

GCSE

Design and Technology: Food Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J302**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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 2014

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education Design and Technology: Food Technology (J302)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A521 Introduction to designing and making	1
A523 Making quality products	6
A525 Sustainability and technical aspects of designing and making	11

A521 Introduction to designing and making

General Comments

The majority of portfolios were labelled clearly with both the candidates name and number and had the required OCR mark sheet. However, a few Centres still omit to state the chosen Theme.

The majority of candidates had organised their portfolios into the separate sections as required by the assessment criteria. However, moderators did see portfolios that were disorganised; work that became loose from slide binders; pages of work placed into one plastic wallet etc. These all hinder the moderation process. A few Centres are still submitting portfolios in hard backed folders; this is not recommended. A number of moderators also commented that some candidates are including work which is not required.

Marking of the portfolios for many Centres was within tolerance. Consequently marking of this controlled assessment was realistic and appeared to be of a more consistent standard, resulting in very few large adjustments this year.

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.

Most candidates are adapting/modifying recipes during the Designing section of the portfolio, but ideas are not always clearly explained. However, moderators did report that ideas had been more creative this year, with a couple commenting that they saw some really superb, innovative work from a number of Centres.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many Centres had done this particularly well but some are still failing 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.**

There continues to be a concern about the use of writing frames and pre-printed sheets. It is important that candidates are given the opportunity to show individuality, flair and creativity when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

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 10pt or 11pt.

Resources are available on the OCR website to help support teachers in the delivery of the controlled assessment. The link is <https://www.ocronlinetraining.org.uk/course/view.php?id=265>

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 and the capability and depth of involvement that has been employed to produce what is on offer. Within an Assessment Criteria strand 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.

The vast majority of 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

- A number of Centres are still over generous when marking this section because of lack of independent analysis. Some moderators reported seeing work that had clearly been copied and pasted from the internet.
- Information on cultural understanding and healthy lifestyles needs to be clearly linked to the chosen theme if high marks are awarded. Information also needs to be presented concisely. Moderators felt that an increased number of Centres had tried to encourage candidates to link their information to the Theme/Product but there are still many Centres where this is not done and candidates are awarded high marks.
- The use of mind maps to present information has increased this year. If high marks are to be awarded, ideas on the mind maps need developing to show the candidate's individual understanding of the various issues raised.
- Acknowledging sources of information continues to show improvement.
- It was evident that some candidates had spent too much time on this section of the portfolio

A high level of response to this section would include:

- ❖ **Chosen product/theme and starting point clearly stated at the start of the portfolio.**
- ❖ **Consideration of 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 remain the main method used to identify the needs of the user/target group/nutritional focus. However, many **questionnaires** still include irrelevant questions which are of little use to the task in hand. In some portfolios the design brief does not arise from research findings and some Centres are still crediting candidates with full marks when there was little supporting 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. This resulted in existing products not being evaluated against identified needs, the design brief and the design specification at the beginning of the Designing Section. 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 main weakest area. Some candidates do not use their identified needs, whilst others use pro-formas with the same identified needs throughout the Centre. In some Centres existing products chosen by the candidates are not always related to the chosen Theme. 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 lack of understanding. Evaluation of one product in detail is now evident in candidates' portfolios. Some candidates continue to offer very limited and superficial comments when evaluating, others tend to describe the product rather than evaluate it.

- Identifying and recording data is evident in many 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 e.g. 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 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) – 4 products in chart form with a conclusion and 1 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

- In some portfolios, Design Specifications are not linked to prior research. A number of candidates still list several nutritional needs and often then fail to discuss them 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.
- 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 centres lacked creativity. One team of moderators felt lack of creativity and skilful products was particularly evident if food from around the world was chosen as the starting point.

Examples of products which show good creativity and skill: - Indian spiced pasties (pastry); Indian spiced shepherds pie; Chinese sweet and sour pie; Stir fry parcels. 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. However, a few moderators commented, that they had seen an improvement in candidates' creative skills this year.

