

GCE PRODUCT DESIGN (AS)

Exemplar Commentary 1

Title: Coke Bottle

Unit: 6GR01

A.

The candidate has compared and contrasted, but the commentary is a little lacking in tech detail. The comments applying to form are a good example of this. The comments regarding the hand grips on the bottle are noted but the comments about the can are not demonstrating a good understanding of the reasons for the can shape. **(Mark Range 4-6)**

B.

Materials are appropriate for their purpose. **(Mark Range 7-9)**

C.

Manufacturing is not necessarily appropriate for alternative for cap (rotational moulding). However the alternatives offered for the label are perfectly appropriate and this can be credited, but the justification of rotational moulding could have been enough for us to access the marks here. **(Mark Range 7-10)**

D.

Quality control checks are listed but not really described in full. The fact that a statement is made about checking the heat for the granules is one thing but how is the heat checked or controlled. The QA examples are better, a process for QA is described and then detail is added to the labels and symbols that could be used to ascertain whether a product is a quality product or not. **(Mark Range 4-6)**

E.

There is an additional page of toothbrush designs. The candidate also designs the packaging and evidence is offered later. Development is good, the design moves on, with modelling and CAD but the level of technical terminology is leaving us a little disappointed. A proposal is made. **(Mark Range 13-18)**

F.

There a range of communication techniques used ICT is carried out with sufficient detail to convey what is intended but not o make the product. A drawing offering some detail of the mould for the packaging is offered. Annotation is relatively detailed. But there is not the performance to gain access beyond the mid box. **(Mark Range 5-8)**

G.

Detailed plan made considered correct sequence, time and deadlines in a Gantt chart. **(Mark Range 4-6)**

H.

Materials listed, justification a but weedy, the work looks to have the complexity needed for top access in this spec, see Photoshop manipulation. The model does lack a little in the way of crispness so the marks in the top box are adjusted down. **(Mark Range 13-18)**

I.

A range of tests are described, but the justification is a bit lacking. The model is evaluated and third party involvement is evidenced. Modifications follow and the work is likely to be little bettered, so **mark range 4-6** is allocated.