

**Website Exemplar**  
**GCE (AS) Graphic Products**  
**Unit: 6GR01**  
**Topic: Barked Beans Packaging**

Note		
A	Performance Analysis	<p>Two similar products (baked bean containers) are considered but they have significantly different designs and material/manufacturing processes. Each product is compared carefully against the specification listed. The function, user requirements, performance etc, tend to be well covered regarding the most obvious comments, but form and materials are less well detailed. The form of the snap pot is ignored in reference to the draft shape of the pot, having a lip for easy ejection from mould or fixing area for the top. No mention of reason for the round shape of the can etc. a good comparison is made though and the work is easily read.</p> <p>4-6 mark range</p>
B	Materials & Components	<p>The advantages and disadvantages are offered. They are clearly listed and easily compared. The comments are pertinent and well justified, however the technical terminology relating to the properties of the material do lack a little focus, strong? No mention of ductility, the rest of the commentary is good though. The final section on environment is well written but some anomalies such as the use of vague terminology regarding strength again. The top assessment criteria are still available though.</p> <p>7-9 mark range</p>
C	Manufacture	<p>There is a lot of very clear technical information in this section; it is clearly a top answer with access to the top box. The alternative method of manufacture is relevant and well researched; there is no reason why this should not gain maximum marks until we read the environmental considerations. Here the candidate makes relevant comments about the disposal of chemicals associated with inks and printing, but is a little less focused on the manufacture of the tins in the can section here we are treated to a repeat of the disposal of materials rather than the impact on the environment of the can production. Emissions transport etc.</p> <p>7-9 mark range</p>
D	Quality	<p>Quality control checks are described in detail; we have a check listed rather than a statement saying 'make sure that' it explains how! QS is well completed, describing a TQM approach to the manufacture of these products and how the relevant standards impinge upon the quality of the product.</p> <p>4-6 mark range</p>

E	Design & Development	<p>A design criterion is offered with a straightforward specification. A wide range of well communicated design ideas are offered, which are clearly and tidily presented. Design inspiration is demonstrated using research, but the additional detail is a little minimalist, particularly in the bottle designs. The bottle and box designs are workable, realistic and some have some detail. They very much link to the specification and are relevant to the brief. The development includes changes, technical aspects, but they fail to mention materials in any great detail. CAD and 3D modelling is used to develop the design, not just to prove the final design or try out its construction. A good final proposal is offered for box and bottle, with materials suggested for the model. I felt that the development work needed greater input of 'real' materials in order to finalise the model designs. The evaluation offered is good enough with the additional comments offered in the table and the design pages, although the final design is not formally offered against the spec. The lack of material input at the design stage means that we must adjust the marks but keep it within the highest section.</p> <p>13 – 18 mark range</p>
F	Communicate	<p>There is sufficient information to make this product from the final drawings offered. We have no cutting list, but the materials are justified in the commentary. The annotation is clear and detailed and presentation is excellent. Good use of CAD is demonstrated, but the work in the commentary is a bit lacking in detail.</p> <p>9-12 mark range</p>
G	Production Plan	<p>At first the candidate offers a detailed flow chart as a planning document. Time is offered and deadlines are supplied via a Gantt chart. Still assessed in the top criteria even though the sequence of events do leave out one or two the key steps.</p> <p>4-6 mark range</p>
H	Making	<p>There is material justification on the first page of this section, but it makes no reference to the card/plastic used for the packaging. We can see from the evidence provided in the photographic record that a great deal of work has been put into the manufacture of this detailed product. The box construction is well executed, although it is disappointing to see that the thickness of the card perhaps provides too flexible a container. The bottle itself is well turned in Jelutong and finished nicely with good use of modelling clay for the top. The laser has been used in proportion and some detailed work on a CAD package has been used directly to assist manufacture. The candidate also offers an architectural model, hand cut in card and clear polystyrene on an MDF base. It is rendered with Styrofoam and filler, then painted and coloured. The vinyl cutter has been used in small way to reproduce road markings and frames for windows. Overall the candidate has produced two good models with demand appropriate to AS. There is detail, precision and accuracy. The</p>

		<p>work cannot be allocated a maximum, as the product does not have the range of materials justified, normally a penalty of two, here there is enough to restrict this to a loss of only 1, there is some evidence of flimsiness to the box but access to the top range of marks is still available.</p> <p>13 – 18 mark range</p>
I	Testing	<p>A range of tests are described and justified. They do in deed check the performance of the product, checking relevant measurable points on the specification. Third party evaluation or input is evidenced; a personal evaluation is offered, although not essential. There is no reason why the maximum marks should not be allocated here; certainly it is in the top assessment criteria.</p> <p>4 – 6 mark range</p>