



Topic: Golf platform		Full Portfolio	
General Description		Centre Mark	Mod Mark
<p><b>Grid 1</b> Investigation</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>In this section we are expecting to see the candidates exploring a range of pertinent design possibilities that grow out of a clear conversation with a real client or a proven narrative with a target market that has a level of reality therefore mimicking commercial activity. Alongside the client/user groups they need to decide on the potential design possibility that they will be working towards and produce a preliminary design brief.</p> <p>The candidate does undertake a simple analysis of golf participation in school. The candidate goes on to identify different possible design scenarios within the golf offer at school. There is an examination of the client and in some ways the needs wants and values are explored it is a pity that some of the analysis lacks detail. The analysis is just too descriptive. A good example of this is the commentary on <b>slide 5</b>.</p> <p>Evidence slides 1-5</p>	Level 3	Level 2
<p><b>Grid 2</b> Analysis/Research</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>The candidate has produced an appropriate selection of research sources, including existing products, ergonomic information, and standards to provide an insight to the design context and show an understanding of the design possibility and related issues. This would seem to indicate a level 3 performance.</p> <p>The candidate does offer a research plan (<b>Slide 7</b>) which in theory should focus the research, some of the anthropometric data is relevant but it does feel a little like a golfing teach in. The work on matting is relevant <b>slide 12</b> as is some of the mechanisms work. <b>Slide 15</b>.</p> <p>However, some of the work on the site is a little descriptive, <b>Slide 17</b>. The candidate needed to look more carefully at tilt and rise mechanisms as this is imperative to the design scenario, i.e. pitching the golf ball from different sloping lies. We may see evidence of this later in the portfolio and will therefore have to make a decision regarding its contribution two grid 2 or its value in contribution to the development.</p>	Level 3	Level 3

	<p>The research summary on <b>slide 22</b> does provide some linkage between the research and the specification which is to be commended.</p> <p>An investigation into materials and processes was largely omitted.</p> <p>The award of level 3 is appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence slide 6-22</p>		
<p><b>Grid 3</b> Specification</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>In this section we are expecting to see evidence of technical and measurable specification points that are a product of the focused research undertaken. This should also be a product of a refining/renegotiation narrative with the client or a realistic target market/user group. We do see highlighted in yellow a re-worked brief <b>Slide 22</b>, and the specification has some level of realism, there are some measurable specification points.</p> <p>The overall specification simply lacks enough detail with for example on <b>slide 23</b> under material properties there are some rather generic terms such as “strong and high tensile strength.” We do see some limited client input here which is credited.</p> <p>This is a level 2 award.</p>	Level 2	Level 2
<p><b>Grid 4</b> Design ideas</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>In order to achieve marks from the highest level, it is expected that a range of design strategies are used to produce a range of design ideas that address the specification criteria from the previous section. Design strategies include elements such as 2D, 3D, subsystem details, inspiration materials, work of other designers and cultural historical influences. The design ideas although rather sketchy do show some detail in terms of sub-assembly design for example on feet and in terms of corner detail.</p> <p>The annotation is also helpful, but it is a pity that the candidate often uses generic terms such as metal, this is a reflection of the lack of research into suitable materials. The sketch work showing universal joints and articulation is more helpful, <b>slide 29</b> and we do begin to see words such as steel being used, this also illustrates some sub assembly work.</p> <p>Some of the review statements here are relevant but would not contribute to the overall review, rather help in this criterion in terms of checking against the specification parameters.</p> <p>The candidate does show some design strategies such as the use of inspiration materials and the analysis of workshop machines to illustrate different mechanisms, but the work still lacks sophisticated detail. E.g. <b>Slide 31</b></p> <p>This is a level 2.</p> <p>Evidence: slide 24-30</p>	Level 2	Level 2
<p><b>Grid 5</b> Development</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>Candidates should be thinking like a commercial designer and apply their knowledge of technical skills and materials and back it up with the research they have carried out previously and any additional research. Annotation should illustrate the candidates’ knowledge and understanding of technical elements such as materials, processes and techniques that are</p>	Level 3	Level 3

