

# **Design & Technology**

Entry Level Certificate **ELC 3960-64**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

**3960-64/R/07**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 syllabus 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 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Entry Level Certificate

### Design and Technology (3960 – 3964)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

| <b>Unit</b> | <b>Content</b>      | <b>Page</b> |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 3960        | Food Technology     | 1           |
| 3961        | Graphic Products    | 4           |
| 3962        | Resistant Materials | 7           |
| 3964        | Textiles Technology | 11          |
| *           | Grade Thresholds    | 16          |



## **Report on Entry Level 3960 Food Technology**

### **General Comments**

The work seen by moderators this year was of a good standard and the hard work in preparing the samples for moderation was much appreciated.

Centres are expected to use coursework tasks set by the board, there are several provided in the Entry Level Specification. Most centres did use these tasks and it therefore made the moderation process easier. If a centre wishes to use an alternative task it must be approved in advance by the OCR.

Whilst the specification allows students to transfer from GCSE to entry level, it is important to ensure these students are not disadvantaged by not meeting the entry level criteria, particularly in unit one where they are required to study one manufactured product in detail.

Many Centres annotated the sample sent for moderation with either a front cover sheet or comments throughout the coursework folder. It is stated in the specification that 'where it is not clear within a course work folder, by the candidate's own presentation or work, where marks have been awarded, annotation must be carried out by the person marking the work'. On occasions when neither annotation nor photographic evidence was provided moderators found it difficult to agree marks awarded by the centre, particularly in objective 5.

Well organised coursework, with name, candidate number and work divided into objectives was greatly appreciated.

It is expected that candidates studying entry level will be supported in order that they can access the course requirements and demonstrate positive achievement, candidates should not be penalized due to this support.

Many centres provided some excellent writing frames/proformas which helped to guide candidates in their work. Where these frames 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.

Centres should be aware that this specification is a qualification that aims to reward positive achievement, some marks should therefore be awarded for work produced by candidates throughout the course and there should be very few cases where a zero mark is given.

### **Moderation Procedures**

Centres should submit their marks, the coursework summary for (CSF), Centre Authentication (CCS160) and the sample to the moderators by 15<sup>th</sup> May. Centres select the sample to be moderated; this consists of six candidates work from across the mark range.

## **Unit 1 – Examining a manufactured product that fulfils the chosen task.**

### **Objective 1– Identification of a need or opportunity that has led to a design brief for a marketed product.**

Providing candidates had identified one product then this objective was well answered. Candidates were able to show where the product could be purchased and who the user(s) might be and what needs they may have. Most candidates wrote a design brief to suit their identified product. Candidates who had used writing frames and support sheets were more able to give a higher level of response as they were more focused on the requirements of the objective.

### **Objective 2 – Study of a manufacturer’s product which results in the identification of specification points.**

The candidates are expected to continue investigating the same food product identified in objective 1. Including the label of the manufactured product meant most candidates could identify information, such as ingredients, storage/cooking instructions. Candidates found it difficult to say how the product met the needs of the user and to describe packaging and give reasons why the packaging materials had been used.

Most candidates produced a specification with at least three points identified. Higher level responses must refer to manufacturing in quantity and batch production.

### **Objective 3 – Study of a manufactured product to identify and communicate simple product design development decisions that have influenced the development of the product.**

The majority of candidates showed evidence of testing the product and recording the results, most candidates could identify the functions of the main ingredients, lower level responses gave basic details for main ingredients only for example, whether an ingredient had been used for colour or flavour. However, higher level responses gave greater detail and included all ingredients including additives.

Higher level candidates considered control systems. These candidates were able to give details at how the product is assembled commercially.

## **Unit 2– Generation of design, modelling, product planning and realisation.**

This unit should begin with a design brief or specification. The specification should refer to a product the candidate would like to develop. The product can be different from unit 1.

### **Objective 4 – Generation and communication of design ideas that contribute to a solution.**

In most cases the teacher provided the design brief and specification for candidates to work to. It is expected that candidates propose two or more ideas that meet their specification.

