

Design & Technology

Entry Level 3960 3961 3962 3964

Reports on the Components

June 2010

3960-64/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Design & Technology ICT (3960, 3961, 3962, 3964)

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

Component/Content	Page
3960 – Food Technology	1
3961 – Graphic Products	4
3962 – Resistant Materials	7
3964 – Textiles Technology	11

3960 – Food Technology

General Comments

The work seen by moderators this year was of a good standard and the hard work of most centres 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 OCR.

Whilst the specification allows candidates to transfer from GCSE to entry level, it is important to ensure these candidates 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. Some candidates had also studied a range of products which is unnecessary.

Many centres annotated the sample sent for moderation with either a front cover sheet or comments throughout the coursework folder. This clearly supported the moderation process and was much appreciated. 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 penalised due to this intervention, and it is helpful where the level of support is indicated by teacher annotation.

Many centres provided some excellent writing frames/proforma 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.

Moderation Procedures

Centres should submit their marks, the coursework summary form (CSF), Centre Authentication (CCS160) and the sample to the moderators by 15th May. For entry level Centres select the sample to be moderated; this consists of six candidates work from across the mark range ideally two high, two middle and two lower achieving folders.

Unit 1

It should be noted that for unit 1 (objectives 1, 2 and 3) the candidates are required to study a single manufactured product.

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. A high level response to this objective would involve candidates providing a design brief that the chosen manufactured product would satisfy.

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 manufactured 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. Only some candidates then went on to describe the packaging and type of materials used. Candidates found it difficult to say how the product met the needs of the user.

Most candidates were able to conclude Objective 2 by writing a specification for the manufactured product. These responses varied from a few words to a detailed list. Some candidates seemed unclear that the specification must relate to the identified product in objective 1, not the products they intended to make. The response of higher-level candidates included reference to manufacturing in quantity and mentioned 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. Candidates were often given a pro forma to support achievement. Most candidates could identify the functions of the main ingredients in the manufactured product. Lower level responses gave basic details for main ingredients only, eg whether an ingredient had been used for colour or flavour. However, higher level responses gave greater detail about the function 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

It should be noted that this unit should begin with a design brief or specification. The specification should refer to a product the candidate intends to develop. The teacher, the candidate or a combination of the two can develop the specification. The product will usually 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. Many centres kept the same as unit 1, this was not necessary. It is expected that candidates propose two or more ideas that meet their specification. This was done well by nearly all candidates this year. 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 do not have to be sketched.

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. It is acceptable for candidates to be given a sequencing activity for planning where they have to sort method into correct order.

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.

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. Some centres limited the marks available to candidates here by doing two versions of the same product rather than two different products, therefore reducing the skills shown. Photographic evidence and teacher annotation is invaluable in this objective. Not providing 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. It was clear from many candidates work that candidates had often been involved in a verbal evaluation of their product and teachers had recorded the comments - marks should be awarded for this. A high level response involves candidates suggesting improvements to their products, making comments on timing 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. Much of the work seen this year has been excellent and centres are to be commended for their continuing hard work in preparing candidates for this specification.

3961 – Graphic Products

General Comments

The work presented this year was to a good standard.

Centres are expected to use the coursework titles provided by the board. Centres who wish to use their own project titles are advised to contact the Board for approval.

The work submitted was generally clearly labelled with the candidates' number, centre number and project title.

Centres are reminded the Entry Level Qualification is to be aimed at candidates who would normally be expected to achieve below G grade at GCSE. The evidence for Objective 5 is to be supported by teachers in order that the candidates can access the course requirements and demonstrate positive achievement.

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. When Centres are assessing the coursework it is advisable to follow the Award Descriptions in the Specification.

Moderation Procedures

Moderation continued to be postal. Centres are responsible for submitting the marks on the MS1, the Coursework Summary form (CSF), Centre Authentication (CCS160) and the sample to the moderator - (six candidates portfolios from across the mark range and tutor groups and where the cohort is six or less all the portfolios).

The use of notes to help identify candidates ownership of work was encouraging from centres, as this assisted with the moderation process. The organisation of the folders has improved with clearer indications of Assessment Objectives.

More use of ICT was present this year, supporting the candidates work with digital images of existing products and evidence of manufacturing and planning.

Unit 1

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

Providing the candidates identified one product the opportunities to have a successful unit was increased. The candidates were capable of making a judgement of a product in terms of situation and who it is designed for. A number of centres still had candidates writing a design brief for their own product and not the focused product investigated in the Objective through the view of the designer.

Candidates who used supported frame works or class focused investigations achieve the higher grades in the Unit one section.

