

GCE FOOD TECHNOLOGY (A2)
Exemplar Commentary 1
Unit: 6FT04

	Mark Range	Gluten free desk top lunch product.
A Research and analysis	1-2	Some design needs are clarified, but research is broad with limited focus on the needs identified in the analysis. Focus seems to be more on the venue for selling rather than the actual product. Product analysis does not provide any useful information to lead onto design intentions, but a list of ingredients and their nutritional value. (Page 1-14).
B Product specification	1-3	Some valid, realistic specification points, but some are stated, with no prior link to the research or the analysis. (Vegetarians). References to the research are mentioned, but with limited consultation with the client/user group. No mention of sustainability. Another specification appears on page 24, which is misplaced and confuses the design process at this stage. It is not clear what the candidate is trying to achieve.
C Design	4-6	Six realistic ideas are modelled (tuna pasta salad, broccoli and cheese quiche, veggie burgers and chips, chilli and bread, Moroccan chicken, Chinese chicken). Ideas address some specification points, with some user group consultation and reference to sustainability.
Review	1-2	Brief, general, subjective evaluation against specification points. Some aspects of sustainability are addressed, with brief client feedback.
Develop	1-3	Seasonal vegetable stir fry products are developed, together with a meat accompaniment, carbohydrate accompaniment and oriental sauces. There appears to be little purpose to the development, with minimal technical information to support knowledge and understanding.
Communicate	1-3	Range of communication techniques used including ICT to show some understanding of design and develop intentions.
D Planning	1-3	Brief production plan with some relevant quality and safety checks (not justified) and timings.
E Use of equipment	4-6	Evidence in the coursework and teacher annotation suggests: organisation of practical work, correct selection of tools and equipment although this is limited by the challenge of the task. Hygiene and safety awareness.
Quality	1-5	Limited evidence of understanding of working properties of materials, ingredients and components. Product matches final design proposal and functions adequately.
Complexity/level of demand	1-3	Limited skills used in production of final product (teacher annotation identifies packet sauce and ready to eat noodles). This an unchallenging task, that is simplistic and does not deserve high levels of credit.

F Test and evaluate	1-3	Specification points are listed, but not tested. Evaluation is subjective and modifications are cosmetic. No life cycle assessment of product.
---------------------------	-----	--