

Food Studies

Entry Level Certificate **R357**

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

Entry Level Certificate

Food Studies (R357)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
R357 Entry Level Food Studies	1

R357 Entry Level Food Studies

General Comments

Once again there was an increase in entries to this qualification. Whilst the specification suggests the tasks are co-teachable with both GCSE Home Economics (J431) and Design and Technology Food (J304), it is important to ensure that these students are assessed against the R357 Entry Level criteria. Centres should be aware that this specification is separate to R364 Design Technology, none of the mark sheets or assessment criteria are common/shared.

Many centres used the front cover sheet and also annotated the sample sent for moderation with comments throughout the coursework folder, which greatly supported the moderation process. On occasions when neither annotation nor photographic evidence was provided moderators found it difficult to agree the marks awarded by the centre, particularly for Making and Outcome sections. The use of digital photographs is to be encouraged, although Centres should try to ensure candidate confidentiality is maintained. Photographs on their own without any annotation or comment do not provide sufficient evidence.

A number of teacher witness statements contained generic comments, such as 'excellent result' with no supporting comments to explain the reasoning for the judgement. A good example of supporting comments is shown below:

"Candidate worked independently. He rolled pastry well, neat shapes and excellent slicing of apple. Unit a little untidy at times but he tidied up."

Best practice was seen when coursework was well organised, with name, candidate number and work divided into assessment objectives. .

A significant number of candidates studying Entry Level were supported in order to access the course requirements and demonstrated positive achievement. In most portfolios support given was acknowledged in teacher comments and reflected in the marks awarded in line with criteria on the unit recording sheets.

Where frames/pro-formas are used, care must be taken that questions are open ended and encourage more than one word answers, to allow candidates to access the higher mark range.

The use of ICT should continue to be encouraged. Excellent examples were seen where ICT provided structure and support for candidates who found communication and recording difficult.

Work was presented on both A4 and A3, both are acceptable.

Short Task

Although all short tasks are centre set, many candidates used the titles available in appendix C of the specification.

Planning

Although to achieve full marks in this section candidates are required to give a full list of ingredients with the accurate quantities they will be using, as well as a plan of action which could be in any format, ie list of instructions or flowchart, many centres had awarded full marks despite the fact there were no quantities of ingredients. Plans of making varied considerably. These included pupils sorting instructions and putting them in the correct order and detailed flowcharts, both formats are acceptable.

Making

Best practice was seen where centres had produced annotation of practical work or used the practical record sheets available on OCR website. These supported moderators in justifying the marks that had been awarded. High marks can only be awarded if a candidate has shown a range of skills and produced an outcome that is suitable to their task/theme.

Some candidates had made more than one product for each short task, however the specification only requires candidates to make one product for each. Candidates are required to produce photographic evidence of their outcome/product.

Outcomes

Centres tended to over mark this section as photographs did not support the mark that had been awarded. To achieve full marks the product/outcome has to be high quality and well presented. The range of skills used to produce the outcome is irrelevant in this section.

Evaluation

Most candidates made a comment about what they had made, although stating 'it is nice' is too vague. To achieve full marks candidates are expected to suggest an improvement to the outcome if it were to be made again.

There was some good use of writing frames and pro-formas. Most candidates wrote on these frames and although literacy skills and written presentation were limited and basic, positive achievements were gained in all areas and enabled candidates to access and attempt all of the assessment criteria.

Food Design Task

All food design tasks must be based on an OCR set themed task from appendix C of the specification. Candidates are required to produce one food design task.

Group work was often undertaken; this is acceptable but centres must ensure they identify this on the work and it is reflected in the marking.

Research

Candidates that selected relevant research to the task achieved higher marks in this section; it is not good practice to just include pages of information that has been downloaded from the internet and these are not creditable. Simple research that is related to the task is far more useful to candidates in producing ideas and writing their specification.

Most candidates had carried out some evaluation of existing products, this was well done. It is helpful if the existing product is related to the theme otherwise it can distract candidates from the task they have been set.

Many centres then still went on to produce a specification for the existing product that had been evaluated (as in old Entry Level 3960). For this qualification the specification should be for the products to be made.

The writing of specifications was the weakest part of this section; we were looking for candidates to show an awareness of basic characteristics of the foods they could make such as sweet or savoury, cake or pastry. Full marks could not be achieved unless candidates had a specification listing at least four characteristics their product should meet.

Designing and Selecting

Candidates were required to suggest a range of food products; the specification indicates four or more products would be a range. Reasons for choice of the two trialled products were not necessary.

For full marks candidates must have chosen a final product/outcome, given a reason for choice that is relevant to the theme/task and suggested an improvement that will be made when the product is made again.

This section was done well by candidates where there was evidence of making improvements/adaptions to their product.

Planning and Making

Centres should be aware that 6 out of the 26 marks available are to be awarded for candidates planning. Plans must give a full accurate list of ingredients with the quantities they will be using as well instructions for making. Many centres had awarded full marks despite the fact there were no quantities of ingredients. The plan of making is for the final product only, the two trialled ideas do not require a plan and if candidates have produced plans for their trialled ideas these should not be submitted.

The marks for the making of two chosen food products completed in the designing and selecting section are awarded here. Candidates were expected to trial two products and then produce a final one, this should be a development of one of the two previous products, not a totally different product. For high marks to be awarded it is important that candidates demonstrate a range of skills and techniques, these are listed in the specification. Photographic evidence of the final product is required.

It is important the centre highlights the support, help and guidance that candidates have been given and this should be reflected in the marks awarded.

Outcome

It is important to note that this mark is only for the final product/outcome not the two products that are trialled. If candidates have no final product then a mark of 0 must be awarded here. Centres tended to over mark this section as photographs did not support the mark that had been awarded. To achieve full marks the final product/outcome has to be high quality and well presented. The range of skills used to produce the outcome is irrelevant in this section.

Evaluation

Most candidates were able to make comments about their final outcome and suggest an improvement. For full marks the final product/outcome must have been evaluated against the specification and some testing/analysis completed. This could either have been sensory testing or nutritional analysis.

Evaluations were rarely completed against pupils' original specification. This area was often the most demanding for candidates and few gained the top mark band (6-8 marks).

Conclusion

The Entry Level qualification benefits candidates who would normally experience problems completing GCSEs. Much of the work seen this year has been excellent. Centres are reminded that this specification can be taught over one or two years.

Administration Procedures

Please note that entry for R357/01 requires the use of the OCR Repository. Entries for postal moderation should be made as R357/02. Details of the entry methods can be found in the specification booklet and on the OCR website.

Centres should submit their marks to OCR by 15th May. Centres will then be informed by e mail through OCR Interchange of the samples required for moderation. If there are fewer than ten candidates entered the whole sample must be sent to the moderator.

When sending work for moderation it is important to include the form CCS160 Centre Authentication. The Unit Recording Sheet (URS) is required to be attached to the front of each task. The Coursework Summary Form (CSF) is an optional form that allows centres to list all of the candidates on one form. Its use is recommended as it is a very useful document for moderation purposes.

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