- 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 lost if these results were not 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. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating, tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. However, the majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Most candidates carried 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, or state this is an area that needs to be improved upon. If high marks are to be awarded to this section, candidates need to show application of their nutritional data when evaluating each product. A number of moderators reported an improvement in candidates' nutritional knowledge this year.
- Reasoned decisions about ingredients and equipment for the final product (prototype) in many Centres, was well done 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).
- Fewer candidates are now 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 3 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 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 process 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. Some candidates do not use tasters' comments when suggesting ideas for future developments.
- Comments when evaluating against the design specification continue to lack specific detail, stating the product had met the specification without any justification.
- There was less evidence this year of candidates focussing 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.
- Centres had given credit for spelling, punctuation and grammar when a final evaluation was evident. However, in a few Centres, when candidates had not completed an evaluation, no marks had been awarded for SPG. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluations for SPG 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.**

A523 Making quality products

General Comments

The majority of portfolios were labelled clearly with both the candidates name and number and had the required OCR mark sheet. However, a few Centres still omit to state the chosen Theme.

The majority of candidates had organised their portfolios into the separate sections as required by the assessment criteria. However, moderators did see portfolios that were disorganised; work that became loose from slide binders; pages of work placed into one plastic wallet etc. These all hinder the moderation process. A few Centres are still submitting portfolios in hard backed folders; this is not recommended. A number of moderators also commented that some candidates are including work which is not required.

Marking of the portfolios for many Centres was within tolerance. Consequently marking of this controlled assessment was realistic and appeared to be of a more consistent standard, resulting in very few large adjustments this year.

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.

Most candidates are adapting/modifying recipes during the Designing section of the portfolio, but ideas are not always clearly explained. However, moderators did report that ideas had been more creative this year, with a couple commenting that they saw some really superb, innovative work from a number of Centres.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many Centres had done this particularly well but some are still failing 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.**

There continues to be a concern about the use of writing frames and pre-printed sheets. It is important that candidates are given the opportunity to show individuality, flair and creativity when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

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 10pt or 11pt.

Resources are available on the OCR website to help support teachers in the delivery of the controlled assessment. The link is <https://www.ocronlinetraining.org.uk/course/view.php?id=265>

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.

Most candidates are now clearly stating the chosen Theme/Product at the start of the portfolio, Desserts, Baked Products, Foods from Around the World and Celebrations being the most popular choices by Centres.

Designing

- Most candidates had stated a design brief which included a target group. Design briefs are 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 continues to vary 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. 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.
- The forward plan in many candidates' portfolios is now showing the level of detail required to achieve high marks. However a number of candidates are still producing a plan that fails to name the products to be trialled and there are still a few candidates who produce the plan retrospectively. There was less evidence this year, of candidates producing a forward plan for the whole portfolio.
- 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 four products to trial. The level of creativity varies widely. In some centres candidates are now designing and making really creative ideas whilst in others changes/modifications to recipes/ideas are very limited e.g. changing the shape, adding or removing a flavour - ideas that lack originality. In a few candidate portfolios there was no evidence of any modifications. Explanation of the changes/modifications also varies. Some candidates give clear detailed comments about the changes to be made, whilst others produce evidence that is brief and very superficial and sometimes it is difficult to identify the changes that have been made. However, overall, the level of creativity is improving.
- A few Centres continue to restrict candidates with product choices, by establishing set products to be made.
- There was less evidence of annotated diagrams, sketches, lists of equipment, practical skills, methods, time plans or flowcharts this year.
- 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 explained or conclusions drawn.
- 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. A few candidates had evaluated each solution but failed to make any reference to the specification. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating, tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. However, there was less evidence this year, of candidates evaluating the making of the products rather than the product itself. Detailed evaluations were often very repetitive. The majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Some candidates had included nutritional analysis in their portfolio when nutrition did not form part of their design brief and or specification. Others included a nutritional focus in their specification but this was then forgotten as the portfolio developed.
- Choice of the design proposal overall, was well done 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 has improved this year but still remains a weak area in this section because too many candidates do not make reference to the comments made when the product was originally trialled and further modifications are not always justified. In many portfolios, suggestions for further developments do not reflect comments made by testers from the previous modifications, so the product is not being developed according to user views. Some candidates developed two products. 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. Fewer candidates planned modifications in advance rather than letting the product develop according to taste/testers views. 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 failed to calculate the total cost of the product. In other portfolios, individual ingredients had been costed but there was no total cost of the product. A few moderators commented that some candidates had not provided evidence of costing of the final product.
- Reasoned decisions, re ingredients and equipment for the final product in many Centres, was well done.
- Product Specifications had improved this year but overall this aspect of the portfolio was still 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.
- The flowchart/plan of action for the final product was generally well done. Fewer Centres now appear to be awarding high marks, when plans are not detailed.
- Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that a few 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 one photograph of the final product.

