Version 1.0: 0806

ASSESSMENT and QUALIFICATIONS ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Design and Technology (Food Technology) 3542/3552

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- Full Course
- Short Course

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX. *Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.*

Contents

Food Technology

Full Course

Short Course

This page has been left intentionally blank

Full Course – Higher Tier

It was clear that most candidates had benefited from preparation and revision prior to the examination. It was encouraging to see that more candidates had attempted all of the questions this year and that many of them accessing the higher marks. Answers continue to be quite simplistic and candidates did not always use specialist terminology to explain points made, so the more open-ended questions proved more difficult for some candidates. The majority of candidates were able to gain marks on the design question and it was good to see more candidates showing an awareness of the functions of ingredients used in their design idea. The quality of design idea sketches was outstanding with some candidates producing very detailed annotation. The majority of candidates this year appeared to use the mark allocations to help them structure their answers and give the correct number of responses to the questions.

Question 1

(a) This was done well, with most candidates achieving full marks. However, many gave responses such as 'healthy', without referring to the competitors' or spectators' requirements.

(b) Many candidates answered well, showing a sound knowledge of computer programs, but many others gave generic descriptions of methods of research rather than 'how' the computer was used.

Question 2

(a) The quality of sketches was outstanding, with some candidates producing detailed drawings fully reflecting the design criteria. Very few inappropriate designs such as pasta dishes or sweet pastries were seen or identical repeated products. Candidates had been well prepared for this style of question by their centres.

(b) (i) Usually well answered with potatoes, rice or the flour in pastry named as giving carbohydrate in their product. Few candidates mentioned the fat content, whilst some wrongly gave vegetables, meat and poultry as examples of high energy foods and also quoted protein as a high energy source.

(ii) Cultural needs answers tended to revolve around the removal of meat for vegetarians and certain religions. Few responses focussed upon traditional foods. Candidates usually gained one mark but did not give enough detail for two marks.

(iii) The suitability of the food for a hand held product was well answered. Common good responses stated that their product was 'small' and often included measurements, whilst shape was linked to the palm of the hand and that the pastry case was firm so as to contain the filling.

(c) Most candidates had been well prepared and gave clear and precise plans for the making of the product in the test kitchen. Marks were lost through a lack of reference to control checks, hygiene, safety, incorrect temperatures and detail of making for their chosen pastry.

(d) (i) The majority of candidates gave a list of the main ingredients, but with the crucial omission of water and the filling, making the recipe unworkable. Detail of the type of flour and fat used was frequently lacking, e.g. strong plain flour for flaky pastry and block margarine for short crust.

(ii) Most candidates knew the correct quantities for their chosen pastry but quantities for the filling ingredients were often missing and not always given in grams, e.g. 100g grated cheese.

(iii) There was a good understanding of different reasons for choice of ingredients reflecting structure, flavour, colour, texture and nutritive value.

(e) Answers to this question were not very creative and few achieved full marks. Many candidates gave incorrect answers, giving additions to the packaging rather than the finishing technique. Many did not understand the term 'finish'.

Question 3

(a) Very few candidates gained full marks for this nutrition-based question because answers were too simplistic. It was expected that candidates would use figures from the table, compare the two products and extend answers to include long term health risks; for example, more fibre present in wholemeal pastry necessary for digestion. Very few extended answers were given and most candidates gained the marks from giving a large range of simplistic answers.

(b) (i) Very few candidates could explain the meaning of the term 'control sample' and did not realise that the question needed responses about the 'fair testing' technique, as indicated on the Preparation Sheet.

(ii) Many candidates did not read this question about ratio and proportion correctly, so did not state why it was important. Answers usually identified poor texture, or stated proportions for a named pastry without explaining why they were needed in terms of texture, consistent outcomes or quality control.

(iii) Although most candidates identified change of colour and flavour if the margarine was replaced by butter, many incorrectly stated that the product would contain more fat. The change in flour was widely known to increase the fibre content but answers lacked detail in other characteristics; for example, nutty flavour, coarser texture and brown colour.

Question 4

(a) Both dates were well understood, but many candidates used the term 'gone off' which was not accepted as a correct answer.

(b) (i) Good understanding was shown of the importance of date marking for the consumer.

(ii) Too often candidates focussed upon safety for customers instead of stock rotation, recording and legal requirements for supermarkets.

(c) (i) The properties of paperboard for packing were usually well answered, with 'cheap', 'lightweight' and 'recycling' being the most popular answers.

