

Commentary on candidate 6 evidence

Total mark – 24/40

Task 1		Commentary	Mark awarded	Max Mark
1	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1 mark awarded as the base is correct ◆ 1 mark awarded as the case is correct. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the top is correct. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the hanging rod is correct. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the sectional views for the base, case and top are shown. ◆ 0 marks awarded as not enough dimensioning is shown. 	5	6
	b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1 mark awarded for accurate assembly. ◆ 1 mark awarded as all views related. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the Sectional Elevation is shown. 	3	3
	c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 0 marks awarded as the view shown is not Isometric. ◆ 0 marks awarded as the components are not aligned correctly. The hanging rod is shown in an incorrect position. 	0	2
	d	<p>Sufficient range of evidence with many inconsistencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Some dimensions are incorrectly applied. ◆ Most centre lines are missing. ◆ The ends of the cutting planes overlap the views. ◆ There are many incorrectly labelled views. 	2	3

Question			Commentary	Mark awarded	Max Mark
2	a		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1 mark awarded for obvious use of plastics in the render. ◆ 1 mark awarded for the use of appropriate lighting, highlights and shadows. ◆ 1 mark awarded for pictorial view and quality. 	3	3
	b		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 0 marks awarded as thumbnail 1 - A price isn't suitable extended text so thumbnails cannot be awarded marks for containing a title, extended text and an image. ◆ 0 marks awarded as thumbnail 2 - A price isn't suitable extended text so thumbnails cannot be awarded marks for containing a title, extended text and an image. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the dominance is correctly identified in both. ◆ 1 mark awarded for clarity of the layout/thumbnails. Both layouts/thumbnails clearly show the intended planning for the final version. 	2	4
	c		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1 mark awarded as the size is correct. ◆ 1 mark awarded for fair quality visual impact. ◆ 2 marks awarded as the two design elements/principles, other than dominance, have been correctly identified. ◆ 1 mark awarded as the description of contrast does not describe why the candidate has used contrast. Simply stating that blue and orange contrast is not sufficient to be awarded a mark. 	5	7

Question			Commentary	Mark awarded	Max Mark
3	a		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 0 marks awarded as all components are incorrect. ◆ 0 marks awarded as the sketches are not shown in good proportion. ◆ 0 marks awarded as the projection shown on the roof End Elevation is incorrect. ◆ 0 marks awarded as there is not enough detail provided to 3D model the components. 	0	4
	b		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 0 marks awarded as the chamfer is not correct on the Elevation. This view is also missing the base. ◆ 1 mark awarded for the follow on rule being applied for the Plan. ◆ 0 marks awarded as the End Elevation does not show the roof overhanging the base. ◆ 0 marks awarded as the proportions are not correct. The roof shown on the End Elevation is not as wide as the Plan. The base on the End Elevation is shown at a different length than the width of the Elevation. 	1	4
	c		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 2 marks awarded as the candidate produced a good quality sketch. ◆ 1 mark awarded for the render being fair quality. 	3	4