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 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 again 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. Some candidates do not use taster comments when suggesting ideas for future developments.
- 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.
- The majority of candidates had suggested how the final product could be improved, but comments made were not always based on results from testing or on the conclusions reached when evaluating against the product specification.
- A few Centres did not give credit for spelling punctuation and grammar. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluations for SPG 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 (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 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.

A525 Sustainability and technical aspects of designing and making

General Comments:

This is the first year of this examination and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were able to access the exam paper, there appeared to be very little doodling on papers and relatively few NR responses. Where these occurred they were on the questions which were targeted at the higher grades.

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 e.g. 16(c) and 18 (e). Candidates need to be encouraged to read the question through carefully before writing their response.

Some candidates did not give sufficient detail in their responses. There is still too much use of the terms: easier, cheaper, healthier, faster, better for the environment, environmentally friendly, without any qualification or justification. 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. Candidates need to do as the question asks, there were occasions when candidates were asked for one response, they gave several and not all the answers were correct. This scatter gun approach meant that some candidates failed to score marks. Examples of this were seen in questions 7, 10 and 17e(ii).

It was, however, pleasing to see improved responses on the banded response questions, particularly on question 16g. Some students made plans / wrote key words before starting these questions and therefore wrote clearly and answered the question in detail. However, on question 19b explaining what advice you would give to consumers when buying and storing food there was a lot of repetition of the same point. It was also disappointing to see candidates referring to 'sell by date' instead of using use by or best before dates.

In section A 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 16c and 16f. Some candidates still make very vague comments e.g. 'better for the environment', 'environmentally friendly' which do not score marks.

Candidates' written English still causes concern and deciphering responses was sometimes very difficult on low scoring papers.

It was noticeable that where extra paper was required or candidates used the extra pages at the back of the booklet to continue a question response, many candidates did not reference the question number on the extra page / 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.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Section A

Question 1

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 2

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 3

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. A few candidates put (b) Supermarkets sell the food at a fair price, or (d) The products are only produced in Africa.

Question 4

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. A common incorrect response was milk.

Question 5

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. Those with an incorrect answer had put either (a) Toxic or (b) Non toxic.

Question 6

The most able candidates scored the mark. Many had incorrectly put biodegradable or recycling.

Question 7

This question was well answered with a range of correct responses. Obesity and tooth decay were the most popular. However some candidates are still putting rotting teeth, getting fat, heart attacks and problems. Candidates need to use correct subject specific language.

Question 8

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. A wide range of dishes were seen the most popular were chicken salads, curries and casseroles.

Question 9

A range of answers were seen, the most popular correct responses were linked to biodegradable; decomposes; reduces waste; nutrients back into the soil. However some candidates gave vague responses –e.g. good for the environment and therefore did not achieve the mark.

Question 10

There was a high proportion of correct answers linked to high blood pressure and heart disease. A few candidates mentioned strokes and kidney disease. A number of candidates incorrectly linked salt to high cholesterol.

Questions 11-15

The majority were answered well with the exception of Question 12 and 14 in particular had quite a few incorrect responses.

Question 12

A considerable numbers of candidates did not understand rhubarb is in season in the spring.

Question 14

Very poorly answered reference to meat products and best before dates. Probably because they misread the question.

Section B

Question 16a

Most candidates scored one mark for microwave. Some scored the second mark for the pressure cooker.

Question 16b

Many candidates gained one mark as they clearly knew that several foods could be cooked at once but they failed to get the second mark as they did not explain how this saved energy. Those that understood how a steamer could be used gave clear, well explained answers and therefore scored two marks. Those that failed to score any marks talked about using a lid to prevent heat escaping. Others misinterpreted the question and discussed how the steamer worked rather than how it could reduce the amount of energy used.

Question 16c

Good responses were seen with a large number gaining two marks. Common correct responses included reducing carbon footprint, lower CO₂ emissions, greenhouse gasses and effects on the cost of food products. Some candidates misunderstood the question and went on to explain about energy and nutrition or wrote about it from a consumer's point of view referring to cooking and reheating.