(ii) Many candidates simply repeated the answers given in (c)(i). Those that gave different reasons usually referred to 'insulation', 'easy to mould' or 'sturdy to protect the product'. Candidates were expected to give material related answers rather than generic answers such as 'to protect the food'. Generic answers resulted in minimum marks being awarded to some candidates.

Question 5

(a) Although some candidates gained full marks, there were equally as many who were obviously guessing and referred to 'fresh' or 'ready made' without qualification.

(b) The temperatures for storage of vol au vents and grated cheese were, in the main, answered correctly. Responses for the tinned filling were very poor. Candidates often quoted 37° C rather than the ambient temperature of 20-25° C.

(c) Both advantages and disadvantages of using standard components were covered but often related to home use rather than the manufacturer. Answers tended to lack full explanations.

Question 6

(a) Many answers were simply a reversal of the question, for example 'too much filling' and 'put less in' rather than 'use a quality control check to ensure accurate amounts'. Several candidates referred to 'salmon' as shell fish.

(b) Most candidates identified the correct causes of hazards. The prevention of all three was poorly answered. Very few realised that ph testing related to cleaning agents.

(c) Sound knowledge and understanding of why control checks are done by computers was shown with good, detailed answers.

Question 7

(a) Cross contamination and the different colours of boards were well understood and most candidates gained full marks.

(b) The use of a food probe was generally understood, but few candidates mentioned cleaning with bacterial wipes, resetting the probe or the core temperature of 72°C.

Question 8

Candidates either gave good, well informed, answers covering the nutritional needs, cultural needs and the manufacturer's developmental techniques, thereby gaining high marks or gave very vague answers and gained few marks. It was obvious that candidates were better prepared for this question at some centres. Many candidates began by simply repeating the question and used up the first lines of the answer space by doing this. It was obvious that some candidates find structuring extended answers of this type difficult.

Full Course Foundation Tier

Question 1

(a) Most candidates gained at least three marks for this question. Some candidates lost marks by not understanding the term 'savoury' or relating answers to 'hand held' food products.

(b) This part was not as well answered, with candidates often repeating types of food rather than factors to consider.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates gave correct responses and gained full marks.

(b) The majority of candidates answered this well, with generic functions of packaging and labelling information being the most common responses.

Question 3

(a) This part was done very well by candidates. Most managed two recognisable, well labelled, sketches. A few candidates gave incorrect or inappropriate products such as pasta dishes and sweet pastries. The majority of candidates did not give creative ideas, but played safe with traditional Cornish pasties or sausage rolls. Some candidates did not name the type of pastry used and simply referred to it as 'ready made'.

(b) (i) Candidates could give some correct explanations, but few scored three marks – often size was the only factor mentioned.

(ii) Answers were varied. Many candidates used sensory terms or age related reasons for choice of product. The suitability for vegetarian choices was a popular response.

(c) (i) Well answered with the correct names of pastries given by the majority of candidates.

(ii) Well answered, most candidates gave an appropriate answer for use.

(d) Candidates could give some good reasons for use.

(e) Most candidates were able to identify the main stages in the production of their product, but many gave vague references to 'wash hands' rather than 'clean hands' and 'put in oven' rather than 'bake in oven'. This meant that full marks were not awarded. Less able candidates managed to gain more marks on this structured response, but the more able tried to add on extra columns for control checks. Candidates need to be aware that questions on the production planning can be presented in different formats.

(f) Generally well done. Some candidates confused finish with packaging.

Question 4

(a) Most candidates could give one reason why for each instruction. Few managed to score five or six marks. Some candidates incorrectly thought that piercing the skin of potatoes aids more thorough cooking.

(b) (i) and (ii) In general, very good answers were seen by the examiners. Dislike of hot curry and allergy to peanuts were the most popular responses. Development notes were frequently appropriate and well explained.

(c) (i) and (ii) Candidates often used salads as fillings for baked potatoes rather than as accompaniments. Responses were lacking in imagination, the most common being cheese, tuna, coleslaw and mayonnaise. Many candidates have the misconception that fish is suitable for vegetarians and that 'quorn chicken' is a product. Explanations were often poor.

Question 5

(a) (i) and (ii) Very well answered, with most candidates gaining full marks and showing a good understanding of potential problems and how they can be prevented.

(b) Few gained full marks here; only a minority of candidates knew about the role of computers in industry.

