaluations being descriptive rather than evaluative.
- Comments when evaluating against the design specification continue to lack specific detail, stating the product had met the specification without any justification.
- Some candidates focussed on how well they had progressed throughout the portfolio rather than evaluating the final product against the design specification and suggesting how the product could be improved based on results from testing.
- Most centres had given credit for spelling, punctuation and grammar. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluation for SPAG even if there is no evidence of an evaluation.

A high level of response to this section would be:

- **Critically evaluating their product against the design specification and design brief using results of testing (five testers) to give meaningful conclusions.**
- **Suggesting possible improvements.**
- **Using specialist terms appropriately and correctly, presenting information in a structured format and accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.**

GOOD PRACTICE WITHIN ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

- 1 Work should be removed from ring binders, presented so that pages can be turned without having to remove sheets from plastic wallets and securely fastened together eg by means of a tag, then clearly labelled with Centre Number, Name and Candidate Number. A Mark sheet/annotation sheet should be attached to each piece of work.
- 2 The Controlled Assessment Mark Sheet(s) should be sent to the moderator with the MS1. Centres need to make sure that this paperwork arrives to the moderator by the date specified by OCR and portfolios should be sent within 3 days of receipt of the request for the sample.
- 3 Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Criteria.
- 4 Where more than one teacher is involved in the assessing of candidates work, the centre should carry out effective internal standardisation to ensure a reliable rank order.

A522 Sustainable Design

Examiners Report

The overall performance and range of results was similar to January 2012. Candidates generally performed much better on the short questions in Section A than in the longer questions of section B, which required detailed answers. However there is still some evidence that the candidates are entered for the exam when they have not covered the whole of the A522 specification. Many candidates demonstrated a general awareness of the main points and issues linked to sustainable design however they lacked the specific knowledge and understanding required to answer questions in depth. This was particularly noticeable in question 17a and 18c (ii).

There were a fewer number of 'no response' answers – this occurred mostly on question 9 and 18C (ii). It was pleasing to see that most candidates attempted most of the questions in section A. Some candidates also ringed more than one answer to questions 1 – 5 and therefore did not score any marks.

In section B, many candidates lost marks through poor exam technique. A number of candidates wasted time and space re-writing the question before they began their answer. Candidates need to be made aware of the importance of the wording of each question and they need to understand the difference between terms like 'name', 'explain' and 'discuss'. Some candidates presented answers to the 'explain' type of questions as a haphazard collection of facts, not necessarily related to the question. It was however pleasing to see that in some centres candidates had clearly planned how to answer the banded response questions and many candidates scored well on this question.

Many students were also let down by spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPAG) and incorrect use of terms. Spelling of key words, such as ingredients, nutrients, and vitamins was poor and vague terms were often used that did not convey sufficient understanding to warrant marks. Vague terms used in answers included: healthy, healthier, heart attack, heart problems, help the environment, pollution, climate change, harmful gases, environmentally friendly, cheaper.

Section A

Question 1

Virtually all of the candidates knew that they needed to reduce sugar in their diet.

Question 2

Most candidates answered correctly but if it was answered incorrectly candidates mainly put 'Use by date'.

Question 3

Free range chicken production was well understood.

Question 4

Organic farming was well understood.

Question 5

Most knew that pregnant women need folic acid but a small percentage stated babies or the elderly.

Question 6

Many candidates answered this correctly however some did not score a mark as they stated 'freeze' or 'must be frozen'.

Question 7

Most candidates knew the function of calcium, with 'strong bones & teeth' being the most frequently given answer.

Question 8

The majority of candidates answered correctly. The common wrong answer was white.

Question 9

This was an A* question. Many candidates did not know the meaning of the initials ETI (Ethical Trading Initiative).

Question 10

Most candidates answered correctly, with various numbers within the range. Some candidates gave minus temperatures which were incorrect. Candidates need to read the question carefully.

Question 11

The majority of candidates knew we should be reducing the amount of fat we eat.

Question 12

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 13

There was a mixed response to this question.

