

Design and Technology: Food Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J302**

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

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

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	4
A522 Sustainable design	10
A523 Making quality products	14
A524 Technical aspects of design 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 is the fourth year of the Innovator Suite.

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.

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

Written Examinations – 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 January 2013 series. There are variations within the subject specialisms and Centres would benefit from reading the individual subject reports for this unit.

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. There was also a significant improvement in the extended response style question* this series, with candidates giving detailed answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response.

In **Section A** of the papers most candidates across the suite attempted to answer all questions, with few candidates giving no response (NR), although these do still occur. Candidates should be encouraged to attempt these types of questions if unsure, rather than giving no response at all.

Candidates generally demonstrated an improved understanding of sustainable design, but were often still hampered by their exam technique. Misunderstanding or misinterpreting the question, or not reading the question carefully enough was evident throughout the suite of papers. Candidates must be encouraged to take notice of the key word in the stem of the question to identify whether the question requires them to explain, describe, discuss, state, name or give.

There was less duplication of answers seen during this examination session, although one area of concern is that of the 'scattergun' approach to answering questions. Candidates need to be aware that where one answer is asked for and multiple answers are given by the candidate, candidates will lose the mark for the correct answer if an incorrect answer is also given. Some candidates approached these questions by supplying multiple answers, writing everything they can think of about the subject. Examiners cannot credit the one correct response out of several provided in a question which explicitly asks for '**one** reason' or '**one** example' because the candidate has not adhered to what has been asked for. It would be unfair on other candidates

who had several possible answers in mind but addressed the question and selected their one final answer to provide rather than 'hedging their bets'.

Section B of the papers showed a greater range of responses in terms of quality and teachers need to ensure they read the subject specific reports for further detailed feedback on specific issues and individual question performance.

Candidates need to be careful that they do not repeat the question in their answer or repeat the same point within their answers.

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. Many candidates did manage to use subject specific terms in their answers, but at times lacked sufficient depth and tended to be repetitive which compromised marks.

Hand writing at times was difficult to decipher and candidates need to do everything possible to ensure that their writing is legible. Centres are reminded that candidates are marked on spelling, punctuation and grammar on this question.

It was noticeable that where extra paper was required to continue a question response, many candidates did not reference the question number on the extra sheets used. It is important that Centres instruct candidates how to highlight where they are continuing an answer on a different page in the examination script to ensure that examiners are clear where an answer continues on a separate page in order that the candidate's full response is considered.

Centres need to be aware that questions may appear on the back page of the examination document and candidates should be encouraged to check carefully that they have completed ALL questions.

Unit 4

For this examination series of the Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms. The overall performance of candidates was varied across the suite once again this series.

Some key areas which Principal Examiners have highlighted as giving scope for improvement are as follows:

- Candidates should attempt every question.
- It is important that candidates read the questions carefully to determine exactly what is required before attempting an answer. It can be helpful for candidates to highlight what they consider to be the 'key' words or instructions.
- In those questions that require candidates to produce sketches and notes, it is essential that answers are made as clear, detailed and technically accurate as possible.
- There were many instances where examiners were unable to decipher illegible handwriting and poor quality sketches.

Controlled Assessment – Units 1 and 3

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 portfolios to the moderator within three days of receiving the sample request.**

Centres are reminded to forward form CCS160 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.

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 as different files.

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 must ensure that candidates clearly label each file using the marking criteria section headings; this facilitates a more effective completion of the moderation process.

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.** (e.g. 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.*

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.** Marks were compromised here this examination series.

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

The majority of portfolios were labelled clearly with both the candidate's name and number and had the required OCR mark sheet. Paper clipping of work can result in portfolios falling apart during movement to the moderator. This resulted in moderators having to sort out the work before commencing the moderation process. Putting work in hard backed folders is not recommended. It is also suggested that candidates use an appropriate font size in their portfolios. Some candidates chose to present their work in a font under 10pt, which made it extremely difficult for the moderator to read. Candidates should try and present their work in at least 10 or 11pt.