Candidates should then trial (cook) their ideas (practical marks awarded to objective 5) and evaluate each one against the specification. A high level response included evaluation against the specification, clearly identifying the final product and giving more than one reason for choosing it.

Ideas don't have to be sketched although where this happened they were of good quality.

### **Objective 5 – Contribution to product planning, modelling and realisation.**

**Planning** – Most candidates included flowcharts or methods for their final product.

Planning was often presented on writing frames, provided by the teacher – these ensured the candidates gave all required information, including list, cost, quantity of ingredients, equipment used and could therefore access higher marks.

**Modelling** – The quality of modelling seen this year was good. Modelling includes the practical work completed for objective 4, creating templates, design for cakes, pizzas and producing a packing logo for trial products. There was little evidence of nutritional modelling this year.

**Skills and Techniques** – Most centres had given candidates the opportunity to produce a range of practical outcomes, this is excellent to see. A high level response would involve candidates showing a range of practical skills and techniques to trial and test two or more ideas which leads to their final product. Photographic evidence and teacher annotation is invaluable in this objective. If photographic evidence is not provided, this can make moderation difficult.

Centres are reminded that where group work has been carried out it should be made clear the contribution of individual candidates.

### **Unit 3**

#### **Objective 6 – Evaluation of the final product.**

Testing of the final products was completed by most candidates using either star profiles or tasting charts.

A high level response involves candidates suggesting improvements to their products, making comments on timing, materials/processes used and comparing products to specification.

### **Conclusion**

It is pleasing to see the entry level qualification has been well received by centres and a growing number have begun to appreciate the benefits that this type of course brings to candidates who would normally experience problems completing GCSE's.

The centres that maximised the benefits of the course were those who provided clear support materials to assist candidates accessing all of the assessment objectives.

## **3961 – Entry Level Graphic Products 2007**

### **General Comments**

The work presented this year was generally to a good standard. There were general improvements in all aspects of the coursework presented to the board. An increasing number of centres are using format materials which has assisted in the organisation of the work. Overall the coursework generally met the assessment requirements and centres should be congratulated for this.

Centres are expected to use the coursework titles set by the board to ensure the candidates meet the assessment criteria. The majority of centres did this, which assisted with the moderation process. The title of the work should be stated at the start of the project, with any changes during the project also made clear. If the centre does not wish to use the OCR suggested titles then they need to inform the Board.

There was increasing evidence that centres were following the Entry Level specification rather than starting with the GCSE course and then changing the candidates to Entry Level. The key differences are in the product analysis task, where they are required to examine one product in detail. Centres who ensured the task was completed following the Entry Level Assessment Criteria were able to assess the Unit one mark scheme fully. When Centres are assessing the coursework it is advisable to follow the Award Descriptions in the Specification.

The Entry Level Qualification is to be aimed at candidates who would normally be expected to achieve below G grade at GCSE. There is evidence that for Objective 5 Centres had given to little credit for the quality of the practical work.

The Specification is designed to follow the Key stage 4 requirements over one to two years and candidates can be entered for more than one Design and Technology Entry Level Qualification.

### **Moderation Procedures.**

Moderation was postal this year. The Centres are to select the sample for moderation. If the cohort is less than 6, then all the work is to be sent. If there is a larger number of candidates the centre is to select a representative sample from across the mark range.

Most centres provided the correct paper work with Centre Authentication sheets and MS1. However centres need to be reminded that deadlines must be adhered to if moderation is to be conducted smoothly.

Work was generally well presented for moderation, with some Centres including annotation and notes. These were very helpful in identifying the candidate's ownership of the work. The organisation of the folders has improved with clearer indications of the Units and Assessment Objectives.

Candidates are expected to receive support in order for them to demonstrate their abilities.

The use of ICT was present this year through the use of proformas, digital images and graphic work. The photographic evidence has improved but Centres need to examine the quality of the images and provide different angles to support the Assessment criteria.