Question 14

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 15

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) Overall this question was well answered with most candidates scoring some marks however very few scored full marks. Generally, advantages were well answered, with common answers relating to recycling and strength for aluminium and recycling and reusing for plastic. Some contradicted their answers for the disadvantages and therefore did not score marks in this section.
- (b) This was well answered. The most common response was putting a recycle logo/symbol on the label. A few candidates quoted Mobius symbol. Those that failed to score a mark had misinterpreted the question.
- (c) Good marks were gained for the packaging of the cake. Most frequent correct answers were 'use cardboard' and references to recycled/recyclable/biodegradable/minimal packaging.
- (d) Most candidates gained marks for 'shorter shelf life'. A few misunderstood the role of preservatives and referred to the cake having a better flavour because it had no additives; others thought that the cake would last longer.
- (e) Many lost marks because they wrote about where the cake would be stored (cupboard, cool dry place, fridge) rather than how.
- (f) This was well answered with a number of candidates scoring the full four marks. The most popular responses were the: name of the product, name and address of the manufacturer, list of ingredients, weight, and place of origin. Some candidates lost marks as two or three of their responses were connected to date marking. Others lost marks because they offered a scattergun approach in relation to date marking. Some candidates are still referring to 'sell by date' this is incorrect.

Question 17

- (a) There were a range of responses to this question and it was clear where this had been taught in centres. There were some good explanations with responses referring to both the manufacture and transportation of the product. Those who failed to score full marks when giving a detailed response was as a result of the answer concentrating solely on transportation. Candidates scoring 0 or 1 mark had offered very vague comments.
- (b) Many candidates seemed to understand what a tetra-pack was but struggled to explain it adequately enough to gain marks. Those who gained marks wrote about mix of materials and difficulty separating them.
- (c) The most popular responses concentrated on aspects connected with a healthy diet, counts as one of the 5 a day or variety of different flavours available. Very few mentioned that fruit juices can be fortified with vitamins, contains vitamins (those found in fruit), no added flavourings and colourings.
- (d) It was disappointing to see a number of candidates failed to attempt this question and some dishes were impossible to decipher. There were some very interesting and creative ideas. Many candidates gave details/or clearly drawn diagrams and scored two or three marks. Those who achieved one or two marks gained these for citing a seasonal summer fruit/vegetable, grown in the UK. Nutrition was the weakest area in terms of responses – some candidates gave vague comments – it is nutritious, others had made no comment regarding nutrition and therefore did not score this mark.

- (e) Most gained 1 mark for 'lasts longer' although fewer were able to achieve the second mark. The most popular correct responses were last longer, require less cooking/preparation time.

Question 18

- (a) Many candidates scored at least one mark with the most popular responses referring to – knowing what they are eating, can compare products, making informed choices, to see if it meets a specified dietary need. Some candidates lost marks as their answer concentrated on allergies, additives and ingredients.
- (b) Most candidates attempted this question and scored marks. The most common responses for Level 1 were related to high intake of sugar and fat and some of their implications to health. However, comments were often vague/superficial and a number of candidates confused their implications to health eg high intake sugar can result in heart disease. The implications of a high intake of salt were also not clearly understood. Those on Level 2 offered more detailed responses and showed a clearer and wider understanding of the effects of too much fat and sugar on health, although in some cases there was still confusion about heart disease in terms of fat and sugar. These candidates showed a little more understanding on the implications resulting from foods containing a high level of salt, though comments were not always technically correct. Those candidates who produced a Level 3 response reflected a greater understanding of the comments made at Level 1 and 2 and also mentioned fibre, and the importance of following healthy eating guidelines (eatwell plate). Overall the low fibre content was the area least mentioned.
- (c) (i) Most candidates scored one mark; it was only the most able who scored three marks. The most popular answers focused on religion, some offered responses connected with family traditions and celebrations.
- (ii) There was a mixed response to this question. Many candidates scored one mark by making reference to the increase in range of the products available. Lower attaining candidates gave repetitive answers concentrating on one issue usually the making different food products for different cultures with no examples of food products. More able candidates offered a wider response with the most popular answers focusing on the range available, providing foods that adhere to religious food requirements, wider range of take away/restaurants. Answers were fully explained as these candidates offered examples of foods/cultures to support their comments.

A523 Making Quality Products

General Comments

Many portfolios were concisely presented and organised in line with the required assessment criteria. However, some candidates are still including work which is not required.

The majority of portfolios were labelled clearly with both the candidates name and number and had the required OCR mark sheet.

Electronic portfolios (entered on the portal)

Some candidates seemed to have spent too much time on the IT element to the detriment of the portfolio.

Moderators do not look at these on a white board therefore the print needs to be in an appropriate size. Care also needs to be taken with the colour of the background – a white font is difficult to read on a red or purple background.

