Full Portfolio Evidence		
General Description: The candidate submits a 59-slide portfolio that begins with the client at their chosen location, exploring a range of possibilities before narrowing the focus to three areas for more detailed study. Following further investigation and discussion, the selected option, a work unit for the hotel's outdoor BBQ area, is chosen for development. A variety of design ideas are explored before the final concept is refined. The outcome is achieved through an extensive development process, resulting in a sophisticated, fully functional product that demonstrates a wide range of accomplished skills.		Mod Mark
Grid 1: Investigation **Evidence** Slides: 2, 3, 5	A wide range of relevant possibilities is identified on slide 2, featuring the candidate's chosen client, a hotel manager, at the selected location, Hotel Indigo in Stratford-upon-Avon. On slide 3, the three most pertinent possibilities are explored in greater depth. The chosen option, a chef's BBQ preparation area, is effectively identified and justified on slide 5, along with a sound investigation of the client's needs, wants, and values. However, this element is not as comprehensive as it could be, and the opportunity to include an initial design brief was missed.	Level 2
Grid 2: Investigation / Research **Evidence** **Slides: 7, 8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15**	This section begins on slide 7 with an analysis of the research required to support the thorough design and development of a successful outcome. Detailed and relevant anthropometric data, both specific and for general use, is presented on slides 11 and 12. Food safety requirements and location factors are outlined on slide 8, while slides 9 and 10 show detailed dimensional limitations and considerations for the wide range of tools and equipment that will be used in the area. An outline analysis and staff flow diagram appear on slide 13, and an evaluation of successful existing products is included on slide 14. This element would have benefitted from more extensive client consultation. Additional client input is provided on slide 15, where appropriate design styles are explored. Overall, this is a comprehensive research section; however, the client's needs, wants, and values are only partially developed, placing it at the top of Level 3.	Level 3
Grid 3: Specification **Evidence** **Slide 16**	In this section, candidates are expected to produce a focused design brief that fully reflects the investigated needs, wants, and values of the client or end user. Specification points should be realistic, technical, measurable, and well justified. A concise and comprehensive design brief is presented at the top of slide 16, although the reference to "ample space" could have been more specific. Most of the specification points on slide 16 are realistic, technical, and measurable, and the links back to the relevant areas of research are a valuable addition. Some points, such as "be moveable" and "use cost-effective	Level 3

	materials", would benefit from greater specificity; however, the justifications provided are perceptive. The inclusion of the column "How I will test this" is particularly useful and will support the testing and evaluation stage. Overall, the work is largely comprehensive and therefore sits at the lower end of Level 3.	
Grid 4: Design ideas **Evidence** **Slides: 17, 18 to 13, 19, 22, 24**	In this section, candidates are expected to use a range of design strategies to develop practical ideas that respond directly to the client and the specification. They should demonstrate commercial awareness, apply appropriate technical skills and materials knowledge, and justify their decisions through both prior and additional research. Imagination is essential, with inspiration drawn from sources such as nature, industry, design movements, and emerging technologies. The Design Ideas section begins on slide 17 with several quick subassembly concepts. At this stage, analysis is limited and there is no evidence of client input. Slides 18 to 23 present six different design ideas, although the level of detail varies between them. At times, the work appears naive, and several annotated notes lack sufficient justification. A range of design strategies is used, including biomimicry on slide 19 and the use of inspirational materials, referencing a deckchair and folding table, on slide 22. Relevant materials, processes, and techniques are considered throughout, though not always fully justified, and there is some concise and useful client input, including on the review table on slide 24, where the idea chosen to develop is selected with justification. There is limited focus on aesthetics or on the historical influences researched and specified earlier. While the specification parameters are addressed, they again lack clear justification. Overall, this represents a mid–Level 2 performance.	Level 2
Grid 5: Development **Evidence** **Slides: 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32**	The development process begins on slide 26 with client consultation on the initial CAD model. The feedback provided is constructive and leads to immediate refinements. The remainder of slide 26 focuses on exploring ways to improve the product's mobility. Slide 27 examines chopping board options and overall dimensions, approached in a more sophisticated manner than is typically seen: a full-scale layout model is taken to the intended location, where both the client and user group provide input. Following further stakeholder consultation, a hygienic knife holder is modelled and developed on slide 28. Slide 29 then explores finishes and the creation of a strong, ergonomic, and cost-effective base frame through modelling, sketching, and continued consultation. On slide 30, weight, strength, and cost considerations are compared during the development of the top. With the final design now close to completion, a full-scale card model is produced, accompanied	Level 3