Question 6

(a) Good response to interpretation of information given in the table.

(b) (i) Reasonably well answered. Most responses referred to flavour (salt) or colour or texture for fat. Few candidates could give sufficient accurate details to gain four marks

(ii) Many candidates attempted this question but could not respond with the clarity required to gain two marks.

(c) (i) (ii) Some vague responses regarding the importance of use by dates; excellent responses regarding vegetarians and recycling. Few candidates recognised the six mark availability and thus many only gained three marks.

(d) (i) and (ii) Well answered. Candidates had learned the generic functions of packaging. Several candidates offered vague answers about 'keeping fresh' without clarification. Many had learned the functions of packaging but did not always give a response appropriate to the material given. Several responses incorrectly referred to foil 'keeping away the light' as a reason for use.

Question 7

(a) Vague answers did not gain marks, with a few candidates referring to 'germs'. The choice of individual colour coding equipment for specific foods by many gained marks. More candidates gave reference to stopping bacteria and cross contamination needs. This question was generally well answered by the majority of candidates.

(b) Most candidates knew what a food probe was used for, but many could not give specific details such as core temperature or the correct steps for use.

(c) Many candidates attempted this question but could not respond with the clarity required to gain four marks. Many still think that freezing 'kills germs'; few gave correct temperatures.

Short Course Higher Tier

Question 1

(a) (i) Most candidates achieved full marks as a range of appropriate answers were given.

(ii) Full marks were frequently awarded as most candidates could give different answers to both part (i) and (ii), but credit was given if answers were repeated.

(b) The majority of candidates gained full marks, as computers are now a widely used tool.

Question 2

(a) A range of savoury snack products were designed. Occasionally sweet products were chosen where candidates misunderstood the question. Detailed labelling was much in evidence, including use of sensory descriptors and improved identification of named ingredients. Sketches were of a high quality.

(b) Many candidates gained higher marks as they were able to explain the design in more detail.

(c) This was well answered. Candidates had learnt the correct proportions for pastry (especially short crust pastry) and the filling amounts. Reasons were clearly explained. Many candidates scored full marks. Occasionally a candidate did not include water for pastry or egg for a quiche product, thus making an unworkable product.

(d) Most candidates could give clear step-by-step instructions for making their chosen product. Less well answered was the correct oven temperature for the product chosen or the fact that the product had to be 'put in the oven' with no indication of temperature or use of specialist terminology. A good range of control checks were in evidence.

Question 3

(a) Very few candidates named an actual sensory test, but most could give simple points of how to carry a test out. Frequently there was no reference to making an analysis or conclusions.

(b) This was accurately answered by all candidates.

Question 4

(a) Despite gaining high marks for identifying a range of simple points for choosing product 'A' as the healthier product, candidates could not give explained reasons for eating less fat, less salt, reduced calories and more fibre.

(b) 'Use by 07/09/06' – candidates generally scored one mark for stating that 'this is a date that the product should be used by', but failed to understand that eating it after that date could lead to food poisoning; 'best before 07/09/06' – this was not fully understood. Many failed to note that the product can be eaten after this date.

(c) (i) and (ii) Candidates often referred to food 'going off' instead of stating 'food poisoning'. Candidates are not fully aware of the legal requirements of date marking. Many candidates rewrote the previous answer, without relating it to the target group and failed to score full marks.

Question 5

(a) Most candidates could give an accurate answer by naming frozen pastry or pastry in the form of a ready made component.

(b) Accurate temperatures were rarely given except for 5C for a bag of grated cheese. Many candidates gave the storage area and not the temperature as asked for in the question.

(c) Some candidates simply repeated the word 'consistent' from the question without explaining more fully. Better answers noted the use of shape, colour, quality and sensory qualities.

Question 6

(a) (i) For the cause, most candidates scored full marks.

(ii) For the prevention of the problem most candidates scored full mark. Some answers, though, were often simply the opposite of the answer given in part (i), rather than a reasoned answer.

(b) (i) The cause of contamination was correctly answered by virtually all candidates.

(ii) Most candidates could not give an extended answer to explain the prevention of the contamination. Few candidates could identify the correct answer for the ph test and failed to achieve full marks.

(c) Most candidates could give simplistic answers to gain full marks.

(d) Colour code chopping boards were correctly identified for the different ingredients / products, but some candidates failed to give 'raw' meat or 'cooked' meat. Some candidates did not refer to cross-contamination, but were given credit for showing understanding that bacteria can be transferred.

