

GCSE

Design and Technology: Food Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J302**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

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

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A521 Introduction to designing and making	4
A523 Making quality products	9
A525 Sustainability and technical aspects of designing and making	13

A521 Introduction to designing and making

General Comments

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

The majority of portfolios are now organised into the separate sections as required by the assessment criteria. There was less evidence this year of work being sent in hard backed folders, plastic wallets etc.

Marking of the portfolios for many centres was within the national agreed standards, consequently, marking tended to be more realistic and of a consistent standard, resulting in very few large adjustments this year.

Where Centres had marked leniently, the portfolios did not show the depth and detail required for the high marks awarded. Words such as 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical' which appear in the top mark band, were not truly adhered to. Some candidates also continue to choose products that show little or no skills or only allow them to show limited skills, yet high marks are still awarded.

Most candidates are adapting/modifying recipes during the Designing section of the portfolio, but ideas are not always clearly explained and are often not creative.

Work which is annotated by the teacher clearly helps the moderation process. Many centres had done this particularly well but some are still failing to submit this evidence with the work. There should be photographic evidence of the practical work along with written teacher comments. This is particularly important for the low attaining candidates where there is little written evidence in their portfolio. **A separate cover sheet containing reference to the assessment criteria applied is required by OCR.**

Writing frames and pre-printed sheets are still being used by too many Centres. For example, candidates use the same IT generated forms for aspects such as evaluating design ideas against the specification. Using these prompt sheets often prevents candidates, the opportunity to show individuality, flair and creativity when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

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

Assessment Criteria

The level of response is an important part of the mark scheme and should be carefully considered when assessing candidates work. Within an Assessment Criteria the quality of evidence to fulfil a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfil a similar level of response at a higher level. The capability and depth of involvement must be evident to gain the marks at the higher level.

The vast majority of Centres are now encouraging candidates to clearly label the chosen Theme/Product and the starting point at the start of the portfolio. Candidates should develop a new product that meets an identified aspect of current healthy eating guidelines.

Cultural Understanding

- A number of Centres continue to be over generous when marking this section because of lack of independent analysis.
- Information on cultural understanding and healthy lifestyles needs to be clearly linked to the chosen theme if high marks are awarded. There are still quite a few Centres who continue to award high marks when this linkage is not apparent. A number of candidates are using the eat-well plate to highlight current healthy eating recommendations, but poor or no real conclusions are drawn. Information also needs to be presented concisely.
- If mind maps are used to present information, ideas need to be developed to show the candidate's individual understanding of the various issues raised, if high marks are awarded. An increased number of candidates are using mind maps to present their work without any explanation.
- The majority of candidates are now acknowledging sources of information.

A high level of response to this section would include:

- **Chosen product/theme and starting point clearly stated at the start of the portfolio.**
- **Considering how changes in society, including cultural issues have influenced the range of food products available today in relation to their chosen product/theme.**
- **Evidence of how wise choice of food products can promote healthy lifestyles.**
- **Information being presented concisely and the sources acknowledged.**

Creativity

- Questionnaires remain the main method used to identify the needs of the user/target group/a nutritional focus. However, many **questionnaires** still include irrelevant or generic questions which are of little use to the task in hand. The good questionnaires are related to their 'starting point' and have a clear aim of what they wish to establish/find out. Many questionnaires miss out on this opportunity because they ask questions which are general e.g. Are you a vegetarian, which vegetables do you eat?
- In some portfolios the Design Brief did not arise from research findings and some Centres are still crediting candidates with full marks when there is little supportive evidence for the choice of the design brief and when a precise design brief had not been given. The Design Brief/Design Specification should include 1 nutritional focus so candidates can show greater understanding and application of nutritional knowledge. Where candidates had focused on a number of nutritional aspects, the application of nutritional analysis and knowledge was very superficial. Candidates' are required to justify their choice of target group and/or nutritional focus.
- Questionnaires that lacked focus did not allow candidates to identify the qualities respondents require from a new product which resulted in existing products not being evaluated against identified needs and the design brief and the design specification at the beginning of the Designing Section not being developed from analysis of the research. A number of Centres continue to credit candidates with high marks when the analysis of the questionnaire results, is very superficial.
- Evaluation of existing products remains the main weakest area. Some candidates do not use their identified needs, whilst others use pro formas with the same identified needs throughout the Centre. In some Centres, existing products chosen by the candidates are not always related to the chosen Theme. Most candidates had evaluated 4 products in the form of a table and provided evidence of some conclusions. However, too often the conclusions were very superficial and showed lack of understanding. Evaluation of 1 product in detail is now evident in candidates' portfolios. Some candidates continue to offer very limited and superficial comments when evaluating, others tend to describe the product rather than evaluate it.