	by an engineering drawing on slides 31 and 32. This model is subsequently tested in the hotel setting, leading to the development of wrought iron handles to ensure the product complements the Tudor-style surroundings. This section is both accomplished in its iterative approach, and sophisticated, when it comes to modelling. Aside from a few leaps in the design development, such as the positioning of the chopping board, which remains untested and insufficiently justified, the work sits comfortably within a level 3 performance.	
Grid 6: Final design **Evidence** **Slides: 34 to 43, 44**	In this section, candidates are required to provide sufficient manufacturing detail for a third party to reproduce the design. This should include final drawings, complete material and component lists, relevant part or exploded views showing how elements fit together, an overview of manufacturing processes, calculations for cost and material quantities, and strategies for reducing waste. Slides 34 to 43 present a full set of parts drawings, including all necessary dimensions for third-party manufacture. Complete parts lists are also provided, which are essential. These slides additionally contain elements of the manufacturing specification for each component, along with quality control instructions and risk assessment considerations. Effective project management is demonstrated on slide 44, where material quantities, costs, and waste-reduction strategies are clearly outlined. However, the section lacks a full assembly drawing and would benefit from exploded 3D representations to show how the parts integrate. Despite this, the work is comprehensive in its approach and sits therefore a Level 3 is appropriate.	Level 3
Grid 7: Review **Evidence** **Slides: 24, 26 to 32, 29**	Evidence in this section should include analysis through development and summary pages, ideally comparing the final idea to the specification, and must use logical, clear communication with appropriate technical vocabulary. This is not a stand-alone section; evidence should primarily come from the development and final ideas but may also include reviews in the design ideas or research sections, such as analysis of prototypes made by others. The work must be analytical rather than being of a commentary, descriptive style, and should present a balanced evaluation, outlining both strengths and weaknesses. Initial ideas are reviewed on slide 24, where in addition to client feedback, we see the pros and cons of each deign. Some of these points, however, are not fully justified. The style of the written comments throughout the development is concise and uses an analytical, technical approach. Client and stakeholder input is used to develop the product and there is evidence of this throughout the development; slides 26 to 32. Pros and cons of development options are highlighted in green and red throughout the development, with the best evidence of this on slide 29.	Level 3

	The work here is sound but not comprehensive as not all elements are fully reviewed and the reasons for some changes are not always obvious. The tabletop construction, for instance. The work therefore sits at the top of level 3	
Grid 8: Communication **Evidence across portfolio**	Candidates should demonstrate perceptive selection and accomplished use of: • Traditional/manual graphical techniques • Computer-aided design (CAD) techniques • Written communication methods All strands are met by the candidate. Both the CAD work and written techniques show a perceptive level of detail, illustrations are reasonably well presented but a bit naïve at times, and the design intention is clear. The choice of communication methods is perceptive apart from the final design where a 3D visualisation would have aided that section. The work is awarded at the lower end of Level 3.	Level 3
Grid 9: Tools & Equipment **Evidence** **Slides: 46 to 53, 55**	In this section, candidates are required to demonstrate the appropriate selection and use of tools and equipment, showing an understanding of the materials involved and providing justification for their choices. The processes chosen should support effective prototype manufacture and ensure dimensional accuracy. Slides 46 to 53 present a comprehensive photo diary, clearly showing that a sophisticated selection of materials, fixtures, and components has been made. The use of manufacturing methods and tools is evidently accomplished, and the final photographs on slide 55 confirm that the completed prototype is both dimensionally and geometrically accurate. A consistently high level of safety awareness is demonstrated throughout the making process. The work in this section is of a high standard and merits a mark within the range of Level 4.	Level 4
Grid 10: Quality & Accuracy **Evidence** **Slides: 55 46 to 53, 48**	This section should demonstrate advanced making skills, resulting in an accurate, high-quality prototype that meets end-user needs. The photographs on slide 55, along with the photo diary on slides 46 to 53, clearly show that accomplished making skills have been applied. It is also evident that the solution responds effectively to what was a sophisticated initial design problem. The final prototype is fully functional and meets the original specification requirements well. Slide 48 provides evidence of an iterative approach, particularly when changes to the worktop materials and manufacturing methods	Level 4

	became necessary. Overall, the work in this section is of a high standard and sits comfortably at Level 4.	
4.1 Testing and evaluation **Evidence** **Slides: 55 to 59, 55, 56, 57, 56 and 57, 58**	In this section, candidates are expected to analyse the prototype through testing against the specification and carrying out physical tests, ideally in the intended location. They should also gather feedback from the client and/or user group. Following this, the results should be summarised in an evaluation that identifies potential future improvements to the product's performance. The evaluation is presented on slides 55–59. Testing at the chosen location, is shown in a storyboard on slide 55, which includes interactions with the user group. Client feedback is provided on slide 56, and testing against the initial specification appears on slide 57. There is some evidence of the candidate's conclusions on slides 56 and 57; however, this is not comprehensive, and there is limited indication of suggested improvements or modifications. Environmental considerations are explored perceptively on slide 58 through a lifecycle analysis, although social, moral, and ethical factors are addressed less clearly. Overall, the work is sound and sits at Level 2.	Level 2
		Grade A