## **Unit 1 – Examining a manufactured product.**

### **Objective 1 – Identification of a need or opportunity that has led to a design brief for a marketed product.**

This section has increasingly improved with Centres using a focused task for this unit. The candidates can describe the situation and the user(s) to a high level; however they are missing out on higher marks by not producing a design brief for the product they have described, but for their own potential product. The candidates who used the proforma approach to the Objective achieved the higher levels.

### **Objective 2 – Study of manufactured product which results in the identification of specification points.**

This objective is a continuation of the existing product from Objective 1. **Candidates whose focus has changed from Unit 1 are reminded to state the specification for the new product.**

The candidates are to examine the product in more detail, leading to a specification for the product. Candidates who examined dimensions, materials, cost and processes achieved the higher levels. Centres are encouraged to examine the product through practical experiences.

### **Objective 3 – Study of a manufactured product to identify and communicate simple product design development decisions that have influenced the development of the product.**

Objective 3 is to examine *the implications of quantity manufacturing*. Centres are now approaching this objective through a more constructive manner which has resulted in candidates accessing more marks. This section still remains weak; Centres are encouraged to include industrial practices and relate them to the examined product from Objectives 1 and 2. The use of photographic evidence supported the marks awarded.

### **Objective 4 – Generation and communication of design ideas that contribute to a solution.**

This section is enjoyed by the candidates and the level of design work is generally very good.

Candidates are expected to produce two idea proposals which need to be supported by evaluations with clear decisions made about the chosen design and reasons why it is most suitable.

The Centres have used this objective to input the use of ICT. This is to support the ideas and improve the level of presentation.

### **Objective 5 – Contribution to product planning, modelling and realisation.**

The Levels of Response in the Assessment criteria in this section should be used as guide to structure the planning, modelling and outcomes. Generally Centres used the structures to support the evidence for this section.

Candidates are to plan their work providing evidence. This process will access the candidates to the higher levels. The use of step by step guides were successful.

Modelling evidence was more evident and aided the Assessment Criteria.

Centres who clearly identified the work contributed by the Candidates were invaluable for the moderation process.

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

Few Centres showed evidence for considering safety during manufacture.

The marks allocated for the outcome were generally too harsh in this Objective. Centres are reminded of the Level of Response and the need for candidates work to reflect Entry Level requirements.

### **Objective 6 – Evaluation of the final product**

This section has continually improved with Centres developing strategies to assess the Evaluation and Testing elements of the Objective, through pair, group or whole class work.

The use of photographic evidence of testing assisted this section.

The Centres who used proformas, provided opportunities for the candidates to reflect on their work in a positive manner.

Few Candidates gained full marks for this section due to the lack of evidence of possible improvements and specification checks.

### **Conclusion**

It has been a very pleasing year and there has been an increased number of candidates who have followed the Entry Level Specification .

Centres who included a cover sheet for each of the portfolios showing how the marks were allocated in each Objective and the supportive notes were invaluable in the moderation process.

Most Centres had chosen appropriate projects. However Centres are asked to ensure the projects chosen are a 'marketable' Graphic Product.

Centres are advised to ensure that each Candidates portfolio is labelled with the Centre name, Centre number, Candidate name and Candidate number.

The photographic evidence of the outcomes has improved, however Centres are asked to ensure the quality and number of photographs, ensure the moderators can give credit where necessary.

Some of the work achieved this year was outstanding and proudly presented.

## **Report on Resistant Materials Entry Level June 07**

### **3962 – Resistant Materials**

#### **General Comments**

There was an improvement in the standard of work and the presentation of folios observed by the moderators from the majority of centres, with folios being clear and well presented with a good range of photographic evidence being shown. Where students had been encouraged to clearly label and organise their folios into the separate objectives for each unit, moderation was made much easier, as were cover sheets and annotation which were included. This was found to be helpful to the moderators, particularly with the postal format for moderation now being well established.