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

The Candidate is expected to continue with the same product investigation identified in objective 1. The Candidates should identify the structure of the product in terms of materials, size and client needs leading to points for the specification. Candidates are to be encouraged to produce a detailed analysis of the product including measurements, materials and how it works to gain the higher marks in the assessment criteria.

The higher grades were gained by centres who used ways to annotate diagrams, special features, safety and ideas for manufacture to produce a specification for the product. Candidates who referred to manufacturing in quality accessed the higher assessment criteria.

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

A majority of Candidates produced evidence within this objective which was an improvement from previous years. A large number of candidates are indicating a process or finishing technique used in the manufacture of the product. However the section still remains weak with candidates struggling to note the valid reasons for the use of materials and production methods.

Centres are to be encouraged to look at different approaches to address this issue by discussing and recording how the product is made, how areas of the product is fitted to together and how it works. The centres, who recorded the manufacturing of the product through testing, dismantle exercises and group tasks were able to achieve the higher assessment criteria.

Unit 2

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

In this section candidates confidently looked at more than two design ideas. Some candidates, however, did not access the higher marks as they failed to note any responses to the designs and indicate the design they wished to use for production. This Objective can also provide ICT opportunities for producing a variety of different designs. Centres using the format sheet to organise the designs and the ICT input accessed the higher grade boundaries.

Objective 5 – Contribution to product planning, modelling and realisation

Most candidates produced a product which fitted the assessment criteria with the outcomes to a high standard. The photographic evidence to support the work has improved with a larger number of candidates using scale; details of skills used and the product in use to support the high marks achieved.

Planning: The recording of production plans and records of making are on the increase with Centres supporting the candidates with visual diary, story board or use of charts to indicate the tools and skills used. Centres are reminded the teacher can support the candidate to achieve this element but must record their interaction.

Modelling: The quality of the model making was encouraging with a number of candidates using a variety of different materials to problem solve and create templates to aid in the production of their final products. It is not necessary to send all models with the coursework to the moderator. Photographic evidence and notes is sufficient. This could be an ICT opportunity for the candidates to record their models and to discuss how they have developed their final piece.

Product: The photographic evidence continues to improve with the use of digital images. Centres should ensure the photographic evidence illustrates the product with scale, detail and overall image. Centres should note that work that is not complete can still access some of the assessment criteria.

Unit 3

Objective 6 – Evaluation of the final product

This section was generally good this year with a high number of candidates gaining mark for this Objective. There were a number of centres who had encouraged the testing element of the objective with great success. Centres should be encouraged to approach this objective through a number of recording methods to access the higher marking criteria. The use of Specification checks also provides an opportunity for the candidates to make a judgement of the work they have produced..

The Centres who used photographic evidence with a third party assisting with this section gained the higher marks. The use of written views from peers or adults was also helpful but practical testing should still be carried out.

Conclusion

A number of Centres are to be congratulated on preparing and supporting candidates to produce excellent work with clear presentation and paperwork.

3962 – Resistant Materials

General Comments

There was an improvement in the standard of work and the presentation of folios from the majority of centres, 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. When centres had included cover sheets and annotation with candidates work, this was 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. This product analysis should consider the design of a single product including 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

Moderators appreciated the assistance given by centres in clearly marking folios with centre number, candidates' names, a clear description of the different objectives and the marks awarded. 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 good. 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 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.

When Candidates examined a product, they explored the purpose of the product, dimensions, special features, safety, ideas for manufacture of more than one and then reached some basic specifications.

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, how components 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 ie '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 centres, which enabled candidates to work to specific lengths of material, holding work in order to join, use fastenings and drilling. 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 a number of 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.

3964 – Textiles Technology

General Comments

The work seen this year was generally of a very good standard, especially the practical outcomes. 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.

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 OCR 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 GCSE 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 GCSE 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.

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 GCSE. There was some evidence of harsh marking of candidates particularly from main stream schools and especially in Objective 5 and the quality of the practical outcome.

Moderation Procedures

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.

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. There was greater use of digital photography in evidence, which was valuable in supporting the marks awarded.

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 clearer where marks had been awarded.

Reports on the Components taken in June 2010

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 learning support 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.

Unit 1

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 in relation 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. 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 was 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.

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.

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, for the process of 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 this year but there continues to be little evidence of testing the practical outcome.

The use of photographs to show the product being tested is very useful here. The photographs can show the product being used by the target consumer.

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 also 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 outstanding for this Entry Level Qualification.

Centres are advised 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.

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.

Centres should note that the services of a Coursework Consultant are available for this Qualification.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2010

