

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage if this assignment.

Candidate 2

Stage 1: design

Themes

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they identified two themes 'Learning item' and 'Preschool child'. They provided an appropriate explanation for only one theme (preschool child). The 'Learning item' was not fully explained. While the candidate included a lot of information, there was no clear link to the impact required by the brief.

Investigations

The candidate was awarded **14 out of 18 marks**.

Investigation 1

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigation technique uses by showing the internet sources and providing links to the internet research.

They gave accurate explanations of the investigation and provided four accurate progressive summary points. However, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded for this stage.

The following summary points were not awarded any marks:

- 'faces' as this was based on personal opinion rather than evidence
- 'eco-friendly' lacked supporting evidence and was not factually accurate.

Investigation 2

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 6 marks** because they provided information on the investigation technique used 'questionnaire to 20 parents with young children'. They gave accurate explanations of the investigation and provided two progressive summary points.

The following summary points were not awarded marks:

- 'fibre property – the statement was too vague and had lots of personal opinions therefore not progressive.
- 'self confidence' – no evidence from the investigation.
- 'everyday skills' – could have gained a mark however the data provided (7/20) was not accurate.
- 'real life scenarios' – no evidence from the investigation.

Investigation 3

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used 'Interview with a textiles teacher'.

They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided two progressive summary points: (polyester) and (quilting), supported by evidence and clearly demonstrating progression.

The following summary points were not awarded marks: 'Cotton', 'eco-friendly' and 'safety' as the candidate simply restated information from the interview, which was then linked to summary points without further justification. No marks were awarded for 'learning' because the interview was not with an early year's specialist and therefore the specialist could not demonstrate this professional knowledge.

Solution

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 18 marks** for the presentation and justification of the features of the solution.

Present the solution

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate presented a solution which was clear and could be easily visualised and replicated with an excellent amount of detail.

Justify features of the solution

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate provided four accurate justifications for their design features. The justifications were clearly linked to the evidence gathered during the investigations and their relevance to meeting the brief was effectively explained.

The justifications provided for the properties and characteristics of the textiles were inaccurate, as the statements lacked sufficient explanation and did not demonstrate a fully justified understanding. Therefore, no marks were awarded.

The candidate provided two accurate justifications for their construction techniques and linked them to evidence from their investigations and clearly their relevance to meeting the brief was effectively explained.

The following justifications were not awarded marks:

- Point 3: 'quilting' is a repeat point, taken from the interview answers.
- Point 4: 'button/rouleau loop' was not justified.
- Point 5: 'bias binding' – there is no evidence from the investigations.
- Point 6: 'applique' – there is no evidence from the investigations.

Stage 2: evaluation

Testing

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they provided a technique (sensory test) and source (10 parents with young children). The test was clear and easy to interpret and included a rating system that enhanced the validity. The data generated could be effectively analysed. Supplementary questions and answers were given to back up the data.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because for each evaluation point as they successfully included a fact, opinion and consequence linked to the test.

Amending the solution

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks**.

Amendment and justification 1: age

The candidate identified a change from the test and then indicated that further investigation would be required to improve the learning item (**1 mark**).

Amendment and justification 2: safety

The candidate identified a potential change; however, the suggestion was not valid (**0 marks**).