A number of centres continue to use Entry Level as a means of providing credit for candidates who had started but were unlikely to complete a full or short GCSE course.

The consequences of this was that in some centres candidates had not studied 'a single existing manufactured product' in Unit 1 according to the criteria set out in the specification. In these cases centres had not provided candidates with the opportunity of attaining the higher range of marks.

In Unit 1 candidates are required to undertake a product analysis that considers the design of a single product and the specification and design considerations that might lead to the development of that product. Centres should note that Unit 1 Objectives 2 & 3 of the Entry Level Specification differ significantly from the initial objectives of the GCSE full or short course. For candidates to score in the higher range of marks, Unit 1 should be addressed according to the criteria set out in the specification.

The use of ICT is to be encouraged, and there was evidence of its successful use  
Candidates were able to:

- Research information via the Internet.
- Use CAD packages to provide a range of images relating to the development of their designs.
- Provide digital images to assist in their product analysis.
- Access support materials provided by the centre eg writing frames and prompts which provided a focus point for students to work from.

The use of CAM equipment as part of the manufacturing process was a little more evident this year, and centres are encouraged to use this as a means of providing candidates with the opportunities to access processes that enable 'manufacturing in quantity'.

A good standard of practical work was observed in the majority of centres, particularly in the range of skills and techniques used in the making of the products and artefacts. However, in Unit 2 Obj.4 many candidates were not provided with a Design brief and Specification on which to collect their design ideas. Modelling and simple planning produced by the candidates was a little more evident.

## **Moderation**

This was the Third year of postal moderation for this specification, and it still seemed to present a number of difficulties for moderators where centres had not fully complied with the stated requirements for this process. In some cases this led to a lot of extra work for the moderator following up missing documentation.

Moderators appreciated the assistance given by centres in clearly marking folios with centre number, candidate's names, clear description of the different objectives and the marks awarded. The recording of the breakdown of marks on the boards printed specification sheets was particularly helpful. Photographic evidence of the final product is a basic requirement of this process, and supporting photographs showing the process of making the product provided moderators with further information. In most cases photographs were taken using a digital camera and the overall quality of these was very encouraging. Writing frames and prompts were helpful to candidates in forming appropriate responses. On occasions work was slightly over structured by centres resulting in one-word answers. In entry level additional teacher assistance is welcomed but marks may only be awarded for work undertaken and completed by the candidate. Many teachers provided good annotation on individual performance showing clearly how much and where assistance had been given.

It is important for the moderator to know if responses were arrived at by group discussion, with the help of a learning support assistant

## **Unit 1**

### **Objective 1 – Identification of a need or opportunity leading to a design brief for a Manufactured Product**

This objective was generally well answered in accordance with the criteria in the specification, particularly where candidates had followed the Entry-level specification  
Analysis that related to the situation and where the product would be used was good but there was often little about the intended users. The use of ICT in providing prompts and digital images of products was seen to be beneficial to a number of candidates.

### **Objective 2 – Identification of specification points that the product meets**

This objective tended to be well structured particularly where candidates had focused on a single chosen item which led candidates to provide appropriate answers. Where candidates had followed a GCSE specification and not followed the Unit 1 criteria, moderation and understanding of how and where marks had been awarded was more problematic. Candidates in examination of the product explored the purpose of the product, dimensions, special features, safety, ideas for manufacture of more than one and some basic specifications were developed.

The best examples provided product information by way of annotated diagrams developing into what an appropriate specification might have been. Manufacture and systems for manufacturing in quantity were the least well answered.

### **Objective 3 – Product development**

Responses to this objective showed an improvement on previous years, with candidates examining materials used, how the product works, what components were used and how they fitted together and what finishes had been used. The better examples provided commentary, evaluation and analysis rather than lists. Photographs were used successfully to show users using products and in examining how products worked.