Question 16 d

Most candidates scored at least one mark. Most candidates highlighted butter, milk and cheese to be removed. However, replacements were not always correctly understood as they had not considered the lactose intolerance or the function of the ingredient in the recipe. Popular correct answers vegetable oil, soya milk, and named vegetables.

Question 16e

Many candidates scored one mark with the most popular responses linked to recycling, biodegradable, can be cooked in the oven, saves washing up. A number of candidates discussed the packaging rather than the container.

Question 16f

Those achieving marks gave reducing carbon footprint; cost of transporting and supporting local farmers / UK economy. Some candidates repeated the same point in different ways and others made very general comments such as good for the environment. Candidates need to be very specific with their responses.

Question 16g

Most candidates achieved a level two response. Some candidates did not gain higher marks because they just focused on one or two points so their answer lacked breadth of knowledge. A disappointing number incorrectly linked salt intakes to obesity. Most common responses for level one were linked to reducing fat and sugar, eating 5 a day; following the eatwell plate. Those on level two went on further to mention government guidelines, portion size, ready meals and take-aways and snacking. Those who gained a level three response reflected a greater understanding of the comments made at level one and two and also mentioned the importance of checking food labels and methods of cooking. Responses at this level did show fluency in writing.

Question 17a

Most candidates scored three or four marks. A few put measuring cup or the example of use being too vague e.g. for the measuring jug they just put measuring.

Question 17 b

Many scored a mark for referring to improvements but answers did not show sufficient understanding for two marks. Those scoring two marks referred to identifying improvements and related this to improving sales, appealing to target market. A few mentioned the specification and nutritional analysis.

Question 17c

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates and most gained two marks for identifying the areas of improvement required. More correct responses were seen for how the attractiveness of the product could be improved. However some answers were too vague to gain marks e.g. add decoration. Fewer candidates gained the mark for how to improve the crispness of the base.

Question 17d

The responses to this question were poor and it was clear that production methods had not been taught in some centres. Correct responses tended to focus on - product is consistent, same size.

Question 17ei

Most candidates understood the correct temperature for a refrigerator. However a small number of candidates gave minus temperatures.

Question 17 eii

There were a range of correct answers seen for this question, most gained marks for making reference to extending the shelf life and containing high risk foods or naming the high risk foods.

Question 18a

Most candidates correctly identified yeast as the raising agent in bread. There were a number of incorrect answers making reference to self-raising flour.

Question 18b

The most able candidates scored two marks. Many candidates scored one mark for mentioning gluten; and improving elasticity.

Question ci and cii

Most candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 18d

Many candidates scored one mark usually with reference to preventing constipation. It was however disappointing seeing so many incorrect responses linked to providing energy and for growth and repair.

Question 18e

Some interesting design responses were seen. Many candidates scored four marks. More able candidates gave detailed annotations clearly explaining how all the specification points had been met.

Hand held - With reference to shape or size or both.

Fibre - Wholemeal flour was the most popular response for fibre. Some candidates made reference to use of dried fruits, seeds and nuts.

Attractive - Many candidates clearly made reference to colour or decoration.

Texture - Many candidates failed to name the foods and the texture they provided and therefore only scored one of the two marks.

A few candidates did not score any marks as they did not design a bread product.

Question 18f

Most candidates scored at least one mark with reference to the same shape and size, tasting sensory qualities, correct weight of ingredients, risen enough, cooked enough and correct cooking temperature.

Question 19a

This question was very well answered by all candidates. Many candidates scored full marks.

Question 19b

The majority of candidates did discuss both buying and storing. It was disappointing that many responses were poorly structured, jumping from buying to storing and back again. Responses generally lacked adequate explanation and use of specialist terms. Many candidates referred to date marking, but some still refer to 'sell by' dates. Use of a fridge for storage was often seen, with many knowing where to store dripping meat and more able candidates explaining about cross contamination. A number gave too many examples of which food is stored where without adequate explanations of why they were suitable places.

Question 19c

The majority of candidate scored at least one mark. Salmonella and E coli were the most popular responses.

Question 19d

The majority of candidates could suggest a symptom of food poisoning.

Question 19e

Many candidates scored two marks with warmth and moisture the most common correct responses.

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 2014