Some centres' marks still required adjustments because the levels of response in the Assessment Objectives had been interpreted too leniently. However, there were fewer large adjustments this year.

Some centres continue to award higher attaining candidates top marks, when in fact the work didn't really show great capability and depth of involvement. Words such as 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical' which appear in the top mark band, were not really adhered to.

Recipes are now being adapted/modified during the Designing section of the portfolio in many centres, but too often the ideas were not explained or creative. Candidates should be encouraged to use their own ideas creatively throughout the whole design and make process.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many centres had done this particularly well but others failed to submit this evidence with the work. There should be photographic evidence of the practical work along with written teacher comments. This is particularly important for the low attaining candidates where there is little written evidence in their portfolio. **A separate cover sheet containing reference to the assessment criteria applied is required by OCR.**

The use of writing frames and pre-printed sheets was less evident this year. It is important that high achieving candidates are given the opportunity to show flair and creativity in approaching the assessment criteria.

It is also important that candidates are given the opportunity to show individuality when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

Assessment Criteria

The level of response is an important part of the mark scheme and should be carefully considered when assessing candidates work. The levels should equate to the quality of the evidence, the capability and depth of involvement that has been employed to produce what is on offer. Within an Assessment Criteria the quality of evidence to fulfil a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfil a similar level of response at a higher level. The capability and depth of involvement must be evident to gain the marks at the higher level.

Many centres are now encouraging candidates to clearly label the chosen Theme/Product at the start of the portfolio.

Designing

- Most candidates had stated a design brief but in some cases this was not clear and concise and did not include a target group.
- The chosen theme and design brief should be analysed carefully so candidates can arrive at an appropriate design specification for a creative and innovative product which includes a target group. The quality of design specifications varied widely. Some candidates produced very detailed design specifications which linked with the chosen theme and design brief, whilst other design specifications were far too brief and in some cases, tended to be teacher led. The design specification should be structured to allow candidates to demonstrate a wide range of practical skills. Questionnaires, research, evaluation of existing products etc which some candidates had clearly spent quite a lot of time completing are not required for Unit A523.
- Fewer candidates opted to include nutritional analysis in their design brief and/or design specifications this year. Of those who did, several centres did not follow this through in detail, in their work. If nutrition forms part of the design brief and/or design specification candidates are required to carry out nutritional analysis during the trialling of their products and refer to the results during evaluation.
- Most candidates produced a forward plan at the start of the Designing Section, but often this was superficial, with products just being referred to as product 1, product 2 etc others had produced the plan retrospectively. A number of candidates continue to produce a forward plan for the whole portfolio. This is not required. The forward plan is only required for the Designing section.
- The use of pro-forma sheets for the planning and evaluating of products limited candidates' creativity and initiative and tended to result in repetitive responses.
- Some candidates continue to choose products that showed little or no skills or only allowed them to show the same skills.
- Most candidates chose four products to trial but too many failed to adapt or modify original recipes to be creative, innovative, fit their design specification and design brief, and to record and explain the proposed changes.
- The changes in many centres still focus on changing shape, adding or removing flavourings – basic changes but not really original.
- Some centres restricted candidates with product choices, by establishing set products to be made. Many of these candidates then failed to make any adaptations/modifications until the product development stage.
- Detailed annotated diagrams, sketches, equipment lists, listing of practical skills, methods, time plans or flowcharts are not required for this section.
- Some candidates had trialled and tested a wide range of interesting solutions. There was good evidence of star diagrams/profiles and rating charts but marks were lost if these results were not always explained or conclusions drawn.
- Detailed evaluations of ideas against the specification remain the weakest area in this section for many candidates. Evaluations were often cursory with only a ticked chart and this cannot be considered a detailed evaluation. Some candidates had evaluated each solution but failed to make any reference to the specification. Other candidates had evaluated the making of the products rather than the product itself. A number of candidates failed to suggest any improvements to the product.
- Choice of the design proposal overall, was well done by a number of candidates. Candidates had clearly explained why the chosen design idea was being taken forward for product development and why other ideas had been rejected.

