

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each section of the coursework assessment task.

Candidate 1

Section 1: planning

1(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **3 marks** because all key issues identified are acceptable.

1(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **3 marks** as the importance of each of the key issues to the brief have been explained in an acceptable manner. Issue 3, only the third bullet point is valid as the others are vague.

1(b)(i) - investigation 1 – the candidate was awarded **5 marks**:

- ◆ technique and sources are valid
- ◆ layout clear and easy to read
- ◆ points of information 1,2,3 mark awarded
- ◆ point of information 4 was not needed however would not have been
- ◆ awarded a mark as it was not investigated

1b(ii) - investigation 2 – the candidate was awarded **5 marks**:

- ◆ technique and sources are valid
- ◆ layout clear and easy to read
- ◆ point of information 1 has incorrect figure however has given other correct information in that point
- ◆ points of information 2 and 3 are both correct
- ◆ point of information 4 would also be acceptable however, maximum mark had been reached

1(b)(iii) - investigation 3 – the candidate was awarded **3 marks**:

- ◆ technique is valid, source is not valid – an FCT teacher is not relevant
- ◆ layout clear and easy to read
- ◆ points of information 1 and 2 are not correct
- ◆ points 3 and 4 can be taken forward in spite of the source not being valid

1(b)(iv)

Ideas – the candidate has been awarded **3 marks** as all descriptions are enough for marks to be awarded.

Justifications – all are clearly linked therefore awarded **3 marks**.

Section 2: the product

2(a)(i) - recipe

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for ingredient list. The candidate was not awarded a mark for the method as some anomalies were noted – there was no indication of how/if the carrots were prepared. The simmering process was wrongly timed for the amount of liquid added. The recipe could be made repeatedly however not successfully.

2(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **5 marks** as follows:

Ingredients

- ◆ broccoli – Links to brief and investigation 2
- ◆ carrots – links to brief and investigation 2
- ◆ pasta – links to brief and investigation 3

cooking method

- ◆ baking – links to brief and investigation 3

features

- ◆ easy to serve – links to brief and investigation 3
- ◆ quick to prepare – no evidence to support this feature

Section 3: sensory testing

3(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they identified an appropriate sensory test and used a valid group of testers.

3(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **1 mark** as they gave a list of attributes rather than reasons why the method of testing would provide relevant information.

3(a)(iii) - the candidate has been awarded **3 marks** as results presented show three correct attributes, five testers whose individual results are shown.

3(a)(iv) - the candidate has been awarded **3 marks** as all conclusions are valid, detailed and linked to a key which has been interpreted in two ways – both acceptable.

Section 4: evaluation

4(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **0 marks** for this section because they have not provided evaluative comments. Comments 2 and 3 are both speculative rather than proven.

4(a)(ii) - the candidate has been awarded **2 marks** as both comments are evaluative and linked to the results of testing.

4(a)(iii) - the candidate has been awarded **4 marks** as both adaptations suggested are valid with good reasons given.

4(a)(iv) - the candidate has been awarded **3 marks** for this section as all three conclusions are valid and linked to the key issues.

Candidate 2

Section 1: planning

1(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **3 marks** because all key issues identified are acceptable.

1(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **3 marks** as follows:

- ◆ issue 1 – the third statement was awarded the mark – the first two are vague statements
- ◆ issue 2 – all statements could be accepted – the last statement is the strongest
- ◆ issue 3 – acceptable

1(b)(i) - investigation 1 – the candidate was awarded **5 marks**:

- ◆ technique and sources are valid
- ◆ layout was clear and easy to read
- ◆ points of information 1,2,4 mark awarded
- ◆ point of information 3 was not accepted as it is unable to be proven

1(b)(ii) - investigation 2 – the candidate was awarded **5 marks**:

- ◆ technique and sources are valid
- ◆ layout clear and easy to read
- ◆ points of information 1,2 and 3 are all easily proven and so awarded one mark each correct
- ◆ point of information 4 would not be acceptable because it is vague and does not lead to a product
- ◆ point of information 5 has used knowledge not found in the research and has selected some information but not summarised it

1(b)(iii) - investigation 3 – the candidate was awarded **5 marks**:

- ◆ technique and sources are valid
- ◆ layout clear and easy to read
- ◆ points of information are all correct and could be taken forward

1(b)(iv)

Ideas – the candidate has been awarded **2 marks** as follows:

- ◆ description 1 – 1 mark awarded
- ◆ description 2 – 1 mark awarded
- ◆ description 3 – too similar to first one plus too minimum – it's not a different idea

Justifications – the candidate has been awarded **1 mark** as follows:

- ◆ justification 1 – 1 mark awarded
- ◆ justification 2 – very minimal – cannot be proven – information not there
- ◆ justification 3 – missing

Section 2: the product

2(a)(i) - recipe

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**; 1 mark for ingredient list and 1 mark for the method.

2(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **5 marks** as follows:

Ingredients

Raspberry	Link to questionnaire and brief	1 mark
apples	Link to questionnaire and brief	1 mark
oats	Link to research and brief	1 mark

Cooking method

Baking	Incorrect there is fat in the crumble	0 marks
--------	---------------------------------------	---------

Features

Served cold	Link to questionnaire	1 mark
Does not contain nuts	Link to interview	1 mark

There are 8 marks available for this section however the candidate has only given the minimum for each section so could only achieve a maximum of 6 marks.

Section 3: sensory testing

3(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they identified an appropriate sensory test and used a valid group of testers.

3(a)(ii) - the candidate was awarded **2 marks** as they gave two valid reasons why the test was suitable:

- ◆ like/dislike of attributes – 1 mark
- ◆ easy to gather information about the dish – 1 mark
- ◆ vague/incomplete - 0 mark

3(a)(iii) - the candidate has been awarded **3 marks** for the presentation of results. Results presented show three correct attributes, five testers whose individual results are shown – no totals or averages included. The layout is easy to read and the data easy to interpret.

3(a)(iv) - the candidate has been awarded **1 mark** for conclusion 1. Conclusion 2 is vague. There are no more visible conclusions on the page.

Section 4: evaluation

4(a)(i) - the candidate was awarded **1 mark** for this section:

- ◆ evaluation 1 is correct and evaluative
- ◆ evaluation 2 is incorrect – the school canteen provides fruit salad
- ◆ evaluation 3 is vague and too similar to evaluation 1 – the candidate should have said what fruit they used

4(a)(ii) - the candidate has been awarded **2 marks** as both comments are evaluative, specific and linked to the results of testing.

4(a)(iii) - the candidate has been awarded **4 marks** as both adaptations suggested are valid with good reasons given.

4(a)(iv) - the candidate has been awarded **2 marks** for this section. Bullet points 1 and 2 both awarded one mark. Bullet point 3 is vague and not saying anything different.