Question 7

A high number of candidates gained a good mark here, but several misunderstood the whole of the question with reference to nutritional and cultural needs. Credit was given for product development in terms of surveys, questionnaires and sensory testing. Knowledge of nutrients and the function of them was less in evidence. Most candidates showed a lack of structure within their answer.

Short Course Foundation Tier

Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to identify three different types of savoury food products to be held in the hand.

(b) The majority of candidates correctly identified two factors affecting the food choice of both sports people and spectators, but answers were very simplistic referring to 'energy' needed in the most part, or 'healthy' foods.

Question 2

(a) Some candidates misinterpreted this question and discussed packaging and labelling information, rather than thinking about taste, shapes of pasta used, sauces made to accompany pasta and portion size.

(b) It was encouraging to see that most candidates were able to give three items that could be found on the information on the packaging of a pasta salad product, although a few focussed purely on the packaging, rather than on the information found on it.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates were able to sketch two different design ideas reflecting the criteria given at the beginning of the question. However, there were some that sketched products without a pastry casing or a sweet filling and they were not able to gain maximum marks. Annotation around the sketch still varies considerably but, where it was included, it helped the examiner to fully appreciate the idea drawn.

(b) (i) Candidates correctly identified the reasons why their product was suitable to be held in the hand, with many answers referring to the size of the product, the fact that the pastry would hold the filling in and that the filling would not be runny.

(ii) This answer was not completed as well as the first part of the question, with responses being vague and simplistic. Some candidates did mention the popularity of ingredients, the use of vegetarian alternatives or food products being used from other cultures, but did not go on to qualify or extend their answers, which would have gained more marks.

(c) Most candidates were able to identify two of the main ingredients for their chosen filling. Popular answers referred to 'adding colour' or 'to give flavour'. Unfortunately, there were some who included the pastry as one of their ingredients, rather than the filling items.

(d) Most candidates attempted this part of the question and used the flow chart boxes to guide their method logically. The majority managed to achieve a fairly simple method of making for their product, but it was evident that a large number of pupils did not have a thorough knowledge of the method – omitting cooking temperatures, cooking or cooling times and precise details that would have gained the higher marks. Candidates who had used the Preparation Sheet to help them were able to write a logical, precise method, including control checks, personal and kitchen hygiene points and were able to access the higher marks.

(e) Typical answers involved the use of egg as a glazing agent, decorations using pastry or items of equipment, such as a fork. Most candidates were able to achieve marks on this question.

Question 4

(a) (i) Control checks used when rolling out dough for scones were generally known, with common answers relating to the need for consistent sizes and shapes, as well as the need for cleanliness of equipment.

(ii) Candidates also were able to identify well the control checks needed when preparing strips of vegetables for a sweet and sour sauce, with most gaining full marks.

(iii) Responses for this part of the question were vague, with few candidates able to give precise answers regarding reheating temperatures and times. While a number of answers referred to heating 'thoroughly' or until 'piping hot', very few candidates were able to give accurate temperatures.

(b) A large percentage of candidates correctly answered that computers were more 'accurate' and 'reliable' than humans and some did explain that computers are able to carry out some checks that a human cannot do, for example, detecting metal.

Question 5

(a) (i) This question was well-answered, with most candidates gaining maximum marks. Most were able to explain the reasons why consumers may not like the dish. Common answers related to nut allergies, dislike of spicy food, meat not being suitable for vegetarians, the fat content, and the overall proportion of ingredients being unsuitable for people's tastes.

(ii) This was poorly answered, with very few candidates managing to describe a method of sensory testing. Many candidates wrote the answer 'questionnaire', but gave no details of how a questionnaire might be used in conjunction with a tasting session. Explanations of how a star profile test may be carried out were vague, with few candidates actually giving a full answer.

(b) (i) and (ii) Most candidates correctly identified the meaning of the two pieces of information which would be found on a label. Some reasons given for the importance of the information were vague and it is still disappointing to see so many candidates using the expression 'the food will go off' instead of referring to 'food will be unsafe to eat'. Similarly, responses referring to 'suitable for vegetarians' did not always explain why it would be suitable, i.e. the product will not contain any animal foods.

(c) (i) Many candidates did not relate their answers directly to the properties of paperboard, but gave generic reasons for packaging any product like protecting, containing etcetera. While marks were awarded for these answers, it would be good to see candidates being able to link certain properties with specific packaging materials.

