

CDT: DESIGN AND COMMUNICATION

<p>Paper 7048/01 Paper 1 - Structured</p>

General comments

Centres are to be congratulated on the overall standard of the responses. Candidates appeared to find the questions accessible and used a range of appropriate drawing techniques in their answers. It was evident that almost all candidates had access to suitable drawing equipment.

Candidates were asked to answer **Question 1** or **2** and two other questions from **3, 4, 5** and **6**. **Question 1** and **2** proved to be equally popular across the cohort although in individual Centres there was often a strong preference towards one question. **Question 5** proved to be the most popular question. Approximately equal numbers of candidates attempted **Questions 3, 4** and **6**. The outcomes suggest that the candidates found the questions reasonably comparable in terms of degree of difficulty.

The total marks ranged from 0 through to 90 plus (with a mean of around 55 and a standard deviation of 18). Whilst there was a good range of marks from the majority of Centres it was noted that some Centres produced work that was skewed towards the top or bottom end of the mark range.

In a small number of Centres a significant number of candidates attempted all six questions and, in some cases, attached unnecessary additional sheets of paper to the printed question papers. Both of these are to be discouraged.

There was no evidence to suggest that candidates had insufficient time to answer the questions.

A small number of candidates failed to fully understand the requirements of the questions and produced inappropriate responses. In some cases the candidates failed to take note of key words, such as sketches and notes.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Part **(a)** was generally answered to a good standard with many candidates completing the side view to the overlay and scoring maximum marks. The plan view was completed less successfully and in some cases not attempted at all. The reasons for this were unclear. A common error on the plan view was to miss out the small gaps between the wheels and the body.

Part **(b)** was generally answered to a satisfactory standard although candidates often failed to model their answers on the style of the example given in step 2. The use of only text to indicate time was a common error.

Part **(c)** was answered to a good standard although a small number of candidates failed to add notes to their sketches.

Part **(d)** was answered to a good standard with the quality of drawing and colouring ranging from satisfactory to excellent. A small number of candidates produced a two dimensional sketch.

Overall this question produced a good range of answers with the majority of candidates achieving at least 20 marks. A large number of excellent answers were seen.

Question 2

Part **(a)** was answered to a good standard with almost all candidates producing alternative designs for the ensuite and bedroom. Many candidates achieved 12 marks in this section.

Part **(b)** was answered reasonably well although many candidates failed to use the 1:50 scale. The use of space in some layouts was inappropriate, with furniture preventing doors opening.

Part **(c)** was answered particularly poorly and very few candidates managed to achieve more than a few marks. There was some evidence to suggest that knowledge of planometric was limited. Many candidates failed to attempt this part of the question or produced a two dimensional plan view.

Part **(d)** was rarely attempted. In some cases the selection of colours did not reflect the theme of 'peace and harmony'.

The majority of candidates scored around 18 marks although most of these were achieved in parts **(a)** and **(b)**. Only a small number of excellent answers were seen.

Question 3

Part **(a)** was answered to a good standard, with many candidates completing the outline shape to the overlay.

In part **(b)** the four missing trees were usually added successfully and appropriate modifications made to make the circles look like trees.

In part **(c)** the design sketches were generally poor and failed to address the issue of the position of the features within the play area. Annotation was generally disappointing.

In part **(d)** many candidates failed to accurately add the sand pit, benches and path to the drawing. Candidates found the size and position of the path the most difficult.

In part **(e)** candidates coloured the features but often failed to add appropriate labels even though the question quite clearly stated 'Add appropriate colour and labels...'

Question 4

In part **(a)** most candidates attempted the three layers although a small number failed to complete the shapes to the overlay with the size or position incorrect. There are still a small number of candidates who are uncertain about the difference between a hexagon and an octagon.

In part **(b)** the sectional view proved to be a challenging question. Many candidates completed the outside shape of the layer but few managed to complete the sectional view of the internal shapes. The sectioning was generally completed to a good standard.

In part **(c)** the exploded view was generally completed to a good standard although a small number of candidates failed to produce an exploded pictorial sketch and produced either an assembled or two-dimensional drawing. The quality of the exploded pictorial sketches varied from excellent to satisfactory.