A high level response to this section would involve:

- **A design brief which is clear and concise and includes a target group.**
- **The chosen theme and design brief being analysed carefully to arrive at an appropriate design specification which includes a target group.**
- **Proposing a wide range of appropriate solutions – listing a range of ideas before choosing four ideas to trial.**
- **Producing a detailed forward plan for the designing section of the portfolio.**
- **For each product to be trialled – listing ingredients, adaptations clearly explained and justified to produce creative and innovative ideas. Nutritional analysis if this forms part of the design brief/specification, evidence of testing by three tasters, detailed evaluation against the specification, using results from testers as evidence, discussion of improvements taking into account users views.**
- **A design proposal at the completion of the designing section clearly explaining why the chosen design ideas is being taken forward to product development and why other ideas have been rejected.**
- **Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.**

Making

- Many candidates had taken one product forward for product development and carried out two modifications before deciding on their final product. However, many candidates did not make reference to the comments made when the product was originally trialled and further modifications were not always justified. In many cases suggestions for further developments did not reflect comments made by testers from the previous modification so the product was not developed according to user(s) views. There was some evidence of evaluation of each development in many candidates' portfolios but too often this failed to include how effective the changes had been. Some candidates planned modifications in advance rather than letting the product develop according to taste/testers views. Lack of creativity was also evident in many portfolios. Once again, if nutrition forms part of the design brief and/or design specification candidates are required to carry out nutritional analysis during product development and refer to the results during evaluation.
- Costing of ingredients was evident in many candidates' portfolios. Costing is only required throughout development work and the final product. In some cases, there was evidence of costing of individual ingredients but candidates failed to calculate the total cost of the product.
- Reasoned decisions, with reference to ingredients and equipment for the final product in many centres, was well done.
- Product Specifications continue to be rather disappointing. Many candidates had simply just copied or added a few points or diagram to their design specification but high marks were still awarded by centres. Product specifications of a high standard were detailed and clearly reflected the results from development.
- Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that many centres are crediting candidates with high marks without evidence of this range of skills. A number of moderators did report that the quality of practical work for this unit of work was significantly higher than Unit A521 and it was a pleasure to moderate some of the excellent quality practical work from some candidates.
- The use of digital cameras allowed candidates to include photographs of their work. Centres are reminded that the minimum requirement is a photograph of the final product.
- Nutritional analysis if this forms part of the design brief/specification should be evident along with a flowchart for the making of the final product.
- To achieve high marks for practical work candidates need to select and use appropriate ingredients and equipment, work safely, hygienically and skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills) and produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes.

A high level response to this section would be:

- Carrying out two modifications before deciding on their final product. Modifications should take place as the product develops and each modification should be clearly explained and evaluated in detail. The first modification should show reference to the comments made when the product was originally trialled. All further modifications should be justified, reflecting comments made by five testers from the previous modification so the product is being developed according to user(s) views.
- Giving reasoned decisions for ingredients, equipment for the final product, applying relevant nutritional knowledge and understanding if this forms part of the design brief/specification.
- Designing a detailed product specification which should arise from the design specification and conclusions reached from development work including a labelled sketch/drawing of the final product.
- Producing a detailed flowchart which clearly shows all process required for the making of the final product.
- Showing thorough understanding and application of the chosen nutritional focus, if this forms part of the design brief/specification.
- Being resourceful and adaptable with materials, foods and equipment.
- Selecting and using appropriate ingredients and equipment.
- Working safely, hygienically, skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills).
- Produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes.

Evaluation

- Evaluations were rather disappointing this year.
- Some candidates provided evidence of testing of the final product but conclusions, were often superficial and unsupported, resulting in the evaluations being descriptive rather than evaluative.
- Many candidates still continue to evaluate the final product against the design specification rather than the product specification.
- Comments when evaluating often lacked specific detail, stating the product had met the specification without any justification.
- Some candidates focussed on how well they had progressed throughout the portfolio rather than evaluating the final product against the product specification and suggesting how the product could be improved, based on results from testing.
- A few centres did not give credit for spelling, punctuation and grammar. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluation for SPAG even if there is no evidence of an evaluation.

A high level of response to this section would be:

- Critically evaluating their product against the product specification using results of testing (five testers) to give meaningful conclusions.
- Suggesting possible improvements.
- Using specialist terms appropriately and correctly, presenting information in a structured format and accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

GOOD PRACTICE WITHIN ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

- 1 Work should be removed from ring binders, presented so that pages can be turned without having to remove sheets from plastic wallets and securely fastened together eg by means of a tag, then clearly labelled with Centre Number, Name and Candidate Number. Mark sheet/annotation sheet should be attached to each piece of work.