## **Unit 2**

### **Objective 4 – Generation and communication of ideas**

Generally well answered with an interesting range of ideas. The use of a range of communication techniques has improved, particularly the use of ICT, this has enabled candidates to achieve the higher range of marks in this objective.

The evaluation of ideas and reasons for choice was not always fully developed but where candidates were able to make some analysis of their ideas and choices it helped them to meet the assessment criteria for the higher range of marks i.e. 'evaluation of ideas leading to reasons being given for choice of idea'

### **Objective 5 – Product planning, modelling and realisation**

The majority of centres produced work of good to excellent quality; outcomes were mostly completed and well finished. Whilst the use of models, mock-ups and proto-typing was not consistent, where it had been attempted it had proved very successful, and had assisted in providing a quality outcome for the final piece.

Evidence of planning was limited. The better examples used flow charts, diaries and photographs showing candidates involved in the making process, which they were able to reference and comment upon. Retrospective recording of the progression and processes used in the production is acceptable in this objective.

The use of visual images showing a final drawing and possible three-dimensional views were considered as contributing to modelling and planning. ICT was a great benefit to some candidates in this area.

Support often took the form of preparing materials for candidates who were then able to form, shape and join independently. An appropriate range of skills and techniques were demonstrated in the making processes. An interesting variety of materials and finishes were used including wood, acrylics, and metal.

There was a creative use of jigs by a number of teachers which enabled candidates in working to specific lengths of material, holding work in order to join, use fastenings, drilling etc. Candidates were still allowed opportunities to demonstrate their competency in a number of ways but particularly through cutting, joining and assembly.

## **Unit 3**

### **Objective 6 – Evaluation of realised ideas**

This was generally a fairly weak section particularly where a design brief and Specification had not been given in Obj.4. Where proformas were used candidates recorded higher marks. Comments were generally superficial with little evidence of testing of the outcome or reference to the original idea and specification.

The better examples demonstrated testing of the product, some reference to the original specification and a review of the materials and time used. Photographs showing the product in use and the use of a third party in providing information for the candidate to develop in their evaluation were particularly helpful.

## **Conclusion**

It would appear that the Entry Level has successfully provided accreditation for number candidates who would not have been able to successfully achieve the lower grades of GCSE.

Candidates have gained maximum benefit and opportunities to achieve at the higher levels when the course has been delivered as a discrete Entry Level course or where candidates have been given opportunities to clearly address Unit 1 according to the Entry Level specification.

Some centres still did not fully understand the board's requirements for postal moderation and the need for the centre to choose the sample of work for moderation.

Centres are reminded that this specification can be taught over one year or two, and candidates can enter more than one Entry Level examination.

**D & T – Textiles Technology  
Entry Level 3964**

**Principal Moderator Report 2007**

**General Comments**

The work seen this year was generally of a very good standard, especially the practical outcomes. There have been noticeable improvements year on year in this Specification. Where Centres had access to exemplar materials, it had helped the candidates in the organisation and presentation of their work and assisted Centres with the recording of work and assessment.

Centres are advised that support materials are available by approaching the Board and requesting the services of the Specification consultancy service.

The majority of Centres have worked very hard to meet the requirements for assessment and in preparing the samples for moderation, they are to be commended for this.

Centres are expected to use the Coursework tasks set by the Board. The majority of Centres did this, which meant that the tasks set were appropriate. The task should be clearly stated at the start of the project. If a candidate has a special interest and does not wish to follow the O.C.R. tasks, then the Centre should contact the Board or the coursework consultant. Centres should note that the Specification contains an Appendix entitled ' guidance for teachers ' which gives a clear breakdown of coursework tasks.

There was less evidence this year of candidates starting to follow the G.C.S.E. course and then being entered for the Entry Level at a later date.

Where Centres had completed a product analysis task with candidates in year 10, this enabled the candidates who were then entered for Entry Level to successfully cover Unit 1 and fully access the marks available.

It was disappointing to see examples of folders submitted where candidates had followed a G.C.S.E. course and no attempt had been made to cover the requirements for assessment for the Entry Level qualification. These candidates were therefore not able to access all the marks available.