- Identifying and recording data is evident in many portfolios, but in others this continues to be omitted but candidates are being awarded full marks for creativity. Candidates need to make sure that the data given is relevant to the design brief/design specification.

A high level of response to this section would include:

- **Carrying out research e.g. questionnaires/interviews/available statistical data to identify the qualities required for the design of a creative, innovative food product/target group/a nutritional focus that the portfolio will focus on;**
- **Providing a detailed analysis of the results in order to identify the needs of the user/target group/nutritional focus which then leads to a clear and precise design brief;**
- **A design brief that includes 1 nutritional focus.**
- *Example of a concise and precise design brief: - Design and make a lower in fat ready meal aimed at families.*
- **Critically evaluating existing products against the needs of the intended user(s) – 4 products in chart form with a conclusion and 1 product in detail;**
- **Relevant data which is edited and presented concisely. All sources of information should be acknowledged**
- Weaker candidates tended to make very little reference to results of research resulting in rather vague briefs and superficial evaluation of existing products. This would be regarded as a low level of response.

Designing

- In some portfolios, Design Specifications are not linked to prior research. A number of candidates still list several nutritional needs and often then fail to discuss them all in the follow on work.
- The use of proforma sheets for the planning and evaluating of products limited candidates' creativity and initiative and tended to result in repetitive responses. Proforma sheets for this section of the portfolio were still far too evident this year.
- Some candidates continue to choose products that show little or no skills or only allow them to show the same skills.
- Most candidates chose 4 products to trial and showed adaptations/modifications to the original recipes. However, adaptations/modifications although recorded were not always explained and in many centres lacked creativity.
- Often adaptations are very simple and too many candidates are still focussing on changing ingredients just in terms of the nutritional focus rather than applying other ways of adapting products.
- Most candidates had listed the practical skills required for the making of each product
- Equipment lists, methods, time plans or flowcharts are not required for this section yet quire a number of candidates are still including these in their portfolio.
- Some candidates had trialled and tested a wide range of interesting solutions. There was good evidence of star diagrams/profiles and rating charts but marks were lost if these results were not always explained or conclusions drawn. Candidates that produced high level work linked their sensory descriptors to their identified needs rather than using generic sensory taste descriptors like flavour, texture.
- Detailed evaluations of ideas against the specification, continues to be the weakest area in this section for many candidates. Evaluations were often cursory with only a ticked chart and this cannot be considered a detailed evaluation. Some candidates had evaluated each solution but then failed to make any reference to the specification. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating, tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. However, the majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.
- Most candidates carry out nutritional analysis using an appropriate computer programme but a significant number still fail to refer to the data with regard to their nutritional focus, or state this is an area that needs to be improved upon. If high marks are to be awarded to this section, candidates need to show application of their nutritional data when evaluating each product.

- Reasoned decisions re ingredients and equipment for the final product (prototype) in many Centres, was well done but some candidates failed to apply relevant nutritional data according to their nutritional focus when giving reasoned decisions. Too many centres are awarding high level responses for nutritional knowledge in the making section, when there was little evidence of independent analysis in relation to the candidates' nutritional focus in both the trialling work and when giving decisions relating to the final product (prototype).
- Some candidates are still including reasons for choosing final product idea and rejecting the remaining ideas, which is not required in Unit A521. Marks for the application and understanding of nutritional knowledge according to the chosen nutritional focus are awarded to the Making Section.