- 2 The Controlled Assessment Mark Sheet(s) should be sent to the Moderator with the MS1. Centres need to make sure that this paperwork arrives to the Moderator by the date specified by OCR and portfolios should be sent within 3 days of receipt of the request for the sample.
- 3 Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Criteria.
- 4 Where more than one teacher is involved in the assessing of candidates work, the centre should carry out effective internal standardisation to ensure a reliable rank order.

A524 Technical Aspects of Designing and Making

The examination paper was well attempted by the majority of candidates and a good range of marks obtained. There were very few candidates who did not attempt any questions. The paper was accessible to the majority of candidates. Some candidates did not give sufficient detail in their responses and were therefore disadvantaged. There is still too much use of the terms: cheaper, healthier, colourful, tasty, flavoured, faster, correct and proper without any qualification or justification. The paper differentiated well with high attaining students able to show their breadth and depth of knowledge in some of the extended questions.

The candidates' written English still causes concern and deciphering responses was sometimes difficult on low scoring papers. Some responses were very general without actually stating facts. Candidates need to be encouraged to read the question through carefully before writing their response as some misinterpreted what was required and as a consequence gained no marks. It was however, pleasing to see improved responses on the banded marked questions. Candidates applied their knowledge and understanding when describing the role of the Environmental Health Officer and explaining how best Vitamin C could be retained when preparing and cooking foods.

The design question was much improved on previous entries with many candidates clearly addressing the specification points with both designs and written comments. The responses were particularly strong in identifying the target group, showing colour and originality.

Section A

Question 1(a)

This was generally well answered with only a few 'scatter gun' responses. Most candidates gained 3–4 marks. Popular responses were 'vegetables' in the steamer and 'eggs' in the frying pan.

Question 1(b)

There was a mixed response to this question. The most popular correct responses were 'to store raw meat at the bottom of the fridge', 'use the correct coloured chopping board/red', 'use a clean knife/chopping board every time'. Those who failed to score any marks did attempt the question but could not be awarded marks as their responses were vague, eg use separate equipment.

Question 1(c)

Generally, most candidates gained one mark for this question. The most popular responses were linked to using a mallet, slow long cooking and marinating. Some candidates did not gain marks for stating 'rub in oil', 'steaming' and 'boiling the meat'.

Question 1(d)

This question differentiated well. There was a wide variety of responses with many candidates incorrectly suggesting 'vegetarian' and 'religion'. Common correct answers which were well explained were linked to time available and busy lifestyles using a microwave and influence from TV programmes to try new recipes. Some explanations were vague and therefore did not gain full marks. A number of candidates failed to score any marks because they offered responses that referred to the choice of food rather than the cooking method.

Question 2(a)(i)

This was very well answered by the majority of candidates. Common responses were 'pasta' and 'rice'. A few candidates gave 'cereal' as a response without naming the type.

Question 2(a)(ii)

This question proved to be a very good differentiator. Many candidates knew that complex carbohydrate provided slow release energy and achieved a mark but did not go on to say that it provided energy for a longer period of time, so consequently only scored 1 mark. Some candidates gave excellent answers to this question.

Question 2(b)

Some candidates gave a very comprehensive explanation of the term 'energy balance' and achieved 2 marks for this question. Others offered more vague responses that could only be awarded 1 mark. Correct responses focussed on the amount of energy needed for different people, age, gender and how active they were during the day. This question differentiated very well.

Questions 2(c)(i)

This was quite well answered with many candidates scoring 1 mark. The most popular response was 'prevents dehydration'. The most popular responses for candidates scoring 2 marks included 'provides minerals', 'needed for digestion' and 'helps flush out toxins'. A few candidates stated that 'water provided vitamins' which was incorrect. Other incorrect answers were linked to responses with 'minerals and vitamins' on one line which cannot be accepted as this is a scattergun approach.

Question 2(c)(ii)

This question was well answered. Many scored 2 marks with 'provision of water fountains' and 'drinking water in lessons' being the most popular responses. However, some candidates read the question as; 'State two reasons why children are encouraged to drink water', rather than 'two ways'.

Question 2(d)

Many scored 2 marks. 'Diabetics', 'coeliacs', 'heart disease' and 'obesity' were the most common responses. Those that failed to score a mark had misinterpreted the question or used the term 'heart attacks' and 'allergies', rather than 'heart disease and 'allergic to food'.

Question 3(a)

This question was well answered with the majority of candidates gaining full marks. Where candidates did not gain marks it was because they had repeated answers or did not state a named vegetable/fruit just used the term 'fruit or vegetables'. There were also some candidates that stated 'remove the cheese' without suggesting an alternative.

Question 3(b)

Candidates gave mixed responses to this question depending if they understood the term 'moral'. However, correct responses mainly included 'vegetarian', 'religion', 'animal welfare' and 'dietary trends'. These were usually explained well, enabling candidates to gain full marks.

Question 3(c)

There were some very good responses to this question. Some candidates showed a detailed understanding of the role of the EHO. Those scoring few marks were only able to offer a brief description. Most common responses for Level 1 tended to be focussed on personal hygiene and hygiene of equipment. Those on Level 2 offered more detailed responses and showed a clearer and wider understanding of the correct storage and cooking of food. The higher ability candidates were able to provide a range of descriptions which related to 'inspection of premises', 'staff training', 'HACCP', ensuring food is safe for the consumer including temperature ranges for storing as well as an understanding of the application of the law. It was pleasing to see Level 3 candidates illustrating a detailed understanding, using specialist terms and demonstrating an accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. This question was a very good differentiator.

Question 4(a)(i) and (ii)

Were well answered with candidates using the data correctly.

Question 4(b)

Quite a lot of candidates only achieved 1 mark out of the possible 2. Many candidates incorrectly wrote about healthy bones & teeth and body building. 'Scurvy' and 'healthy skin' were very common correct answers.

Question 4(c)

This was a little disappointing as many candidates offered vague answers that could not be awarded a mark. The most popular sensory analysis test named was star profile. The most popular responses for using a sensory analysis test were to 'modify/adapt the drinks' and 'find the favourite flavour.' Common incorrect answers for the name of a test was 'taste test'.

Many candidates however did achieve 1 mark for the reason. Common correct responses included 'to see how the drink could be improved'.

Question 4(d)

This question differentiated well. Most common responses for Level 1 were related to peeling fruit and vegetables, steaming, using the cooking liquid as gravy. However, comments were often vague or superficial. Those achieving Level 2 offered more detailed responses and showed a clearer understanding of the problems of retaining Vitamin C, whilst candidates achieving Level 3 showed more technical knowledge and were able to explain reasons for the importance of using a minimum amount of water when cooking and using vegetables as fresh as possible. To gain high marks on the banded response question candidates must show a detailed understanding and use specialist terms and demonstrate an accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question 5(a)

This was well answered overall with some very interesting and creative ideas given by a number of candidates. Many gave detailed annotation, scoring 3 or 4 marks. It was apparent that candidates had referred to their four specification points often ticking them off as they completed each one or putting a simple statement against each point. All candidates chose a cake of some sort to design. Designs were often original and linked well to their chosen target group. Candidates gave a description of how their cake would be tasty stating, for example, 'vanilla butter cream, with lemon slices' or focussing on aspects of chocolate, white, dark and milk. Icing and decorations were often the specification point for 'be colourful'. These components were named, for example, 'blue icing', 'gold stars' and 'red lettering'. A limited number of candidates did not gain marks as they just stated 'colourful', 'tasty' or 'named target group'. Also, candidates who did not draw a design found it difficult to gain the creative new design mark.

Question 5(b)(i)

It was pleasing to see that many candidates understood the advantages for job/craft production. 'Unique' and 'high quality' were the most popular responses. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and related their answers to the advantages for the manufacturer.

Question 5(b)(ii)

There was a mixed response to this question. The most common correct answers related to 'skilled staff' and 'can take a long time to make'. However, candidates often lost marks for failing to be specific enough in their answers, for example, stating 'expensive' without justifying their answer. Common incorrect answers included reference to other types of production methods, for example, batch production or did not link their response to the manufacturer.

Question 5(c)

Quite well answered generally. Responses relating to 'weight of finished cake', 'weight of ingredients', 'temperature control', 'visual checks on appearance', 'sampling for flavour', 'size and shape' were the most popular responses. Some candidates did not achieve marks where repeated answers were given. A number of candidates did not state the control check but made a simple statement, namely 'make sure temperature is correct', 'check product can be eaten' and 'should be high quality', the latter being in the question.

Some candidates related their responses to personal hygiene, maintenance of equipment, reference to working conditions and packaging and so failed to gain marks.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