(ii) Most answers referred to the fact that aluminium foil can be easily moulded and that it is light. Again, some responses referred to general functions of all packaging materials, rather than specific properties of the foil.

Question 6

(a) (i) and (ii) Although answers were generally very simplistic, candidates were able to access maximum marks on this question and correctly identified the causes of the problems during the production of the pies. Similarly, they also demonstrated simple knowledge of how to try to prevent the fault from arising.

(b) (i) Candidates who had worked with the Preparation Sheet on the lead-up to the examination were all able to correctly identify the functions of the ingredients used in pastry making. Virtually all were able to connect salt with 'flavour', but few were able to link fat with 'shortening' or 'giving texture'. Common answers for the vegetable fat were 'to give colour' and 'to give moisture'.

(ii) Many candidates produced incorrect answers for this question. Common answers were 'in the order you add them to the product' and 'they are written in a list'. Few correctly mentioned the order in which the ingredients have to be listed or that it is a legal requirement.

(c) (i) Some candidates identified 'frozen' or 'refrigerated', but some misread the question and said 'ready-made' or 'fresh' which gained no marks.

(ii) Only a few candidates were able to extend or qualify their answers to gain maximum marks. A typical answer was 'it is cheaper', with the candidate not going on to explain how it could be cheaper than buying all the pastry ingredients separately.

Question 7

(a) The majority of candidates were able to describe the possibility of cross contamination occurring if the same boards and knives are used for meat and other food items. Answers were quite basic but did show an awareness of the importance of using colour coded equipment in food preparation.

(b) Answers were general, with few candidates identifying fridge and freezer temperatures. Typical responses referred to 'keeping it cold enough' or 'keeping it at the right temperature'. Candidates were able to give very general answers on keeping food in a fridge safely, keeping raw meats at the bottom , keeping food covered, but only a few showed a real understanding of how freezers and refrigerators can be used to help to store food safely.

Coursework

Introduction

The hard work, which teachers and candidates have put into this GCSE Design and Technology (Food Technology) course, must be recognised. The level of challenge and the quality of work seen in many centres showed a progressive and demanding approach.

Administration and Documentation

In general, centres' administration was good, following the instructions and advice given correctly. There continue to be, however, areas in which some centres could improve, which are as follows.

- very late submission of Centre Mark Sheets.
- very late return of sample, after the request from the moderator.
- still considerable number of matrix errors.
- telephone calls to centres by moderators took a lot of time and even then did not result in prompt action.
- centres with twenty or fewer candidates entered for either / or the Full Course or the Short Course did not always send the folders of all of their candidates with the Centre Mark Sheets to the moderator.
- some centres only sent the second (pink) copy of Centre Mark Sheets to the moderator, making it necessary for the moderator to photocopy the sheet on which they identified the sample, before returning it to the centres – this slowed up the process.

The following points are intended to give a view of some of the positive aspects of candidates' coursework and also some areas for development.

Standards

- Centres have used and referred to AQA exemplar materials well.
- Internal standardisation had, in the majority of cases, been done well.
- There was more evidence this year of centre marks being adjusted upwards.
- Some centres are marking low ability candidates severely. For example, in a number of centres the very bottom candidate had been given an exceptionally low grade for making when there was evidence in the folder and teacher annotation for at least two products having been made.
- The LU grade is still being used.
- Over rewarding 'making' often resulted in centres not meeting the AQA standard.
- At the top and the bottom ends of the mark range, QWC is often marked either too severely or too leniently.

Folders

- Generally the quantity of work in folders has reduced. However, some candidates still continue to produce too much research and often simply copy large quantities of theoretical information from textbooks, rather than applying the information to their work.
- Some excellent use of ICT has been seen.
- The quality of the presentation of work is variable. Some candidates are using the space on pages well, while others use large fonts for writing and leave very large areas of pages unused.
- This year has seen an increase in the use of 'writing frames'. In many cases this has been done successfully; however, in some centres this has led to a very prescriptive approach with more able candidates not being sufficiently challenged. These candidates have not, therefore, been able to achieve their potential.
- Where candidates demonstrate their thought process, work is usually satisfactory at least and provides clear evidence of the design process. Where candidates are unclear of the process, they rarely produce a folder which 'tells the story' of their designing and making.
- There are often gaps in the folders of middle ability candidates or the folder comes to an abrupt end. With more attention to these areas, candidates could improve their grades.
- There needs to be evidence in folders which demonstrates how decisions have been made about the design and production of a food product. Decision-making is a vital part of the process and should be the result of good research and evaluation.
- Although photographic evidence in folders is not an AQA requirement there has been a significant increase in the use of photographs. These are extremely helpful for the moderation process. Many of the images were included at relevant points in the process of making and were not just included as evidence of the end product. This is good practice.

