



Chief Examiner and Chief Moderator Report

**NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Creative
Design and Production
603/7003/8**

Series: Summer 2024

NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Creative Design and Production (603/7003/8)

Paper numbers: P0024442, P002480, P002441

This report contains information in relation to the examined assessment (EA) from the chief examiner and non-examined assessment (NEA) from the Chief Moderator, with an emphasis on the standard of learner work within this assessment series.

The aim is to highlight where learners generally performed well as well as any areas where further development may be required.

Key points:

- grade boundary information
- administering the EA and NEA
- evidence creation
- standard of learner work
- responses to the tasks
- Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment and the NEA.

The qualification is linear, meaning both assessments must be taken in the same assessment series and cannot be combined across different assessment series. Learners are allowed one attempt at each assessment, and there are no resit opportunities.

Grade boundary and achievement information (V Certs)

This qualification consists of two assessments: the examined assessment (EA) and the non-examined assessment (NEA).

After both assessments are completed and marked or moderated, the marks are combined to give a final mark for each learner. Where the raw marks do not reflect the required weighting of the assessment, a scaling factor is applied. For further information on grading information and scaling factors, please see the Qualification Specification.

Qualification scaled mark boundaries in this series are:

		<i>Notional boundaries*</i>	
	Overall	EA	NEA
Scaling factor		1	1.25
Max	200	80	96
Level 2 Distinction*	165	66	79
Level 2 Distinction	139	56	66
Level 2 Merit	113	46	53
Level 2 Pass	87	36	41
Level 1 Distinction	66	27	31
Level 1 Merit	46	18	22
Level 1 Pass	26	10	13

** The grade boundaries given for each assessment are known as 'notional grade boundaries', as they are for illustrative purposes only. Grade boundaries are the lowest mark with which a grade is achieved.*

Administering the EA and NEA

The EA is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#) document.

Learners must be given the resources to carry out the tasks and these are highlighted within the [Qualification Specific Instructions for Delivery \(QSID\)](#) document.

The NEA must be conducted in line with the regulations outlined in the [Tutor Guidance Document](#)

Evidence creation

EA

Learners should use the space provided to answer questions. Where answers are typed or additional pages included, the learners name, centre number, centre name and task number must be clearly visible. The additional paper must then be securely attached to the workbook.

Where assessments are completed online, centres must ensure they are familiar with the Surpass platform and have completed all testing and preparation before the assessment, to ensure learners are unaffected by technological issues.

NEA

Learners should approach all tasks in the NEA with reference to time requirements and control conditions. Learners should produce evidence to meet each task independently and with no feedback or guidance from tutors during the assessment.

Learner evidence requirements are stated per task and give mandatory outcomes which can often be evidenced in a variety of ways to best meet the needs of the learner, unless otherwise stated.

Learner evidence submissions in this session often included a range of word-processed documents, PowerPoint presentations, sketches, hand drawings, CAD designs and photographs in line with expectations.

Moderators were pleased to note that the majority of learners had included visual evidence which reinforced written commentary in most cases. The Chief Moderator suggests that for best effect, screengrabs and photographs should be subject to annotation to maximise the value of the evidence.

Centres are reminded that template documents, word frames and other supporting documents should not be supplied to the learner for the purposes of generating evidence against this assessment. Use of such materials to generate assessment evidence could potentially be considered malpractice.

Standard of learner work

EA

The standard of work presented by learners varied significantly, ranging from Level 1 pass/merit/distinction. Notably, performance across the lower and mid-range questions was consistent, reflecting those learners had been well-prepared with a solid understanding of the foundational concepts outlined in the course specification. This strong grounding enabled many learners to effectively meet assessment objective 1, which focuses on the recall of knowledge.

The paper tested knowledge across a broad range of the specification, with some aspects proving more challenging than others for learners, which was particularly evident in the extended response questions, which assessed all three assessment objectives. Learners were often able to recall knowledge but struggled to apply knowledge and understanding, and analyse and evaluate within their responses, therefore were often limited in their ability to achieve marks within assessment objective 2 and 3.

Some learners left several questions unanswered, which inevitably reduced their overall scores. It is recommended learners attempt every question, as leaving questions blank their ability to achieve higher marks.