A high level response to this section would involve:

- **A detailed design specification reflecting research findings from the Creativity section of the portfolio**
- **Proposing a wide range of appropriate solutions – listing a range of ideas before choosing 4 ideas to trial.**
- **For each product to be trialled – listing ingredients and practical skills, adaptations clearly explained and justified to produce creative and innovative ideas, nutritional analysis according to the chosen nutritional focus, evidence of testing by 3 tasters, detailed evaluation against the specification, and nutritional focus using results from testers as evidence, discussion of improvements taking into account users views.**
- **Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.**
- **Giving reasoned decisions for ingredients, equipment for the final product (prototype), applying relevant nutritional knowledge and understanding**

Making

- Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but some Centres continue to credit candidates with high marks without evidence of this range of skills. Too many candidates are still producing products that only show repetitive skills. These candidates cannot be awarded high marks for practical skills. There was more evidence this year of centres limiting the range of products candidates could choose to make. Candidates should be allowed to research and choose their products.
- The use of digital cameras allowed candidates to include photographs of their work. Centres are reminded the minimum requirement is a photograph of the final product.
- In many Centres, flowcharts had been correctly marked and candidates had clearly identified the processes involved. Nutritional analysis of the final product was evident in many candidates' portfolios but was not always applied.
- To achieve high marks for practical work candidates need to select and use appropriate ingredients and equipment, work safely, hygienically, skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills) and produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes.

A high level response to this section would be:

- **Producing a detailed flowchart which clearly shows all process required for the making of the final product (prototype)**
- **Showing thorough understanding and application of the chosen nutritional focus throughout the portfolio**
- **Being resourceful and adaptable with materials, foods and equipment.**
- **Selecting and using appropriate ingredients and equipment**
- **Working safely, hygienically, skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills)**
- **Produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes**

Evaluation

- Many candidates provided evidence of testing of the final product (prototype) but conclusions, were often superficial and unsupported, resulting in the evaluations being descriptive rather than evaluative. Some candidates do not use tasters comments when suggesting ideas for future developments.
- Comments when evaluating against the design specification continue to lack specific detail, stating the product had met the specification without any justification.
- Centres had given credit for spelling, punctuation and grammar when a final evaluation was evident. However, in a few Centres, when candidates had not completed an evaluation, no marks had been awarded for SPG. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluations for SPG even if there is no evidence of an evaluation

A high level of response to this section would be:

- **Critically evaluating their product against the design specification and design brief using results of testing (5 testers) to give meaningful conclusions.**
- **Suggesting possible improvements**
- **Using specialist terms appropriately and correctly, presenting information in a structured format and accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.**

A523 Making quality products

Assessment Criteria

The level of response is an important part of the mark scheme and should be carefully considered when assessing candidates' work. The levels should equate to the quality of the evidence, the capability and depth of involvement that has been employed to produce what is on offer. Within an Assessment Criteria the quality of evidence to fulfil a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfil a similar level of response at a higher level. The capability and depth of involvement must be evident to gain the marks at the higher level.

Most candidates are now clearly stating the chosen Theme/Product at the start of the portfolio.

Designing

- Most candidates had stated a design brief which included a target group. Design briefs are usually concise.
- The chosen theme and design brief should be analysed carefully so candidates can arrive at an appropriate design specification for a creative and innovative product which includes a target group. The quality of design specifications continues to vary widely. Some candidates produced very detailed design specifications which linked with the chosen theme and design brief, whilst other design specifications were far too brief and in some cases, tended to be teacher led. It was noted by some moderators this year that some specifications did not include a target group. The design specification should be structured to allow candidates to demonstrate a wide range of practical skills. A few centres are still encouraging the candidates to carry out questionnaires, research, evaluation of existing products etc. This is not a requirement for Unit A523.
- The forward plan in many candidates' portfolios is now showing the level of detail required to achieve high marks. However a number of candidates are still producing a plan that fails to name the products to be trialled and there are still a few candidates who produce the plan retrospectively. Some centres are encouraging their candidates to produce a forward plan for all the work. The forward plan is only required for the designing section of the portfolio.
- Some candidates continue to choose products that showed little or no skills or only allowed them to show the same skills.
- Most candidates chose 4 products to trial. The level of creativity varies widely. In some centres candidates are now designing and making really creative ideas whilst in others changes/modifications to recipes/ideas are very limited e.g. changing the shape, adding or removing a flavour - ideas that lack originality. In a few candidates' portfolios there was no evidence of any modifications. Explanation of the changes/modifications also varies. Some candidates give clear detailed comments about the changes to be made, whilst others produce evidence that is brief and very superficial and sometimes it is difficult to identify the changes that have been made. However, overall, the level of creativity continues to improve.
- Some candidates had trialled and tested a wide range of interesting solutions. There was good evidence of star diagrams/profiles and rating charts but marks were lost if these results were not always explained or conclusions drawn.
- Detailed evaluations of ideas against the specification continues to be the weakest area in this section for many candidates. Evaluations were often cursory with only a ticked chart and this cannot be considered a detailed evaluation. A few candidates had evaluated each solution but failed to make any reference to the specification. In some portfolios, comments given when evaluating, tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative. Detailed evaluations were often very repetitive. The majority of candidates did suggest improvements to their products.

- A few candidates had included nutritional analysis in their portfolio when nutrition did not form part of their design brief and or specification. Others included a nutritional focus in their specification but this was then forgotten as the portfolio developed.
- Choice of the design proposal overall, continued to be done well done by many candidates. Candidates had clearly explained why the chosen design idea was being taken forward for product development and why other ideas had been rejected.

A high level response to this section would involve:

- **A design brief which is clear and concise and includes a target group.**
- **The chosen theme and design brief being analysed carefully to arrive at an appropriate design specification which includes a target group.**
- **Proposing a wide range of appropriate solutions – listing a range of ideas before choosing 4 ideas to trial.**
- **Producing a detailed forward plan for the designing section of the portfolio.**
- **For each product to be trialled – listing ingredients, adaptations clearly explained and justified to produce creative and innovative ideas. Nutritional analysis if this forms part of the design brief/specification, evidence of testing by 3 tasters, detailed evaluation against the specification, using results from testers as evidence, discussion of improvements taking into account users views.**
- **A design proposal at the completion of the designing section clearly explaining why the chosen design ideas is being taken forward to product development and why other ideas have been rejected.**
- **Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.**

Making

- Product development has improved this year but still remains an area that is over marked. Some candidates do not make reference to the comments made when the product was originally trialled and further modifications are not always justified. Suggestions for further developments do not reflect comments made by testers, from the previous modifications, so the product is not being developed according to user(s) views. There was some evidence of evaluation of each development in many candidates' portfolios but too often this failed to include how effective the changes had been. There was less evidence this year of candidates planning modifications in advance rather than letting the product develop according to taste/testers views. Lack of creativity was also evident in some portfolios.
 - Costing of ingredients was evident in many candidates' portfolios. Costing is only required throughout development work and the final product. In a few cases, there was evidence of costing of individual ingredients but candidates failed to calculate the total cost of the product. In other portfolios, individual ingredients had been costed but there was no total cost of the product. A number of moderators commented that there was more evidence of inaccurate costing this year.
 - Reasoned decisions, re ingredients and equipment for the final product was well done.
 - Product Specifications were still disappointing this year. Many Centres appear to be encouraging their candidates to copy or add a few points or diagram to their design specification and then awarding high marks. Product specifications of a high standard were detailed and clearly reflected the results from development.
 - The flowchart/plan of action for the final product was generally well done.
 - Some candidates produced products that demonstrated a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that a few centres continue to credit candidates with high marks without evidence of this range of skills.
 - The use of digital cameras allowed candidates to include photographs of their work. Centres are reminded the minimum requirement is a photograph of the final product.
- A high level response to this section would be:**

- **Carrying out 2 modifications before deciding on their final product. Modifications should take place as the product develops and each modification should be clearly explained and evaluated in detail. The first modification should show reference to the comments made when the product was originally trialled. All further modifications should be justified, reflecting comments made by 5 testers from the previous modification so the product is being developed according to user(s) views.**
- **Giving reasoned decisions for ingredients, equipment for the final product, applying relevant**
- **nutritional knowledge and understanding if this forms part of the design brief/specification.**
- **Designing a detailed product specification which should arise from the design specification and conclusions reached from development work including a labelled sketch/drawing of the final product.**
- **Producing a detailed flowchart which clearly shows all process required for the making of the final product**
- **Showing thorough understanding and application of the chosen nutritional focus, if this forms part of the design brief/specification**
- **Being resourceful and adaptable with materials, foods and equipment.**
- **Selecting and using appropriate ingredients and equipment**
- **Working safely, hygienically, skilfully to prepare, shape, form, mix, assemble (wide range of skills)**
- **Produce high quality, creative and innovative outcomes**

Evaluation

- Evaluations were again rather disappointing this year.
- Some candidates provided evidence of testing of the final product but conclusions, were often superficial and unsupported, resulting in the evaluations being descriptive rather than evaluative. Some candidates do not use tasters comments when suggesting ideas for future developments.
- Many candidates still continue to evaluate the final product against the design specification rather than the product specification, often resulting in the work being a repetition of the evaluation when the product was originally trialled.
- Comments when evaluating often lacked specific detail, stating the product had met the specification without any justification.
- The majority of candidates had suggested how the final product could be improved, but comments made were not always based on results from testing or on the conclusions reached when evaluating against the product specification.
- A few centres did not give credit for spelling punctuation and grammar. Credit needs to be given in the Evaluations for SPG even if there is no evidence of an evaluation

A high level of response to this section would be:

- **Critically evaluating their product against the product specification using results of testing (5 testers) to give meaningful conclusions.**
- **Suggesting possible improvements**
- **Using specialist terms appropriately and correctly, presenting information in a structured format and accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.**

GOOD PRACTICE WITHIN ADMINISTRATION OF THE CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

1. Work should be removed from ring binders, presented so that pages can be turned without having to remove sheets from plastic wallets and securely fastened together e.g. by means of a tag, then clearly labelled with Centre Number, Name and Candidate Number. Mark sheet/annotation sheet should be attached to each piece of work.
2. The Controlled Assessment Mark Sheet(s) should be sent to the Moderator with the MS1. Centres need to make sure that this paperwork arrives to the Moderator by the date specified by OCR and portfolios should be sent within 3 days of receipt of the request for the sample.
3. Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Criteria.
4. Where more than 1 teacher is involved in the assessing of candidates' work, the centre should carry out effective internal standardisation to ensure a reliable rank order.

A525 Sustainability and technical aspects of designing and making

General Comments:

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

It was notable that the responses to the design question (Q17d) were significantly better than in the previous year and the legacy papers. Candidates addressed all the specification points and many of the designs were creative and innovative.

It was clear to see that many candidates had practised writing extended answers. Some candidates made plans / wrote key words before starting these questions and therefore wrote clearly and answered the question in detail.

Some candidates did not give sufficient detail in their responses particularly in those questions where candidates had to describe or explain their ideas. Candidates must be encouraged to take notice of the key word in the stem of the question to identify whether the question requires them to explain, describe, discuss, state, name or give. Candidates need to do as the question asks, there were occasions when candidates were asked for one response, they gave several and not all the answers were correct. This scatter gun approach meant that some candidates failed to score mark. Examples of this were seen in questions 9, 17a(ii) and 17a(v).

In section A many candidates demonstrated a general awareness of the main points and issues linked to sustainable design, however they lacked the specific knowledge and understanding required to answer questions in depth. This was particularly noticeable in questions 16d and 16f. Some candidates still make very vague comments e.g. 'better for the environment', 'environmentally friendly' which do not score marks.

Candidates' written English still causes concern and deciphering responses was sometimes very difficult on low scoring papers. Many candidates did use the additional pages at the end of the examination paper. It was noticeable that where extra paper was required or candidates used the extra pages at the back of the booklet to continue a question response, many candidates did not reference the question number on the extra page / sheets used. It is important that Centres instruct candidates how to highlight where they are continuing an answer on a different page in the examination script to ensure that examiners are clear where an answer continues on a separate page in order that the candidate's full response is considered.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

The majority of candidates answered this correctly, the most common incorrect answer was polystyrene

Question No. 2

Most candidates answered this correctly

Question No. 3

Many candidates did not know the correct answer, which was primary recycling.

Question No. 4

The majority of candidates correctly identified more fibre as the correct answer.

Question No. 5

Many candidates did not correctly identify Ethical Trading Initiative. Higher attaining candidates did identify this correctly.

Question No. 6

Many candidates answered question correctly, mainly stating gluten free / wheat free or suitable for coeliacs. Those who did not get this correct mainly identified 'wheat' and gave answers around that e.g. contains wheat, wholemeal.

Question No. 7

This question was well answered. Those who did not score had misread the question and suggested ways to recycle or materials the manufacturer should use that were recyclable.

Question No. 8

This question was correctly answered by the higher attaining candidates, however most referred to the addition of chemicals or stated 'don't know what is in them'. Very few candidates appeared to understand what is meant by genetically modified foods.

Question No. 9

The majority of candidates scored a mark by here naming a correct vegetable. Some did however name a fruit, indicating that candidates did not read the question properly or know the difference between a fruit and a vegetable.

Question No. 10

Those candidates who scored a mark mainly stated allergies or hyperactivity. There was a wide range of incorrect responses including, unhealthy, not organic, have more fat and sugar in, have chemicals in, not good for you, bad for you.

Question No. 11

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

Question No. 12

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

Question No. 13

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

Question No. 14

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

Question No. 15

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

Question No. 16a

The majority of candidates gained a mark for the correct storage of cooked meat. Those that had not read the question carefully stated 'at the bottom of the fridge' thinking it was fresh meat. Fewer candidates gained a mark for storage of scones. A wide range of different containers were listed.

Question No. 16b

This was well answered with majority scoring well in the top 4 boxes but less well in the bottom boxes where candidates left out ingredients that would be needed to make the product work e.g. listing biscuits for a cheesecake base but no butter / margarine or missing out a liquid to make a casserole. A substantial number of candidates named a cake as the dish but then proceeded to state they would use the stale cake to make it not realising they needed to list the cake ingredients in the bottom box.

Question No. 16c

There was a range of responses here with good responses referring to only buying what was needed and linking this to meal planning, making shopping lists, avoiding offers, checking cupboards before shopping and portion control. Composting suitable foods, donating foods to food banks and feeding animals were also frequent responses. Higher attaining candidates included references to use by dates and buying frozen foods.

There were still references to 'sell by dates' indicating a lack of understanding of date marking. Many included references to using leftovers which was not credited as the question asked them for ways other than reusing.

Question No. 16d

Most candidates scored at least one mark on this question. The majority of candidates identified supporting local farmers, fresher and reducing food miles / CO₂. Where candidates failed to give correct responses included they included responses such as, knows where it comes from, its organic, better for the environment, cheaper, don't have to travel far, can take it back easily.

Question No. 16e

The majority of candidates scored at least one mark. Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of religions with many correct responses for Hindus, Muslims and Jews. However many candidates repeated the question as their response and said 'persons culture affects what they eat' without saying how it does.

Question No. 16f

Most candidates scored one mark mainly for, fair pay and moral / ethical reasons. More able candidates were able to access the second mark often linking it to improved living / working conditions, and community projects. It was evident that this had not been taught in many centres.

