

Commentary on candidate 1 evidence

Candidate 1 was awarded **57/60 marks** for the assignment.

Section 1 – 26/27 marks

1 a (i) Identify key issues from the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they identified three key issues from the brief: high protein, snack and for athletes.

1 a (ii) Explain the importance of the key issues to the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they explained why each key issue is important to the brief. It should be noted that the candidate gave two valid explanations for both key issues 1 and 3. For key issue 1, the mark was awarded after 'physique' and after 'what they eat' for key issue 3.

1 b (i) Use one appropriate investigative technique from one relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (internet search) with appropriate sources (3 suitable websites)
- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 3 marks for selecting and summarising three points of information that can be used to develop the product. Bullet points 1, 2 and 4 were awarded marks. The third bullet point is a repeat of bullet point 1, so was not awarded a mark.

1 b (ii) Use a second appropriate and different investigative technique from a different relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (questionnaire) with appropriate sources (10 equestrian vaulters)
- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 3 marks for selecting and summarising three points of information that can be used to develop the product. Bullet points 1, 2 and 3 were awarded marks. Bullet point 4 would be difficult to take forward as a product that was both sweet and savoury, and bullet point 5 is a repeat of bullet point 2.

1 b (iii) Use an appropriate investigative technique from a different relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (interview) with appropriate source (coach)
- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 3 marks for selecting and summarising three points of information that can be used to develop the product. Bullet point 1 was not awarded a mark, as it cannot be taken forward to develop the product. Bullet points 2, 3 and 4 were awarded marks.

1 b (iv) Generate and justify appropriate food product ideas.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they fully described two product ideas. Product 1, the nut assortment was not awarded a mark because it was too vague and lacked detail of the contents. All three products had detailed justifications as to why they would be suitable for the brief which were linked to the results of the investigations. Although the description for product 1 was not accepted, the justification was accepted, ensuring that the candidate was not penalised by their original error.

Section 2 – 9/10 marks

2 a (i) Provide a recipe for manufacture of the food product idea.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they provided a recipe where both ingredients and method were sufficiently detailed to allow the product to be made successfully with identical results.

2 a (ii) Justify the food product based on the information generated from the investigations and relevance to the brief.

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** for the following:

- ◆ Ingredients:
 - 1 mark was awarded for peanut butter because the justification linked to both the brief (high protein) and results of investigations (investigation1)
 - 1 mark was awarded for chopped peanuts because the justification linked to both the brief (high protein) and results of investigations (investigation1)

- The mark was not awarded for chocolate chips because this information did not come from the investigation
- 1 mark was awarded for rolled oats because the justification linked to both the brief (athletes) and results of investigations (investigation1).
- ◆ Cooking method:
 - 1 mark was awarded for baking because the justification linked to both the brief (high protein/ snack/ athletes) and results of investigations (investigation 3).
- ◆ Features:
 - 1 mark was awarded for bar shape because the justification linked to both the brief (high protein / snack /athletes) and results of investigations (investigation 2 and 3)
 - 1 mark was awarded for vegetarian/ pescetarian because the justification linked to both the brief (high protein/ athletes) and results of investigations (investigation 2)
 - 1 mark was awarded for hand held because the justification linked to both the brief (snack) and results of investigations (investigation 2).

Section 3 – 10/11 marks

3 a (i) Identify an appropriate sensory test and appropriate group of testers.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they carried out a suitable test (ratings) with an appropriate group of testers (equestrian vaulters).

3 a (ii) State three reasons why this method of testing will provide relevant information.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they stated two valid reasons for using this method of testing. Reasons 1 and 2 were awarded a mark each. Reason 3 was not awarded a mark because it lacked detail about the type of information the test could have provided.

3 a (iii) Present the results of the testing.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the results were clearly presented allowing at least three valid aspects of information to be obtained

3 a (iv) Come to conclusions from the results of testing.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because three valid conclusions derived from the results of testing were reached.

Section 4 – 12/12 marks

4 a (i) Evaluate the food product based on the results of investigations.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they made three valid evaluative comments referring to the suitability of the product for the brief based on the results of the investigations. Each comment contain an accurate fact based on results of investigations, judgement and conclusion, and was linked to the brief

4 a (ii) Evaluate the food product based on the results of sensory testing.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they made two valid evaluative comments referring to the suitability of the product for the brief based on the results of testing. Each comment contain an accurate fact based on results of testing, judgement and conclusion, and was linked to the brief

4 a (iii) Improve or adapt the product.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they described two suitable amendments to the product (mix the peanuts more thoroughly into the mixture, and spread the chocolate chips on top better), and gave a valid reason why each would improve it.