Objectives / Knowledge and Understanding

The Specification states that:

'Candidates should be able to demonstrate their design and technology capability through acquiring and applying knowledge, skills and understanding:

a. of materials, components, processes, techniques and industrial practice;

b. when designing and making quality products in quantity;

c. when evaluating processes and products and examining the wider effects of design and technology on society.'

These aspects should be evident in the work which candidates produce.

Design Briefs

- There was more evidence this year of centres devising their own design briefs, which was very refreshing.
- Some centres still continue to give very long and indirect design briefs causing confusion and resulting in candidates producing a lot of unnecessary research. Design briefs should be appropriate and realistic.
- Some candidates were not clear about the design brief and began their work by saying 'I am going to do a topic on...', 'For my Home Economics project I am going to do…', 'I have been told to…', 'I am going to make…', or even 'we were told to…'
- All centres have been provided with the contact details of their Coursework Adviser. If centres would like advice or guidance on the coursework component, then they should not hesitate to contact their Adviser.

Research and Analysis

- This continues to be a weak area.
- Where candidates had gathered large amounts of research, the result was often that they lost sight of the information they had gathered.
- There is still a real need to ensure that research is relevant and that candidates make use of what they already know. Summaries of findings are required, rather than vast quantities of facts which they neither require nor use.
- In many cases nutritional information was vast and clearly not understood or applied. There continues to be a lack of use of software for nutritional analysis in some centres.
- Often all research was front loaded. For example, at the beginning of folders there would be information on packaging, ingredients, manufacturing processes, HACCP, labelling etcetera. Research needs to be done at the relevant point in the process.
- Analysis of research is crucial to the writing of design criteria and generation of ideas. When candidates have spent so long and completed so many pages on research they gain little credit if they do not analyse their findings. In some cases, candidates seem to feel they have to summarise how useful the methods are, rather than providing a summary of the information which they have gathered.

Mood Boards

- There seems to have been a proliferation of these this year.
- A mood board can be useful in stimulating design ideas providing the candidate annotates the pictures and comments on how this montage will help in getting ideas.
- All too often the mood board is just appearing at no particular point in the process. In these cases, there is often no annotation and no evidence of how this has informed the thought process or the ideas. This activity has, therefore, been a waste of time and a waste of space.

Making

- Overall the quantity of making has increased.
- More able students were producing excellent production plans.
- There was some outstanding work in terms of quality of outcomes from some centres. However, in too many centres there continues to be a lack of challenge in the products which are made. This applies across the whole ability range.
- Some centres continue to spend too little time on 'making' – for a forty hour project with 'making' carrying a weighting of two thirds of the final project mark it would be appropriate to devote **at least** half the project time to making (please note that this is intended as a guide and is **not** a Specification requirement).

- Candidates are providing evidence of 'making' in the following ways:

    - using existing recipes to make products at the research stage
    - carrying out product analysis – this is a very good way to show making, provided that the product is relevant and the activity takes place at the appropriate point in the process
    - making stand-alone recipes as design ideas
    - carrying out developments of their chosen idea
    - carrying out storage tests at various stages of the development
    - making the final developed idea
    - organising and using sensory evaluation
    - using standard components at the manufacturing stage to mirror what happens in industry
    - providing photographic evidence of the process and the outcomes in folders
    - recording making activities in folders.

Development

- Although centres are getting to grips with the idea of developing a product, there are still issues relating to development.
- Food is a material which provides many opportunities for changing, adapting, substituting, altering proportions, using different methods, comparing, altering cooking methods, trying out different storage methods, producing different finishes, etcetera.
- Although there has been more evidence of development this year, the vast majority of 'development' seen by moderators has been modification, with the quantity of development being minimal. Higher ability candidates must produce significant evidence of development. The type of development should be challenging and complex.
- Candidates should be encouraged to carry out small-scale investigations and experiments where several small samples are compared against each other; for example, different types of pastry made and shaped to find the best casing for a savoury product. Candidates might compare shortcrust, filo, own made puff pastry and standard component puff pastry etcetera.
- For average ability candidates there should be some evidence of modifying and changing.
- For lower ability candidates, development is likely to be weak or not done.