An area to highlight for development was the learners' understanding of different printing techniques and methods and requires focussed improvement in the future to ensure that learners can fully engage with all aspects of the examination.

NEA

This was the first NEA for the qualification. The assessment consisted of six tasks to be completed by learners over 16 hours.

A total of 96 marks was available across the assessment. Each task was allocated a range of marks placed against stated assessment objectives (AO) linked to task focus. In this assessment AO's 1-5 were assessed via levels of response mark grids aligned to each task, with weightings per task varied to reflect the nature of the qualification outcomes.

Learner outcomes were achieved across the available range of awarded grades in this assessment, which was suggestive of learner engagement and useful differentiation of assessment. The majority of learners had attempted all tasks within the assessment, producing appropriate evidence in most cases to accrue marks against AOs. The majority of learners had also undertaken tasks in a logical manner demonstrating understanding of key areas of the qualification content. Moderators noted that in some cases, evidence against tasks were not clearly labelled as such and the chief moderator would advise that evidence be clearly referenced to tasks in future submissions.

A minority of learners registered for the assessment had not submitted any evidence or had not gained any credit for evidence produced. Some learners had not attempted all tasks within the assessment, which led to a reduction in the available marks.

Evidence of creditable practical outcomes were in place in the work of the majority of learners. Outcomes generally reflected demands of the brief in terms of stylistic and functionality demands. In some cases, the prototypes exhibited imagination and confidence which were reflected in AO4 marks.

Responses to interpretation of a brief, planning of production stages and evaluation were more varied in breadth and depth. Learners generally tended to achieve more highly against AO1 and AO2 marks were present in tasks than AO3 and AO5 marks. However, learners who achieved well-tended to present evidence which was more balanced in outcome at AO and task level in terms of accrual of marks.

It was noted by moderators that summative assessor feedback to learners was generally useful and positive. However, assessor feedback did not always include marks and commentary at AO level within tasks which on occasion made assessor decisions unclear for both the purposes of accuracy of feedback to learners and external moderation.

Evidence upload for moderation was generally well handled by centres, although it was noted that some uploads did not initially include all submitted learner evidence and, in some cases, did not include assessment documents. This potentially led to some delays in moderation of learner work.

All tasks must be uploaded using the 'Learner evidence upload checklists' as a guide so it is clear that learners have attempted the tasks or not. These will be available as part of the live assessment materials. The assessor feedback sheet must also be uploaded per AO. Learner feedback should also be included.

Responses

EA

Question 1

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 2

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 3

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 4

Learner performance on this question varied. While some learners correctly identified the postmodern features of the shoes, others struggled and made incorrect connections. Explanations frequently did not align with postmodernism, often referencing other design eras instead.

Question 5

This question was well answered by learners. Most were able to identify different costs that would need to be considered with an explanation given to that cost implication.

Question 6

Responses to this question were varied. Some learners did not correctly identify the Computer Aided Manufacture (CAM) techniques required, instead referencing Computer Aided Design (CAD) software. This suggests a gap in understanding the distinction between CAD and CAM technologies.

Question 7 (a)

A well answered question, learners were able to identify a suitable material factor and justify their stating specific factor.

Question 7 (b)

A well answered question, with the majority of learners able to compare the two materials with justified, detailed explanations as to why they recommended the materials for the bowls manufacture.

Question 8 (a)

Learners generally provided a poor level of response to this question, with few correctly identifying the two wallpaper printing techniques. This identified a gap in understanding the various printing methods and their applications.

Question 8 (b)

This question proved challenging for learners. Many learners struggled to identify and justify the appropriate printing techniques for wallpaper, with explanations often failing to demonstrate a clear understanding of their relevance.

Question 9 (a)

Learners performed mixed in this question. Many learners could correctly identify the design movement but not the era it was active in.

Question 9 (b)

Learners demonstrated varied performance on this question. While many effectively described the use of sketches, mood boards, and models in presenting designs, a limited number of learners addressed the significance of materials and CAD in client feedback, indicating a gap in understanding the comprehensive design communication process.

Question 10

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 11

Multiple-choice question which was answered correctly by most learners.

Question 12

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 13

Learners performed well in this question and were able to identify a suitable presentation method to display their design solution.

Question 14

This question was well answered by learners. Most correctly identified a way in which Lisa could promote herself at the marketing event with clear explanation given.