There were some Centres this year entering candidates who had completed coursework for the Specification in Year 9.

When Centres are assessing the coursework and filling in forecast grade forms it is advisable that the ' Award Descriptions ' in the Specification are considered.

Centres should note that this Qualification is aimed at candidates who would normally be expected to achieve below a G grade at G.C.S.E. There was some evidence of harsh marking of candidates particularly from main stream schools especially in Objective 5 and the quality of the practical outcome.

Please note that this Specification can be taught over one or two years and candidates can be entered for more than one D & T Entry Level Qualification.

## **MODERATION PROCEDURES**

Moderation this year was by post.

For Entry Level, the Centre selects the sample to be moderated. This consists of the folder and resultant practical work from 6 candidates, to represent work from across the mark range.

The folios, MS1, Coursework Assessment Form and Centre Authentication Form should be sent to the moderator by May 15<sup>th</sup>. There is no need to wait for the moderator to contact the Centre.

Most coursework folders were very well presented for moderation, with the majority of Centres including annotation and notes. This is invaluable for moderation, particularly in Assessment Objective 5.

Where candidates had been encouraged to organise their folders into separate sections for each Unit and Assessment Objective and had labelled them, moderation was much easier as it was more clearly seen by the moderator where marks had been awarded.

Where the candidates work was clearly structured and / or had the benefit of using pro forma sheets to help them work through the Units and Assessment Objectives, it helped them to access the marks available and demonstrate positive achievement.

A comprehensive use of ICT by candidates was seen again this year and this is to be encouraged. Very good examples were seen of it providing structure and support for pupils who may find communication and recording a difficulty.

Centres should note that for Entry Level, the candidate is expected to receive support in order for them to demonstrate their abilities. This can come from the teacher or teaching assistant, and intervention is allowed in order to achieve success. This does not disadvantage the candidate. The amount and type of support given to the candidate should be included in the annotation. Many Centres are including this type of annotation and it is invaluable during moderation.

### **Unit 1 – Examining a manufactured product that fulfils the chosen task.**

There were improvements seen again this year in addressing this Unit. Although some candidates approached this Unit and Assessment Objectives 1, 2, and 3 in the same way as for Specification 1958 / 1058, the majority of candidates met the Assessment Criteria.

Centres should be reminded that in this Unit, the candidates should be closely looking at and investigating one existing textile product rather than writing about what they *intend* to make. Looking at a range of textile products is not necessary and candidates working from a large range of magazine and catalogue cuttings are to be discouraged.

### **Objective 1 – Identification of a need or opportunity that has led to a design brief for a marketed product.**

Some candidates responded to this as if it were for the product they *intended* to make rather than for the existing textile product they were investigating. Most candidates were able to show some consideration of the needs of the user/s and the situation in which the product would be used. Candidates who had used writing frames and support sheets were more able to give higher level responses as they were more focussed on the requirements of this assessment objective.

**Objective 2 – Study of a manufactured product which results in the identification of specification points.**

The candidates are expected to continue investigating the same textile product.

Most candidates were able to give some specification points for the manufactured product. A higher level response was where the Candidate gave a detailed response as to whether they thought the product met the needs of the user (which they had identified in Objective 1). Few candidates were able to refer to manufacturing in quantity as it related to the product. Many candidates included notes about methods of production, which at least indicated an awareness of manufacturing in quantity.

Many candidates found presenting the specification points in bullet point form a simple and concise method.

**Objective 3 – Study of a manufactured product to identify and communicate simple product design development decisions that have influenced the development of the product.**

Where candidates were closely guided and focused in this section, some excellent work was produced and they clearly enjoyed the investigative aspect of looking closely at a manufactured product and were able to give quality responses. Examples were seen of candidates investigating the product by using it in different circumstances eg trying out a toy and allowing different children to play with it, then recording their observations. Again, some excellent materials used to support candidates were seen. Photographs were a useful method of recording candidates' investigations of the textile product.