Candidate Record Forms (CRFs)

- The majority of centres have used the correct Candidate Record Form, which now provides the opportunity for assessing different aspects of 'making' before coming to a final judgement.
- The 'making box' has been completed well and gives a clear view of the quantity of making which has taken place (it is easier to get this view when the making list is completed by the teacher and not the candidate!).
- The majority of teachers are supplying annotation of making.
- Annotation is most helpful when:

    - teachers give specific comments not general ones
    - different information to what is already written in the assessment criteria is provided
    - reference is made to work in the folders
    - words like excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, poor, very poor are used
    - teachers use comments indicating aspects about individual products and giving a qualitative view of each product
    - quality of specific methods, skills are given
    - information about the quality of the sensory testing is provided, saying how the candidate used this information.

Recommendations

- Provide exemplar material to show how the thought process can be explained.
- Ensure that candidates have a short direct design brief which is evident at the beginning of the folder.
- Restrict research at the beginning of the project to no more than three sides of A3 paper.
- Insist on a range of research which is relevant and not irrelevant research methods.
- Ensure all research is analysed.
- Check that candidates understand the importance of design criteria.
- Teach candidates to generate ideas from design criteria and evaluate the suitability of these ideas against the criteria.
- Omit time plans for each idea.
- Ensure sensory testing is rigorous and fair.
- Try to incorporate methods of sensory testing other than star profiles (candidates will call them star diagrams when in fact they are product profiles).
- Make sure that the final idea for development arises as a result of evaluation of ideas.
- Encourage more able candidates to carry out challenging complex development.
- Include further research as and when it is required.
- Apply knowledge and understanding of manufacturing methods, packaging materials and labelling requirements to the developed product **not** lots of general copied notes from books.
- Produce a plan for making / manufacture of the developed product and evidence of a specific HACCP procedure and Quality Control for that product.
- Omit a final evaluation but ensure candidates include evaluations as they proceed in order to justify their decisions.
- Encourage candidates to provide more evidence of social, moral and environmental issues.
- When completing the making box on the CRF give sufficient detail and clarity: for example, what does ‘used gelatine’ mean?

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3542/F	125	140	76.6	23.0
3542/C	95	210	125.8	34.7
Foundation tier overall 3542	--	350	202.6	49.2

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3542/F boundary mark	raw	125	97	82	67	52	37
	scaled	140	109	92	75	58	41
3542/C boundary mark	raw	95	60	47	35	23	11
	scaled	210	133	104	77	51	24
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		350	229	189	149	109	69

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3542/H	125	140	87.2	18.6
3542/C	95	210	179.5	24.5
Higher tier overall 3542	--	350	266.7	37.3

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3542/H boundary mark	raw	125	104	95	86	77	57	-
	scaled	140	116	106	96	86	64	-
3542/C boundary mark	raw	95	95	83	71	60	47	-
	scaled	210	210	183	157	133	104	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		350	316	284	251	219	168	142

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation Tier (30525 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	32.4	62.8	81.2	91.5	97.0

Higher tier (27430 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	8.0	35.9	68.4	89.7	98.8	99.4

Overall (57995 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	3.8	17.0	32.4	59.6	79.8	89.8	95.3	98.1

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3552/F	100	120	69.2	20.0
3552/C	95	180	102.8	28.9
Foundation tier overall 3552	--	300	172.3	41.0

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3552/F boundary mark	raw	100	71	60	49	39	29
	scaled	120	85	72	59	47	35
3552/C boundary mark	raw	95	60	48	36	24	12
	scaled	180	114	91	68	45	23
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		300	194	160	126	92	58

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3552/H	100	120	91.1	13.0
3552/C	95	180	152.0	22.7
Higher tier overall 3552	--	300	243.5	30.9

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3552/H boundary mark	raw	100	91	84	77	71	61	-
	scaled	120	109	101	92	85	73	-
3552/C boundary mark	raw	95	95	84	72	60	48	-
	scaled	180	180	159	136	114	91	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		300	290	259	229	199	164	146

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (477 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	33.3	61.8	82.2	92.5	98.3

Higher tier (497 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	2.6	36.4	71.2	90.5	97.8	98.6

Overall (974 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	1.3	18.6	36.3	62.5	80.2	90.6	65.6	98.5

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade. Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend only on their total marks for the subject.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled)