

GCSE

Design and Technology: Food Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J302**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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 2016

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 were organised into the separate sections as required by the assessment criteria. A separate cover sheet containing reference to the assessment criteria applied is required by OCR. 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. If candidates choose to include photographs from the internet in their portfolio these must be acknowledged.

Good practice within administration of the controlled assessment

- 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.
- 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.
- Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Criteria.
- 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.

Marking of the portfolios for many centres was within the national agreed standards, however an increasing number were marked too leniently. 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.

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 demonstrating individuality, flair and creativity when approaching the various sections of the portfolio.

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.

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.
- Information also needs to be presented concisely.
- An increased number of candidates are using mind maps to present their work without any explanation. 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.
- 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.
- ✓ Consideration of how changes in society, including cultural issues have influenced the range of food products available today in relation to their chosen product/theme.
- ✓ Evidence of how wise choice of food products can promote healthy lifestyles.
- ✓ Information being presented concisely and the sources acknowledged.

Creativity

- Questionnaires remain the main method used to identify the needs of the user, target group, and a nutritional focus. However, many questionnaires include irrelevant or generic questions which are of little value to identifying the needs of the target group. The good questionnaires are related to their 'starting point' and have a clear aim of what they wish to 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?
- Questionnaires that lacked focus did not allow candidates to identify the qualities respondents require from a new product. This resulted in existing products not being evaluated against identified needs, It also led to 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.
- 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.
- 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 one product in detail was evident in many 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 and information given is relevant to the design brief/design specification.
- The Design Brief / Design Specification should include one nutritional focus so candidates can show greater understanding and application of nutritional knowledge. Where candidates had focused on a number of nutritional aspects, the application of nutritional analysis and knowledge was very superficial.

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 with a target group and one 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.

Designing

- In some portfolios, Design Specifications are not linked to prior research.
- A number of candidates still list several nutritional needs and often then fail to discuss them all in the follow on work
- The use of pro forma sheets for the planning and evaluating of products limited candidates' creativity and initiative and tended to result in repetitive responses. Pro forma sheets for this section of the portfolio were 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, although recorded they 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 quite 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 or 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.
- Some candidates are still including reasons for choosing the final product idea and rejecting the remaining ideas, which is not required in Unit A521.
- Reasoned decisions for choice of ingredients and equipment for the final product (prototype) was well done but some candidates failed to apply relevant nutritional data according to their nutritional focus when giving reasoned decisions for their choice of ingredients.

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.
- Too many centres are awarding high level responses for nutritional knowledge, 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).

- 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 the results of testing (5 testers) to give meaningful conclusions.
- ✓ Suggesting possible improvements
- ✓ Using specialist terms appropriately and correctly, presenting information in a structured format and accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

A523 Making quality products

General Comments:

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. 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 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 are 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.
- 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 does not 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.
- Most candidates chose 4 products to trial. The level of creativity varies widely. In some centres candidates are now designing and making very 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. Some candidates continue to choose products that showed little or no skills or only allowed them to repeat the same skills.
- 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.

- 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 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 idea is being taken forward to product development and why other ideas have been rejected.
- ✓ Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.

Making

- Product development 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.
- 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. A number of moderators commented that there was more evidence of inaccurate costing this year.
- Reasoned decisions, for the ingredients and equipment for the final product was well done.

- Product Specifications were 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 processes 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.

A525 Sustainability and technical aspects of designing and making

General Comments:

Examiners report A525 June 2016

This is the third 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 fewer NR responses than in previous years. Where these occurred they were on the questions which were targeted at the higher grades.

It was noticeable that the responses to the design question (Q18d) were significantly better than in the previous years. Candidates addressed all the specification points and the majority of candidates were able to link them to the topic of 'eat on the go'.

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

Some candidates did not give sufficient detail in their responses particularly in those questions where students 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 a candidate was 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 the mark. Examples of this were seen in questions 17b, and 19c.

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 question 16g. Some candidates still make very vague comments e.g. 'better for the environment', 'environmentally friendly' which do not score marks. It was disappointing to see in question 16a candidates muddling food groups and nutrients and therefore some of their responses lacked the clarity to score the highest level.

The 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 where 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 additional page or indicate on the original page that they were using the additional pages. 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. Many candidates answered this correctly, the main incorrect answer was composting vegetables.
2. Generally well answered. The most frequent incorrect response was (d) water. Some candidates appeared to be confused by the question and had not read it carefully.
3. Very high percentage of candidates achieved the available mark.

4. Majority of candidates achieved the available mark.
5. Very high percentage of candidates achieved the available mark.
6. Most gave the correct answer. The incorrect responses were mainly to do with water eg recycle water. Other incorrect responses referred to 'high temperatures', ovenable and freezer.
7. Vast majority gained a mark. Shepherd's and cottage pie were the most frequent correct responses. Others included bubble and squeak and fish cakes. The most frequent incorrect answers included sausage and mash and dishes that would not work such as potato salsa.
8. Generally quite well answered with fresh, local and less food miles being the most frequent correct answers. Many stated cheaper without saying 'maybe cheaper' A few stated 'you know where they are grown' which was too vague.
9. This was not well answered. More able candidates made reference to allergic actions and possible hyper activity. References made to 'hyper', 'unhealthy', 'contains sugar' were made by many candidates and did not score any marks.
10. Most candidates answered this correctly. Those who did not score marks had not realised the importance of the word 'environmental' in the question and gave alternative reasons for the manufacturer using card e.g. easy to print on, strong.
11. Most answered this correctly.
12. Most answered this correctly.
13. Most answered this correctly.
14. Most answered this correctly.
15. Most answered this correctly.

16a. The responses to this question were disappointing and the majority of candidates scored two or three marks. Many candidates gave alternate suggestions for the diet shown, they did not show understanding of the suggested changes by explaining why the changes would improve the diet plan or how they fitted in with the recommendations. Very few candidates used specialist terms or made direct reference to the government guidelines. The mention of too much fat or sugar was done in passing but with no discussion. Popular reference to government recommendations included the Eatwell plate, 5 a day and water.

16b. Reducing fat was answered correctly by many candidates, with removing meat, removing fat from bacon, substituting meat with quorn. The most common mistake was to suggest the use of low fat cheese. The increasing of fibre was less well done with many candidates stating the use of brown spaghetti instead of whole-wheat. The addition of vegetables was a common correct response. A few candidates suggested pulse vegetables. There were however a few suggestions to add more cheese and meat indicating a lack of nutritional knowledge.

16c. This was well answered with the majority of candidates scoring one mark. Frequent correct answers included decomposing, recycling, reusing, breaking down. Higher achieving candidates scored the second mark by referring to nutrients, plants growing, good soil and reducing landfill.

16d. Most scored one mark stating using less energy and making food tender. Many did not score a second mark as they didn't identify the piece of equipment that they were referring to e.g. it cooks faster, but didn't state the pressure cooker. A few mentioned the retention of vitamins but not specific vitamins this again showed a lack of nutritional knowledge.

16e. Common correct answers were making reference to quality, high standards, from the UK / British. The most common incorrect responses stated points referring to 'knowing where it comes from' and 'safe to eat'.

16f. It was disappointing to see so many incorrect answers to this question. Incorrect responses included best before date, expiry date, sell by date, stamping date, date of manufacture, date labelling.

16g. Some candidates showed excellent knowledge and understanding and achieved the full four marks with correct points being suggested and full explanations given to back up their answers. A lot of candidates appeared confused with the fact the question was referring to the energy used in manufacturing the product and discussed food energy or energy used by the consumer in reheating the product.

17a. It was disappointing to see so many incorrect answers with raw meat being placed above the cooked meat. Many candidates also put the meat in the salad drawer. More able candidates scored full marks on this part of the question.

17b. The majority of candidates scored at least two marks with the most common methods of preservation being canning and freezing. Candidates who did not understand the question referred to where you could store foods e.g. store in a cupboard, wrap in cling film, cool dry place. Some also repeated the chilling example which they did not score marks for.

17c. Most candidates concentrated on personal hygiene, the use of coloured coded chopping boards to avoid cross contamination, washing hands before and after handling raw meat, clean equipment and surfaces. Higher level responses included explanations with use of technical language. Many responses were however disorganised with a lot of repetition.

17d. Candidates scored one mark for making reference to hygiene in food outlets. Some candidates gave clear answers showing excellent understanding. Most referred incorrectly to general health and safety. Some candidates picked up on the word environment but clearly had no idea of the actual work of an Environmental Health Officer and suggested they were responsible for keeping the environment clean, saving energy, CO₂ emissions to help the environment

18a. Many candidates did not have an understanding of energy balance. Those who understood the question gave clear and concise answers.

18b. The majority of candidates answered this correctly with a variety of answers reflecting those on the mark scheme.

18c. Most candidates scored three or more marks and this question was answered much better than in previous years. Many only included one protein food though, indicating that the candidates need to read the question very carefully. Complex carbohydrates were very well known. The annotation on the sketches was also much better than in previous years and candidates had clearly linked their annotations to the specification points.

18d. Correct responses mainly consisted of a reference to eating a variety of food in the correct amounts. Some candidates went on to mention the Eatwell plate but then explained it incorrectly listing nutrients as well as food groups. Very few candidates mentioned the 8 tips for healthy eating. Those that did stated eating more fruit and vegetables and eating less fat and sugar. One or two stated increasing the intake of fish.

18e. Many candidates scored full marks on this question.. Those who didn't score well tended to refer to eating fatty or salty foods but didn't mention eating high amounts of them.

19a. Many candidates did not know the correct answer to this question. Many simply gave a number higher than two.

19bi. The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

19bii. The majority of candidates answered this correctly.

19c. This question was not well answered. A minority of candidates were able to give two examples of a fat soluble vitamin, mainly A and D. One or two stated Vitamin E. Even fewer were able to give the correct function. Of these the function of vitamin D was the most well known.

19d. Very few correct responses. Most made a guess from the question 'fatty acids' and stated functions of fats/energy. Others mentioned the immune system, digestion and skin. Some stated 'brain food' as opposed to 'may help memory/concentration.

19ei. Convection was well known by many candidates.

19eii. The most frequent correct response was the reference to no fat being added. Many candidates did not realise the question was in relation to the cooking of the fish and made general points e.g. saving energy.

19f. Many referred to producing fish fingers being made quicker and cheaper without an explanation. A frequent incorrect response referred to identical products being produced. The most common correct answers were about skilled workers not being needed, many products being produced quickly / faster and it being cheaper as a result of bulk buying.

19g. Many candidates scored one mark usually for making reference to size and shape of the fish finger. Those who did not understand the term 'quality control' made reference to tasting the fish finger, nutritional information and packaging.

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 2016