4 a (iv) Make final conclusions on the overall suitability of the food product based on the issues in the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they made three valid comments about the overall suitability of the product for the issues in the brief. These comments linked to each of the issues identified in section 1 a.

Commentary on candidate 2 evidence

Candidate 2 was awarded **47/60 marks** for the assignment.

Section 1 – 23/27 marks

1 a (i) Identify key issues from the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they identified three key issues from the brief: lunch, allergies and nursery children.

1 a (ii) Explain the importance of the key issues to the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they explained why each key issue is important to the brief.

1 b (i) Use one appropriate investigative technique from one relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (internet search) with appropriate sources (numerous websites)
- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 3 marks for selecting and summarising three points of information that can be used to develop the product.

1 b (ii) Use a second appropriate and different investigative technique from a different relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (questionnaire) with appropriate sources (parents of nursery children)
- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 3 marks for selecting and summarising three points of information that can be used to develop the product – all 6 points would have been acceptable.

1 b (iii) Use an appropriate investigative technique from a different relevant source(s) to present results of investigation and select and summarise main points of information.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for the following:

- ◆ 1 mark for demonstrating an appropriate technique (internet search) with appropriate sources (4 websites)

- ◆ 1 mark for clearly presenting results
- ◆ 0 marks for points of information from the results because none of the points made could be used to develop the product.

1 b (iv) Generate and justify appropriate food product ideas.

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they gave detailed descriptions of three possible product ideas. However, the justification for idea 1 (marble cupcakes) refers to children preferring colourful foods. This product was vanilla and chocolate, which would not be considered colourful therefore that description was not awarded a mark

Section 2 – 6/10 marks

2 a (i) Provide a recipe for manufacture of the food product idea.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the list of ingredients was not accurate – the ingredients for the vanilla mixture lacked vanilla and the quantities for the icing were incorrect for butter icing. The method was accurate and was awarded one mark

2 a (ii) Justify the food product based on the information generated from the investigations and relevance to the brief.

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** for the following:

- ◆ Ingredients:
 - No mark was awarded for strawberries because this did not link to the brief. It did link to Investigation 2.
 - 1 mark was awarded for cocoa powder because the justification linked to both the brief (children) and results of investigations (investigation 2).
 - 1 mark was awarded for dairy free butter because the justification linked to both the brief (food allergies) and results of investigations (investigations 1 and 2).
 - 1 mark was awarded for red food colouring because the justification linked to both the brief (children) and results of investigations (investigation 1).
 - 1 mark was awarded for icing sugar because the justification linked to both the brief (children) and results of investigations (investigation 2).
- ◆ Cooking method:
 - No mark was awarded for baking because this did not link to the brief. It did link to Investigation 2.

◆ Features:

- No mark was not awarded for repeating dairy free because this had already been awarded a mark.
- No mark was awarded for marbled because it did not link to the brief and it did link to Investigation 1.
- No mark was awarded for paper cases because this was not based on evidence from the investigations.

Section 3 – 7/11 marks

3 a (i) Identify an appropriate sensory test and appropriate group of testers.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they carried out a suitable test (ratings) with an appropriate group of testers (parents of nursery school children).

3 a (ii) State three reasons why this method of testing will provide relevant information.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they stated two valid reasons for using this method of testing. Reasons 1 and 3 were accepted. Reason 2 was not awarded a mark because it is too vague.

3 a (iii) Present the results of the testing.

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they did not show the results from individual testers.

3 a (iv) Come to conclusions from the results of testing.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they made three valid conclusions derived from the results of testing – all four conclusions were acceptable but only three marks are available.

Section 4 – 12/12 marks

4 a (i) Evaluate the food product based on the results of investigations.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they made three valid evaluative comments referring to the suitability of the product for the brief based on the results of the investigations. Each comment contains an accurate fact based on results of investigations, a judgement and conclusion, and was linked to the brief.

4 a (ii) Evaluate the food product based on the results of sensory testing.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they made at least two valid evaluative comments referring to the suitability of the product for the brief based

on the results of testing. Each comment contain an accurate fact based on results of testing, a judgement and conclusion, and was linked to the brief. All three evaluations would have been acceptable, but only two marks are available.

4 a (iii) Improve or adapt the product.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they described two suitable amendments to the product (change dairy free butter to a vegetable fat and incorporate more fruit) and gave a valid reason why each would improve it.

4 a (iv) Make final conclusions on the overall suitability of the food product based on the issues in the brief.

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they made three valid comments about the overall suitability of the product for the issues in the brief. These comments linked to each of the issues identified in section 1 a. Point 1 did not gain a mark but points 2 – 4 covered all 3 issues and each was awarded a mark.