



Topic: Skate Sharp

Full Portfolio evidence

General Description

The candidate undertakes a project based around ice hockey and skating. The portfolio is 30 pages/slides in length, the candidate designs and develops a storage product for the storing of skating equipment. The product incorporates a skate sharpening workstation that has predominantly bought in/upcycled components.

Mod Mark

<p>Grid 1 Investigation</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>To work in a client centred iterative way, candidates must first identify the problems or needs of a client or user group to develop a product that may fulfil their needs. The early selection of potential projects shows some level of wider thinking and a consideration of a range of project possibilities, Slide 4 including client identification. Design possibilities are outlined and some further discussion/justification takes place. (Slide5) The Alessi work is largely spurious, (Slide 2 and parts of 3), the section titled Designing for.... Has some merit. This does evidence some justification of proposals and a linkage to the client (Slide 5), this does culminate in a client description and some indication of the Needs, Wants and Values. This therefore elevates the work slightly and justifies a Level 2 award.</p>	<p>Level 2</p>
<p>Grid 2 Analysis/Research</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>This section should be characterised by client led research that maintains the candidates focus on relevancy. The work should endeavor not to be descriptive or generic. The candidate does submit some limited evidence of wider research into needs of client and potential storage of other components such as the hand sharpener (Slide7). However, the research is limited and indeed superficial, but the work of merit is to do with existing products, limited by quite descriptive annotation. However, there is some limited work on materials on Slide 18 which is included in this criterion. The work is superficial and fulfils the descriptors for level 1.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Grid 3 Specification</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>In this section we are expecting to see evidence of technical and measurable specification points that are a product of the focussed research undertaken. The candidate has submitted a simplistic specification (Slides 11-12) with little evidence for consideration of linkage to the research or indeed the needs of client. It is difficult to see any measurable elements in the specification but there is a slight balance to consider in terms of the justifications on Slides 9 and 10 and the specification points. Broadly the specification points are too generic, and we see little in terms of a re-worked design brief. The summary of the interview (Slide 10) does help somewhat in terms of the specification points and a partial design brief. The award in this case is therefore a high level 1.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>

<p>Grid 4 Design ideas</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>In this section we should see the candidates evidencing a range of ideas with sub assembly detail and informative ‘return to client’ discussions, maintaining the client designer relationship. There are a simple range of ideas that certainly fulfil the needs of the client in terms of functionality, but the ideas lack real sub assembly design and detail. They are holistic and have virtually no detail, but the overall concepts can be seen. There is little evidence of design strategies that trigger iterations and very limited client engagement. We do see some referral to technical detail such as adhesives and joints (Slide 14) In this case the ideas are basic but realistic, this is a Level 1 award.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Grid 5 Development</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>On-going developmental changes are informed by technical application of research, experimenting, and client/end user feedback in order to improve, refine and realise a design. There are some developments in terms of the joint detail and the overall look of the product but, the client input/real development influenced by users is limited. The candidate also alludes to the inclusion of LED lighting (Slide 17) and again jointing techniques (Slide 18). The key words in the level one assessment criteria fully describe the work submitted i.e. Basic, superficial and limited.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Grid 6 Final Design</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>This section should be characterised by the candidate submitting enough detail to enable third party manufacture including detailed workings drawings and a manufacturing specification that illustrate the operational requirements to create the parts. The work of credit here is the cutting list and the costs, (Slide 19) the candidate omits to include working drawings and so third-party manufacture would be rather difficult. This is clearly a level 1 submission</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Grid 7 Review</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>It is expected that candidates include notes throughout the development and summary pages comparing the final idea to the specification and gather the thoughts of the client or interested stakeholders so that they can, at least make some evaluative commentary. There are limited review statements in the annotation, often the annotation is a commentary or merely descriptive, but some of it does have some merit in terms of LED lights and the functionality e.g. sufficient lighting source.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>

<p>Grid 8 Communication</p> <p>Evidence across portfolio</p>	<p>We see 2D and 3D sketching and reasonable annotation, the CAD is omitted but there is merit in the sketching and annotation.</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Grid 9 Tools and equipment</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>The candidate has produced a functioning prototype that is effective in terms of usage, however the evidence seems to show that the skills and processes are somewhat simplistic. It is glued and screwed, with rather crude joints and joining techniques, the vacuum formed tray has some merit but it is difficult to find evidence of a former and so this may be a bought component. The arm mount for the skate is a recycled/repurposed element as is the cutting mat. There is no evidence that the candidate made the vac formed tray, with a former this would elevate the work! The fitting of the lighting does help a little but overall, the work is adequate for this level of qualification. Overall, this is a level 2 submission.</p>	<p>Level 2</p>
<p>Grid 10 Quality and Accuracy</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>The candidates should produce a prototype that demonstrates accomplished making skills at an advanced level in relation to a sophisticated design problem it should be generally functional and match the end user needs. There is no doubt that the product is at least partially effective in terms of the functionality of the product. The quality however is somewhat lacking, the finish also is lacking in terms of quality, but storage of the products is again adequate with some accuracy but lacking in a holding mechanism for the skates for example. Overall, the submission lacks finesse and sophistication and so the award is at level 2.</p>	<p>Level 2</p>
<p>Grid 11 Test and Evaluate</p> <p>Evidence</p>	<p>The candidate does submit photography that helps to illustrate the functionality of the product, which is to be commended. This does demonstrate the products usage ‘in situ’ to some extent. They go on to look at the success of the product measured against the specification points. The initial specification is weak and so this has a ‘knock on’ effect. The justifications are descriptive, and the modifications have a naive tone to them. (Slide 26-27). The client engagement is limited and has a somewhat ‘flowery’ use of language which seems slightly at odds with the rest of the portfolio (Slide 28) If AI is used within the portfolio this should be referenced in the centre documentation. The life cycle analysis is largely a commentary and is therefore a limited evaluative commentary. The work is awarded at a high-level 1</p>	<p>Level 1</p>
<p>Total</p>		<p>E Grade</p>