**Unit 2**

**Objective 4 – Generation and communication of design ideas that contribute to a solution.**

The majority of candidates clearly enjoy the design and making aspects of this specification and some very good quality work was seen.

Candidates are expected to produce at least two design proposals. These design proposals should be evaluated and a chosen design identified with reasons why it is the most suitable. Most candidates produce a wider range of designs than the minimum suggested, where support and guidance is given they were able to demonstrate evaluation of the designs.

A good range of media was seen to be used in communicating their ideas. The use of stencils and ICT was seen to aid the candidates and to raise the standard of presentation. For example design and graphic programs were used to aid design work and communicate design ideas. All candidates were able to communicate their ideas

**Objective 5 – Contribution to product planning, modelling and realisation.**

Where candidates were guided in the structure of the planning and modelling aspects of their work, this section was extremely well done.

Centres are advised to look closely at the Levels of Response in the Assessment Criteria in this Objective. Candidates are required to 'contribute' to planning, modelling and the making of the practical outcome.

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

Where candidates were given guidance and support, they were more able to show evidence of their contribution to the planning and making of the practical outcome and consequently access higher marks.

Some excellent photographic evidence was seen in this Objective to support marks awarded, they were invaluable in the assessment process and a real pleasure to see.

A wide range of practical outcomes were seen, very little unfinished work was in evidence. In general Centres have a tendency to mark harshly in this Objective and not credit sufficiently the excellent standard of work in evidence.

Centres should note that even where practical work is unfinished, marks can be awarded. In this Objective, it is invaluable in moderation if annotation is included so that it is clear where assistance has been given and how marks have been awarded. This does not disadvantage the candidates.

### **Unit 3**

#### **Objective 6 – Evaluation of the final product.**

Candidate responses in this section have improved again this year and there is more evidence than in previous years, of testing the practical outcome.

Testing should be carried out by the intended user / target group, so that evaluation of the product against the specification can be made.

The use of photographs to show the product being tested is very useful here to support the comments made and as evidence to support the marks awarded.

The written views and opinions of candidates' peers and adults are also useful and were much in evidence, but practical testing of the product in use should be carried out.

Evaluation sheets using star ratings or smiley faces can be used where written communication is difficult.

### **Conclusion**

It has been very pleasing this year to see entries from Special Schools and Special Education Units and also from candidates with special needs in mainstream schools. Even where candidates have physical difficulties, support as required can be given so that the candidate can demonstrate positive achievement.

Centres are clearly finding that this type of specification and the flexibility they are allowed in enabling their candidates to access it, suited to the needs of their students.

Some of the work seen was yet again outstanding for this Entry Level Qualification.

Centres are advised and recommended to include a cover sheet on each folio showing how marks have been awarded in each Objective. This, together with brief notes and photographic evidence can be invaluable in the moderation process to support the marks awarded.

Centres are also advised to ensure that each folio is labelled with the Centre name, Centre number, Candidate name and Candidate number.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

The significant number of Centres who had very carefully prepared the folios for moderation and those who sent paperwork and samples to the moderators promptly are to be commended and sincerely thanked. They played an invaluable role in the moderation process.

Centres should note that the services of a Coursework Consultant are available for this Qualification at no cost to the Centre. Support materials, including pro formas, word frames and worksheets, as well as advice are available.

They should contact the Subject Officer to access this service,

*Report on the Units taken in June 2007*

**Entry Level**

**Graphic Products 3961**

**June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

| <b>Component</b> | <b>Max Mark</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>U</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1                | 100             | 67       | 43       | 15       | 0        |

**Option/Overall**

|                                | <b>Max Mark</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>U</b> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Percentage in Grade            | 100             | 45.1     | 29.4     | 22.6     | 2.9      |
| Cumulative Percentage in Grade |                 | 45.1     | 74.5     | 97.1     | 100      |

The total entry for the examination was 108

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2007