Question 15 (a)

Many learners correctly were able to identify and describe the purpose of self-promotion so that Stuart's business could grow and develop.

Question 15 (b)

Learners performed very well with this question. The majority could identify two different forms of digital self-promotion that Stuart could use.

Question 16 (a)

Responses to this question were very mixed. Some learners limited their answers by focusing on specific jobs Tom could seek rather than considering broader types of work suited to his skill set. However, most learners successfully identified two distinct job types that aligned well with Tom's abilities.

Question 16 (b)

Learners performed very well with this question with the majority identifying three skills that are vital to the design industry that would help Tom to choose the correct type of work for him.

Question 17

Multiple-choice question which was answered well by many learners.

Question 18

Multiple-choice question which was answered correctly by most learners.

Question 19

Multiple-choice question which was answered correctly by most learners.

Question 20

This question was well answered by learners. Most learners correctly identified the type of client Joe could work with as an independent designer.

Question 21

Learners often misinterpreted the question, which emphasised the production of "a small number of the same design" for the client. Although the question was aimed at small-scale manufacturing, many learners incorrectly discussed mass production, and did not address the client's specific needs appropriately.

Question 22

The learners demonstrated a solid understanding of various quality control measures, effectively identifying applicable visual checks. They also showed competence in ensuring products adhere to designer-specified tolerances, reflecting a thorough grasp of the subject matter.

Question 23

Learners demonstrated proficiency in identifying time-management tasks but struggled to articulate how these tasks support the production schedule. Centres should emphasise not only the identification of time-management tasks but also their impact on process efficiency and schedule adherence.

Question 24

In the extended-writing task focussed on bag design, learners demonstrated commendable proficiency in recommending various materials for manufacturing. Their choices were well-justified, showcasing an understanding of material properties and their application to the design process. However, across the cohort, learners encountered difficulties accurately identifying the design movement that influenced the bag's style. This suggests a need for a deeper exploration of design movements in future instruction, emphasising their distinctive characteristics and historical contexts. Improving this understanding and analysis would enhance learners' ability to accurately link design principles with appropriate movements.

Question 25

In this extended-writing question, learners frequently encountered difficulties in providing comprehensive responses, meeting the higher mark bands. Their answers often reflected only a rudimentary grasp of the key components required for the client presentation.

While some learners did identify essential elements such as research, initial ideas, and prototyping, they largely failed to articulate the significance of these components within the context of the presentation. Specifically, they did not adequately explain why these elements are critical to the client's understanding and decision-making process. This suggests a need for deeper engagement with the material and a clearer demonstration of how these aspects contribute to the overall effectiveness of a client presentation.

NEA

Task 1a

In this task, learners were required to analyse the given brief and with reference to these findings and research, produce at least three initial ideas in response. The task evidence required that the outcome be submitted as a digital portfolio.

The majority of learners engaged well with this task to produce a creditable outcome which included research findings and initial ideas. Evidence of visual research and design work was often usefully supported by commentary to access the range of AO1, AO2 and AO3 marks available.

Research sources were not always well referenced in learner responses, which in some cases suggested a limited understanding of how source material should be presented and credited.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to be able to present a coherent analysis of the demands of the brief and then target research to drive inspiration. Useful avenues of research included consideration of similar existing products in terms of function and aesthetics, ranged against examples of key elements drawn from the movement / styles given within the brief. Some learners working at this level undertook strong primary research and usefully focussed secondary research.

Learners were often able to draw clear conclusions in regards to stylistic features of each of the given options and use these in context to create the required number of initial ideas. Balanced consideration of suitability of the use of shape, colour and visual language was in evidence in visual presentation often allowing learners to begin to make choices in terms of stylistic elements and discount others.

Learners who achieved less well in this task tended to have undertaken less coherent research, which was more often limited to secondary sources. Conclusions drawn from research were in some cases less concerned with stylistic considerations than historical commentary, which tended to limit the usefulness of the research in terms of driving the aesthetics of initial ideas. A minority of learners did not generate the required number of ideas, or generated ideas which varied considerably in application of thought. Learners working at this level had often focussed on one movement / style at this stage, which gave less opportunity for judgemental commentary.

Coherent judgements and clarity in initial ideas at this stage tended to allow the learners to gain credit against AO3 and move more confidently into task 1b.