Question No. 17a(i)

Virtually all candidates identified whole milk as the correct response.

Question No. 17a(ii)

The majority of candidates identified a correct function of fat in the diet. A wide range of correct responses were seen.

Question No. 17a(iii)

More able candidates were able to identify that vitamin D is a fat soluble vitamin and therefore was lower in low fat and semi skimmed milk.

Question No. 17a(iv)

The majority of candidates identified the correct answer.

Question No. 17a(v)

The majority of candidates scored one mark making reference to strong bones / teeth.

Question No. 17b

Most candidates gained a mark with the most common correct responses being soya milk, goats milk, almond milk, goats cheese. Higher attaining candidates gave examples from 2 different sources whilst others repeated goat or soya e.g. goats milk and goats cheese and therefore did not gain the second mark. Some candidates did not understand this question and simply listed cheese and yoghurt or stated food product such as pasta bake and curry. A few gave 'dairy free' as a response which again was not specific enough for a mark.

Question No. 17c

Many candidates did not answer the question correctly. The most frequent correct response was UHT with a few stating pasteurised, dried/powdered and canned. Many incorrectly stated freezing and storing in the refrigerator.

Question No. 17d

There were many very good sketched designs that were well annotated. The lack of two different textures being identified was the main reason for candidates missing out on a mark.

Question No. 18a

The majority of candidates scored for stating 'fruits and vegetables' but very few were able to give the correct response for the second mark. The vast majority just stated 'carbohydrates'.

Question No. 18b

The majority scored at least one mark. Most stated heart disease, obesity / overweight, and cholesterol levels. There was a noticeable decrease in the use of 'heart problems and heart attacks this year.

Question No. 18c

High scoring candidates identified the nutrients, their function and dietary source. Protein, calcium and iron were the three most frequently stated nutrients. There was however a good knowledge of the need for folic acid and its role in preventing spina bifida. Candidates also included references to the need for water to avoid dehydration, the importance of a balanced diet and the need to reduce fats, sugar and salt. However some candidates forget what is in the stem of the question and included information that was not relevant to the question e.g. reducing alcohol and avoiding unpasteurised cheeses. This does illustrate the need for candidates to identify the key words in the question and the importance of a brief plan. It was pleasing to see an increased number of candidates doing this.

Question No. 18d

A very well answered question, most candidates scored 2 marks for babies / children / elderly.

Question No. 18e

A very well answered question with nearly all scoring at least 2 marks and the majority scoring 3.

Question No. 19a

Candidates' responses to this question were disappointing and it was clear that they were not able to transfer knowledge from aspects of their practical work that they will have carried out throughout the course. Very few candidates gained two marks. The common correct responses were mainly the roux and all in one methods. Many confused cake making methods and stated whisking and creaming. Others listed processes such as frying, boiling, stirring.

Question No. 19b

The most able candidates were able to give very good detailed descriptions including the absorption of liquid by the starch, swelling, bursting and thickening. Many candidates mentioned the thickening of the sauce but failed to mention that heat was required for this to occur.

Question No. 19c

Many candidates answered this correctly with reference to preventing lumps and prevention of burning / sticking being the most frequent correct responses.

Question No. 19d

Responses to this question were disappointing. Some candidates had not read the question correctly and described the procedure for the preparation for making a product showing a lack of understanding of the subject of the question i.e. sensory analysis testing. Candidates who scored marks made reference to having clean equipment, water to cleanse the palette and food being presented in an identical way to testers and testers not allowed to communicate with each other.

Question No. 19e

The responses to this question were disappointing as all candidates are required to write a product specification for their A523 controlled assessment. It is important for candidates to draw on their learning for some aspects of the written examination. Most candidates described a design specification.

Question No. 19f

It was clear when candidates had been taught about how heat is transferred when using a microwave. They referred to radiation, microwaves penetrating the food. Very few candidates were able to explain the production of heat by the friction. Conduction as part of the process was mentioned by a few.

Question No. 19g

The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