Generally work was marked more realistically than in previous series. Consequently there was less need to recommend reductions in marks. However, it was noted by moderators that a number of centres are still marking too leniently, though recommendations for very large adjustments have greatly reduced.

In some cases where centres had awarded higher performing candidates within their cohort top marks, the work did not really show the quality or depth required. Words such as 'appropriate', 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical' which appear in the top mark band, were not really evident in the work provided.

Recipes are being adapted/modified during the Designing section of the portfolio but there is still evidence of ideas not being explained and in particular not being 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 a few still do not submit this evidence with the work. Photographic evidence is now present in the majority of portfolios but this is not always supported with written teacher comments. This is particularly important for the lower marked candidates where there is limited 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 still remains a real cause for concern in a number of centres. It is important that high achieving candidates are given the opportunity to show flair and creativity in approaching the assessment criteria.

Resources are available on the new OCR Professional Development website to help support teachers in the delivery of the controlled assessment. This can be found at www.ocronlinetraining.org.uk

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 Criterion the quality of evidence to fulfill a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfill 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.

The vast majority of centres are now encouraging candidates to clearly label the chosen Theme/Product and the starting point at the beginning 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 done well though some centres are still too generous when awarding marks.

- Candidates had provided evidence of 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 still needs to be presented a little more concisely and linked more closely to the chosen theme in some portfolios.
- Many centres are still too generous when marking this section because of the lack of independent analysis presented in candidate work. Some moderators reported seeing work that had clearly been copied and pasted from the internet, or leaflets included from supermarkets which were not then analysed by the candidates or referenced.
- Acknowledging sources of information was generally better this year, however.

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 are the main method used to identify the needs of the user/target group/a nutritional focus. Too many questionnaires ask lots of irrelevant questions which are of little use to the task in hand. Often the 'starting point' is given at the beginning of the controlled assessment, and then the questionnaire is simply a process candidates undergo, and questions do not relate to the stated starting point. For example, Indian food is stated at the beginning of the portfolio, and the questionnaire then asks lots of questions about other foreign foods. In some portfolios the Design Brief does not arise from research findings. Some 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/Design Specification should include one nutritional focus so candidates can show greater understanding and application of nutritional knowledge. Where candidates had focused on a number of nutritional aspects, the application of nutritional analysis and knowledge was very superficial. Candidates are required to justify their choice of target group and/or nutritional focus. A few candidates still continue to establish a design brief before carrying out any research. In some portfolios the chosen target group was very general – 'all', 'everyone'.
- Questionnaires that lacked focus did not allow candidates to identify the qualities respondents require from a new product which 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 the research. A number of centres continue to credit candidates with high marks when analysis of the questionnaire results is very superficial.

Evaluation of existing products remains the weakest area. Some candidates do not use their identified needs, whilst others use pro formas with the same identified needs throughout the centre. Most candidates had evaluated four products in the form of a table and provided evidence of some conclusions. However, too often the conclusions were very superficial and showed limited understanding. Evaluation of one product in detail is now evident in candidates' portfolios, although several moderators commented that this aspect of the work was missing in a number of centres portfolios this year. Some candidates continue to describe the product rather than evaluate it, often using information from the packaging.

- Identifying and recording data is evident in some portfolios, but in others this is omitted but candidates are being awarded full marks for creativity. Candidates need to make sure that the data given is relevant to the design brief/design specification.

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 one nutritional focus;**

Example of a concise and precise design brief: - Design and make a lower 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.

Designing

- In some portfolios, Design Specifications are not linked to prior research. A number of candidates still list several nutritional needs and often do not then discuss them at all in the follow-on work.
- 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. 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. Choosing appropriate products according to the design brief/specification/nutritional focus is also an issue in some candidates' work (e.g. pineapple upside pudding for eating on the go; all desserts for low salt product).
- Most candidates chose four products to trial and showed adaptations/modifications to the original recipes. However, adaptations/modifications, although recorded, were not always explained and, in many cases, lacked creativity. Often adaptations are very simple and too many candidates are still focusing on changing ingredients just in terms of the nutritional focus rather than applying other ways of adapting products.
- Most candidates had listed the practical skills required for the making of each product.
- 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 not gained 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 continue 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 not made any reference to the specification. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating, tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. A few candidates continue to evaluate the making of the products rather than the product itself. However, the majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Candidates carry out nutritional analysis using an appropriate computer program but a significant number still do not refer to the data with regard to their nutritional focus, or state this is an area that needs to be improved upon rather than being an intrinsic part of the controlled assessment. Some candidates changed their nutritional focus halfway through the portfolio, whilst others lost sight of the nutritional/health aspect as they progressed through the work. Some high attaining candidates are even adapting recipes to show off their practical skills, rather than their knowledge of nutrition or health.
- Reasoned decisions on ingredients and equipment for the final product (prototype) were done well in some centres but some candidates did not 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 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 that 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 but was not always applied.
- To achieve high marks for practical work, candidates need to select and use appropriate ingredients and equipment, work safely, hygienically, 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 focused on how well they had progressed throughout the portfolio rather 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 Evaluations 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 (5 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 e.g. 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 three 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 and consistency of standard and approach between centre assessors.

A522 Sustainable design

The overall performance and range of results was similar to January 2013. It was pleasing to see that there were fewer 'no response' answers in this series. 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. Candidates generally performed better on the short questions in section A than in the longer questions of section B, which required detailed answers. 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 questions 16(b) and 17(d).

In section B, candidates continue to limit their own access to marks through poor examination technique. 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. This meant they did not score all the available marks. This was particularly noticeable in questions 17(b) and 17(d). There was some evidence of candidates not reading the questions carefully, eg, in question 16(b), where candidates were asked to relate their answer to a sustainable chicken pie, many candidates wrote generally about what a manufacturer should consider. It was pleasing, however, to see that some candidates had clearly planned how to answer the banded response questions and many candidates scored well on this question. A number of candidates wasted time and space re-writing the question before they began their answer.

Many candidates were also let down by their poor standard of English and used vague terms which did not convey sufficient understanding to warrant marks. Vague terms used in answers included: healthy, healthier, heart attack, heart problems, helps the environment, pollution, climate change, harmful gases, environmentally friendly, cheaper.

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates gave a correct response.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered. Most candidates who got this question wrong had given 63°C as their response which is the top of the danger zone not the temperature the food should be reheated above.

Question 3

Most candidates answered this correctly.

Question 4

Most candidates answered this correctly.

Question 5

Most candidates answered this correctly.

Question 6

'Eco footprint' was the most common incorrect response.

Question 7

This question was targeted at higher attaining candidates and there were few correct answers. There were many no responses from lower attaining candidates.

Question 8

Many candidates answered the question correctly. Those who did not score a mark gave a range of responses – red, brown, white.

Question 9

This question was targeted at higher attaining candidates and there were few correct answers. There were many no responses from lower attaining candidates. Candidates who scored marks gave clear concise responses.

Question 10

Most candidates answered this correctly with the majority of answers linked to obesity and heart disease. Very few candidates are now answering 'heart attacks'.

Questions 11-15

These questions were generally well answered.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks.
- (b) Many candidates did not score any marks as they had not read the question carefully. They had interpreted the question from a nutritional point of view and related their answers to choosing low fat / sugar / salt and high fibre ingredients. Most popular correct responses related to the cost of ingredients, locally grown produce and supporting local farmers and reducing carbon footprint. Candidates who had scored full marks tended to have underlined the key words in the question and therefore focused on the sustainable aspect of the question.
- (c) There was a mixed response to this question. Candidates who had achieved full marks had offered recycling; strong; lightweight; reusable and responses re-cooking more quickly. Many candidates gave the same answer twice in reference to conducting heat and worded it in two different ways.

- (d)(i)** Cardboard was the most popular correct response. It was pleasing to see that some candidates had learnt about potato starch packaging.
- (d)(ii)** Many candidates scored two or three marks on this question and related their answer to the impact on the environment. The most popular correct answers related to recycling, biodegradable and from sustainable sources when referring to cardboard.
- (e)** Many scored the full two marks. Those candidates who did not score full marks usually gave incorrect responses for freezing.

Question 17

- (a)** Most candidates scored at least one mark. The most popular responses focused on – reducing carbon footprint; renewable energy; sustainable choice; comments related to cost and appeal to customers.
- (b)** Some candidates gave good responses showing a good understanding of why supermarkets had introduced a bag for life scheme. Stronger; reusable so they last longer and less bags required were the most popular correct responses. Higher attaining candidates included answers related to landfill so reducing waste and saving non-renewable resources. Most candidates gained one or two marks, higher scoring candidates were able to give explanations for what they said and accessed the higher marks, and some candidates did not gain further marks for using the same explanation twice. Candidates need to be made aware that their explanations of the two points need to be different.
- (c)** A wide variety of responses were seen to this question. However some candidates did not gain marks because their responses were too vague. Most popular correct responses focused on cost, supporting local farmers, fairtrade issues, flavour, and freshness/quality.
- (d)** Many candidates scored marks for two ways of reducing energy consumption but some did not gain marks for the explanation as they just repeated the question saying they saved energy; higher attaining candidates were able to expand their answers and gave clear explanations showing good subject knowledge. Most common responses related to the use of steamers, microwaves, cooking several dishes in the oven at once.

Question 18

- (a)** Fairtrade had clearly been taught in the majority of centres. It was also clear that candidates have practised answering these longer answer questions and are now writing extended answers. However some candidates did not gain marks because they just focused on one or two points so their answer lacked breadth of knowledge. Most common response for level one was related to pay and working conditions. Those on level 2 went on further to mention improving lives and tackling poverty. Level 3 responses reflected a greater understanding of the comments made at level 1 and 2 and also discussed the implications within the community for example education and empowerment to women. Responses at this level did show fluency in writing.
- (b)** Most candidates scored at least two marks. Candidates were aware of the range of Fairtrade products available and could suggest ideas for the attractiveness of the product. A number offered suggestions as to why their product would be suitable for families. Comments relating to storage at room temperature were the weakest area. Many candidates stated that the product would be suitable to be stored at room temperature but did not qualify this statement.
- (c)** The most common answer related to the mobius loop and were able to draw this; however it was disappointing that candidates could not name the symbol correctly.
- (d)** Many candidates knew two pieces of information required by law. The most popular responses were ingredients; allergies; manufacturers name and address; product name and date marking. It was pleasing to see fewer candidates referring to nutritional

information as required by law. Most of those who did linked it to the nutritional claim and therefore scored the mark.

- (e)** A range of correct responses were seen. Answers relating to nutrition were the most popular.

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. Paper clipping of work can result in portfolios falling apart during movement to the moderator. This resulted in moderators having to sort out the work before commencing the moderation process. Putting work in hard backed folders is not recommended. As with A521, some candidates chose to present their work in a font under 10pt, which made it extremely difficult for the moderator to read. Candidates should try and present their work in at least 10 or 11pt.

Marking of this controlled assessment was more realistic and appeared to be of a more consistent standard, resulting in very few large adjustments this series.

Where centres had marked leniently, the portfolios frequently did not show the capability and depth of involvement required for the high marks awarded. Words such as 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical' which appear in the top mark band were not really adhered to and portfolio evidence did not suggest that they had been met.

Recipes are now being adapted/modified during the Designing section of the portfolio, but ideas are not always explained or creative. Candidates should be encouraged to use their own ideas creatively throughout the whole 'design and make' process. However, moderators did see some stunning, creative and innovative work from a number of candidates.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many centres had done this particularly well but some are still not submitting 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 lower marked candidates where there is limited 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 is a cause for concern in some centres. It is important that high achieving candidates are given the opportunity to show flair and creativity in approaching the assessment criteria.

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 Criterion the quality of evidence to fulfill a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfill 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 beginning of the portfolio.

Designing

- Most candidates had stated a design brief which included a target group. Design briefs are now usually concise.
- 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, seemed to be teacher led. The design specification should be structured to allow candidates to demonstrate a wide range of practical skills. A number of centres are still encouraging candidates to carry out questionnaires, research, evaluation of existing products, etc. This is not a requirement for unit A523.
- A forward plan at the start of the Designing section is now evident in the majority of portfolios and this is an area that has improved from previous years. However a number of candidates are still producing a superficial forward plan, with products just being referred to as product 1, product 2, etc. A few candidates 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.
- There was less evidence of the use of pro forma sheets for the planning and evaluating of products this year.
- Some candidates continue to choose products that showed little or no skills or only allowed them to show the same skills.
- Most candidates chose 4 products to trial but some did not 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 continue to restrict candidates with product choices, by establishing set products to be made.
- 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 did not make any reference to the specification. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. A few candidates continue to evaluate the making of the products rather than the product itself. However, the majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Choice of the design proposal overall, was done well by many 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 idea 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

- Product development was the weakest area in this section. 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. A few candidates planned modifications in advance rather than letting the product develop according to taste/testers' views. Some candidates had used their second development as their final product. Lack of creativity was also evident in some portfolios.
- Costing of ingredients was evident in many candidates' portfolios. Costing is only required throughout development work and the final product. In a few cases, there was evidence of costing of individual ingredients but candidates did not calculate the total cost of the product.
- Reasoned decisions, re. ingredients and equipment for the final product in many centres, was done well.
- Product Specifications were disappointing on the whole. Many candidates had simply copied or added a few points or diagrams 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, but these were in the minority.
- The flowchart/plan of action for the final product was generally done well but some centres are awarding high marks when plans are not always detailed.
- Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that a few centres are crediting 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 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, 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 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, often resulting in the work being a repetition of the evaluation when the product was originally trialled.
- 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. In some portfolios suggested improvements did not always reflect the findings from tasters or from the conclusions reached when evaluating against the specification.
- A few centres did not give credit for spelling, punctuation and grammar. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluations 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 e.g. 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 three 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 and consistency of standard and approach between centre assessors.

A524 Technical aspects of design and making

The paper was appropriate; candidates who had clearly learnt and understood the work overall performed well. The paper differentiated well with higher attaining candidates able to show their depth and breadth of knowledge in some of the extended questions but some candidates appeared to find it difficult. There were a significant number of 'No Responses', particularly on shorter questions where candidates did not even attempt to respond.

Candidates did not always read the wording of questions with sufficient care and interpreted them in ways that restricted the marks which they could access. Some candidates did not give sufficient detail in their responses. There is still too much use of the terms: easier, cheaper, healthier, colourful, tasty and faster without any qualification or justification. It was disappointing to see a lack of knowledge of the parts, functions and nutritional content of eggs.

The candidates' written English still causes concern and deciphering responses was sometimes very difficult on low scoring papers. Some responses were too 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 in consequence gained no marks. It was, however, pleasing to see improved responses on the banded response questions, particularly on the question 'Why we are being encouraged to reduce the fat content of our diet?' However, the other question on the use of prepared vegetables was not answered well, therefore very few candidates gained high marks.

The design question was disappointing with many candidates unable to clearly address the specification points. One factor was the lack of knowledge of staple foods and those foods that provided vitamin C.

Section A

Question 1

- (a)(i)** This was generally well answered, with butter, olive oil and sunflower oil being the most frequent response. Some did not name the fat or oil and just answered 'fat' or 'oil' and so failed to gain marks. A common incorrect answer was lard as they had mistaken shortbread for short crust pastry.
- (a)(ii)** Some candidates wrote polyunsaturated margarine instead of low fat spread, however on the whole it was well answered.
- (a)(iii)** Grilling and steaming were popular answers. A few wrote about using less fat in dishes rather than giving methods of cooking.
- (b)** Most candidates knew that a high fat consumption leads to obesity, coronary heart disease, heart attacks, stroke, high cholesterol, but very few explained in any detail. Candidates know you have to cut down on fat and eat more vegetables and fruit but very few mentioned the different types of fats, low self-esteem, high blood pressure, lack of exercise and the implications of the increased number of obese people having to use the NHS. This question differentiated well with higher level candidates making good use of technical terms.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates gained two marks for being able to identify the yolk and white. Very few knew chalaza.
- (b) The functions of egg in food products had been taught well with candidates easily gaining marks for stating the correct terms for coagulation, emulsion, aeration and coating but many gained only one mark for describing how egg holds the breadcrumbs onto fish fingers.
- (c) Calcium was the most frequently given correct answer and when given, candidates knew its function. Iron and fat were also popular answers, but a large number of 'No Responses' were seen and many included protein, which was in the question, and carbohydrate or fibre in their answer or just stated 'vitamins' and so did not gain marks.

Question 3

- (a) This was well answered with sugar being the most common answer.
- (b) (i) and (ii) These were generally well answered, but a few repeated the original ingredients and so did not gain marks.
- (c) It was good to see candidates using terms such as 'drizzling', 'coated', 'piped' and 'glazed'. Those who did not gain marks did not specify how it should be decorated or what fruit to add to the top.
- (d) This was quite well answered. Most popular responses were 'identifying areas for improvement'; 'to meet consumer preferences'. Those not achieving a mark offered vague responses – e.g. 'see what product is like'; 'see if product is up to standard'.
- (e) Many candidates gained at least one mark by stating 'accurate' or 'can be easily changed' but some candidates misread the question and wrote about manufacturing.
- (f) This was generally poorly done; candidates can recount what they do in the classroom but not what is done in industry. Very few candidates scored marks, mainly due to their incorrect interpretation of the question. Many discussed how they carried out sensory analysis testing and why the processes were done, eg, to find out whether people liked the taste of a product rather than how sensory analysis testing should be set up. Many responses were very superficial. A few candidates achieved one mark for making reference to having a tasting chart ready. The few candidates who did score well gave very detailed answers which showed good understanding of the process. There were a significant number of 'No Responses' to this question.

Question 4

- (a) It continues to be disappointing to see how many candidates do not show how their design met the specification. Many candidates thought chicken, lettuce, chocolate, bacon, were staple foods, also many thought cheese and some meat contained vitamin C. Those candidates who described colours and stated textures such as 'crunchy', 'crisp', 'soft' gained marks for texture and colour.
- (b) Those who received high marks were specific and gave appropriate examples. Many seemed to concentrate on a few points rather than showing breadth of knowledge which tended to result in repetitive comments. Most common responses for Level 1 were related to busy lifestyles/reduced preparation time, no skill required. Those on Level 2 went on to discuss cost, shelf life, availability of mixed vegetable packs, whilst candidates achieving

Level 3 discussed issues connected to increased packaging, high carbon footprint, added ingredients. This question differentiated well.

Question 5

- (a)(i) and (ii)** The most popular response was ‘shortcrust’, ‘rubbing in’. When puff pastry was offered as the pastry, many had stated ‘kneading’ as the method of making instead of ‘rolling and folding’.
- (b)** This was well answered overall. Those who failed to score any marks had misread the question and offered responses connected to the making of the pastry or pie rather than the preparation of the apples. Some gave vague responses, eg, ‘cooking the apples’.
- (c)** This was fairly well answered with a lot of candidates comparing with fresh or each other. ‘Shelf life’, ‘flavour’ and ‘texture’ were frequently referred to. Marks were lost when points were repeated. Few gained four marks.
- (d)(i)** A number of candidates wrote about quality control checks that the manufacturer would make. Others wrote about apples, not apple pies.
- (d)(ii)** This was fairly well answered. ‘Safe to eat’, ‘suitable to be sold’ and ‘customer satisfaction’ were popular answers.

Most candidates had used their time well. There was clearly sufficient time for candidates to complete this paper in the detail required to score high 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 2013