	<p>relevant to the identified design area.</p> <p>As suggested earlier we do see some further investigations in terms of mechanisms for example the use of a scissor Jack etc. This is useful iterative designing and is to be commended. <b>Slide 32.</b></p> <p>This was more useful in the development stage and illustrated an iterative approach to the design work. However, some of the work on fixings and fastenings seems somewhat unnecessary or unfocussed. <b>Slide 38.</b> The candidate does model to good effect to test the tilting mechanism and also to a certain extent in trying to mimic the correct scale.</p> <p>We also see some calculations which can be credited in the final design criterion <b>Slide 41.</b></p> <p>This does illustrate some useful modelling and does draw some conclusions; it is a pity that the candidate did not undertake further client dialogue.</p> <p>The award is at level 3</p> <p>Evidence: Slide 31-40</p>		
<p><b>Grid 6</b> Final Design</p> <div data-bbox="174 691 380 751" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;">Evidence</div>	<p>In this section we are looking for the candidates to be making some final refinements and then presenting a detailed final design solution that enabled third party manufacture to take place. The candidates should then produce a manufacturing specification that details the technical information needed for manufacture.</p> <p>The candidate does submit a final engineering drawing and a parts list, <b>slides 46, 47,</b> however there is a lack of detail in terms of the pivoting mechanism and the production plan is somewhat descriptive. We do see some calculations in the portfolio which should be credited for example <b>slide 41</b> but there is a need for greater detail in terms of joining and fabrication techniques. This is also true of the pivot mechanism detail which would have benefited from a detail drawing or an exploded view.</p> <p>This is a level 2 submission.</p> <p>Evidence: Slide 46-53</p>	Level 3	Level 2
<p><b>Grid 7</b> Review</p> <div data-bbox="174 1217 380 1278" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;">Evidence</div>	<p>This section is where the candidates must undertake an intellectual analysis of the work they have undertaken so far; the commentary must be analytical and evaluative it must not be simply descriptive. In the best cases there should be strength and weakness analysis that provides balance and should consider all factors such as materials, processes, techniques and have reference to feedback.</p> <p>There are some reviews statements within the main body of the portfolio but they're often descriptive lacking balance and analysis, the client commentary is again somewhat descriptive lacking the analytical critique that we're looking for in this assessment criterion. The candidate missed opportunities to gather the thoughts of interested third parties or other stakeholders this was an oversight.</p>	Level 2	Level 2

	This therefore is a level 2 award. Evidence: 34-46		
<b>Grid 8</b> Communication  <b>Evidence throughout portfolio.</b>	The candidates should: Demonstrate a perceptive selection and accomplished use of traditional/manual graphical techniques to communicate design proposals. Demonstrate a perceptive selection and accomplished use of computer-aided design (CAD) techniques to communicate design proposals. Demonstrate a perceptive selection and accomplished use of written techniques to communicate design proposals. All of these strands need to be evidenced and be effective but also perceptive, if for instance the best communication method is a sectional view and the candidate recognizes this, that is perceptive. We see evidence of all three component parts of this criterion some of the written work lacks technical detail The sketched work has some merit, but the candidate would have benefited from showing further annotation within each sketched idea.	Level 3	Level 3
<b>Grid 9</b> Tools and equipment  <b>Evidence</b>	In this section the candidates are expected to demonstrate an accomplished and sophisticated selection and use of tools and equipment which shows and in depth understanding of the materials being used and a justification of their use.  The work of the candidate here is somewhat reliant on the use of welding this is something of a pity as the candidate did produce an interesting product, that missed opportunities. They could have developed the pivoting mechanism to a greater extent perhaps using locking systems or turned thumb turns. The platform also had opportunities to look at other materials or different bonding for the surface material.  The award is level 3. Evidence: Slides 54-65	Level 3	Level 3
<b>Grid 10</b> Quality and Accuracy  <b>Evidence</b>	This section should be characterised by demonstrating high level making skills that evidence accuracy leading to a quality artefact that is fully functioning prototype that meets the end user needs identified in the specification. We should also see candidates not being afraid to consult with the interested parties and amend the design during the manufacturing  There is no doubt that the candidate produced an accurate well-made product it does appear to lack a little in terms of a finish especially on the main framework, this is also true of the matting. That said the product does appear to be a functional prototype that lacks a commercial level of finesse. The candidate missed opportunities to look at more compound angles and differing mechanisms which again is a missed opportunity to unlock the very highest levels of the assessment criteria for manufacture.  This is a level 3 performance	Level 3	Level 3

	Evidence: Slides 54-65		
<p><b>Grid 11</b> Test and Evaluate</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>In this section we are looking for the candidate’s ability to discern the difference between testing and evaluating. The notion of testing implies putting the product into service and considering its success, especially in terms of the specification and the clients’ needs wants and values, whereas in the evaluation phase we are looking for a critical review including strengths and weaknesses which will then give a balanced conclusion supported by all of the analysis undertaken.</p> <p>The candidate did put the product into service into service and we do see differing users using the product it is a pity that some of the conclusions felt lacking in analysis, for example successful connections at differing angles. There is an attempt at some balance in terms of pros and cons but again this is not an evaluative commentary. The specification is used to test success, but it would have been better to have had more meaningful dialogue with the clients and interested stakeholders.</p>	Level 3	Level 2
Total		B Grade	B Grade