Question 5

This question proved to be the most popular on the paper.

In part **(a)** the bar chart was completed accurately and many candidates scored 7 or 8 marks. A small number of candidates failed to add the sales figures to their chart.

In part **(b)** the pie chart was completed to a good standard with many candidates scoring 6 or 7 marks. A small number of candidates produced a pie chart for the quarterly sales rather than total sales for the year.

In part **(c)** the view of the glasshouse was completed to a poor standard, with many candidates drawing a single span rather than the 2 spans.

In part **(d)** ideas for the logo often contained the three letters but did not include annotation. Very few candidates applied their logo to the drawing of the glasshouse.

Question 6

In part **(a)** the development (net) of the box was generally completed to a good standard although candidates often failed to add the glue tabs and fold-in flaps or to use the correct convention for fold lines. The window was often drawn on the correct surface but to an inappropriate size.

In part **(b)** both of the inserts proved to be questions that achieved a good degree of differentiation. In many cases candidates completed the outer shape of the insert but failed to include the cut out circle or slots.

Many excellent answers were seen in part **(c)**. Candidates used sketches and notes to show a range of methods of hanging the box on the rack. A small number of candidates attempted to show modifications to the rack rather than the packaging.

CDT: DESIGN AND COMMUNICATION

Paper 7048/02
Coursework

General comments

The majority of projects were well presented and candidates had concentrated their efforts on the design content of their folders. Unfortunately, some candidates had spent a lot of time on the Research and Analysis section at the expense of some others. As a general guide mark allocation should be an indication of the amount of time to be given to each aspect of the assessment scheme.

Comments on specific assessment headings

Problem Identification

Most candidates were able to identify a meaningful design problem linked to the chosen theme and many were awarded high marks for this introduction to their project. It should be possible for the reader of a folder to be under no doubt as to the intention of the brief at the earliest opportunity.

Research and Analysis

This section should indicate that the candidate is thinking through the possible requirements of the project outcome and identifying those issues that need to be considered at various stages as the projects progresses. Information that is relevant to this should then be collected and collated in some orderly way.

Most candidates were able to do this and many looked at existing products to help develop their ideas. However, there was a tendency for some candidates to reproduce pages of information, often from textbooks, that was totally irrelevant at this stage of the project folder. For example, information on materials and constructions should be considered only when a design idea has been chosen and is being developed at a later stage.

Specification for a Possible Solution

In many ways the Specification should be considered as a summary of research and analysis, setting out the design requirements for the product. This is one section where candidates often fail to gain high marks because they do not see this as following on from the previous section. Specification points are often too vague or general in nature and could be applied to a whole range of product types. Failure to complete this section successfully also undermines the quality of subsequent product evaluation as there are no meaningful reference points from which to work.

Proposals for a Solution

Some candidates should be congratulated on the imagination shown and the quality of communication skills used to present possible design ideas. Many ideas were genuinely innovative in nature and indicated that candidates had developed the ability to look beyond a narrow range of obvious solutions.

Unfortunately many initial ideas failed to progress beyond this point but it is hoped that candidates with such vision will develop the confidence to follow these through as they develop expertise in the subject.

Although candidates tend to present a range of complete design ideas, it is hoped that they will develop the ability to select aspects from more than one when presenting and developing the chosen solution.

Realisation

Photographic evidence only of design solutions was seen by CIE's Moderator so it is difficult to comment in detail about made products. However, work appeared to cover the intended range of appropriate materials and many artefacts were finished to a very high standard.

Evaluation

This, alongside Specification, is the other section where many candidates do not do themselves justice. There was evidence that candidates had carried out user tests and questionnaires to this end were presented. However, these were often ticked boxes which, in themselves, cannot be an end to the evaluation but must lead to qualitative judgement and comment.

Candidates need to be reminded that evaluation is of the **product**, with reference to the Specification, and not of the design folio or progress of the project generally.

A successful evaluation, by its very nature, will then lead to suggestions for further development and improvement.