Task 1b

Task 1b required learners to produce a slide show presentation explaining how their initial ideas from task 1a met the needs of the client.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to have produced a coherent presentation which presented their ideas against all the brief requirements including the selected style / movement. The evidence was judgemental in nature, with learners reflecting on all the three ideas to

consistently consider suitability in terms of style, aesthetics and functionality. Learners were able to separate evidence for this task from task 1a evidence and successfully condense responses into a suitable format for presentation.

Learners who achieved less well tended to have produced evidence which was not clearly differentiated from task 1a and had in some cases ignore the slide show presentation requirement. Commentary was often less focussed upon all elements of the brief and more upon outlining ideas against the brief. Judgements were often less detailed and conclusive in nature. Reflection upon stylistic concerns tended to mirror the scope of research undertaken in task 1a, with learners who were less able to consider key features of styles / movements in terms of visual outcomes tending to produce less convincing commentary in this task.

It is noted that learners should not be provided with template structures from which to produce assessment evidence.

A minority of learners had not attempted this task or had produced evidence which was not distinct from task 1a which tended to limit available marks and did not produce a useful basis to proceed to task 2.

Task 2

Task 2 required that learners select one of their initial ideas and develop this via consideration of design principles to create a design drawing and commentary on choices of materials, for development of their design.

The majority of learners had engaged with this task to present evidence of drawings, application of development and consideration of material choices. A minority of learners had not presented evidence in response to this task.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to have given further consideration to refinement of ideas in terms of functionality and aesthetics, based on conclusions drawn from task 1a. Evidence for this often included further sketches, commentary on experimentation and annotated images. A range of hand and CAD drawings were evidenced with varying degrees of sophistication in application of drawing skills and detail of appropriate dimensions. Learners working well at this level had produced well considered drawings suitable for use in manufacturing the design prototype. Commentary showed ongoing review of ideas and in some cases allowed learners to considerably advance, refine and reconsider their designs from task 1a / 1b.

Material choices were often logical and focussed, with consideration of properties clearly laid out. Learners were able to explore a range of potential materials and draw conclusions upon suitability to discount choices and form a conclusion. Review of drawings and material choices tended to be interlaced with responses to allow learners to adjust and redesign ideas and provide ongoing analysis consistently through the task leading to a considered outcome.

Learners who achieved less marks tended to have provided more limited evidence of development and expansion of ideas. In some cases, the initial ideas were not given further consideration via commentary and the learners instead produced drawings to refine. Drawings at this level were often less sophisticated and more limited in scope, with some dimension

inaccuracies evident. In a minority of submissions learners had produced no further design drawings and resubmitted initial sketches, which limited available marks.

Material choices were not always well considered and, in some cases, materials commented upon were not contextually realistic against the brief. In some cases, only basic consideration of materials to form the 'box' element were in evidence and were limited to one or two material choices, which tended to limited commentary. Review of work at this level was often undertaken summatively, so tended not to drive the development process forward. Application of a 'What went well' and 'Even better if (WWW/EBI)' structure to these evaluations in some cases did not draw conclusions which allowed for scope of coverage.

Appropriately presented and dimensioned drawings, alongside refinements to the design and evaluation of choices generally allowed learners to approach task 3 with confidence.

Task 3

In this task learners were required to plan the production of the design, with reference to tools, materials, techniques and risk assessment. The task required that a production plan document and risk assessment be submitted as part of the digital portfolio.

Learners had generally engaged with this task to provide coverage of some, or all elements noted above in their responses. A minority of learners had not produced evidence in response to this task, limiting available credit against the stated AO1, AO2 and AO3 outcomes.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to be able to produce a concise and useable plan which referenced stages of production, processes, techniques and quality assurance. Learners at this level had often given consideration to timelines referenced against the NEA to consider realistic approaches to production.

Details of processes against each stage of production were logically arrayed and, in some cases, justified via commentary. A range of techniques was considered in respect to materials as a coherent expansion from task choices. Risk assessments were suitably documented with consideration of relevant hazards and control measures.

Learners who achieved less well in this task tended to have produced less coherent planning documents, which in some cases detailed techniques and processes which were not relevant to the outcome.

Timelines were in some cases not considered or were unrealistically long or short. Choices of process and techniques was often more limited and in a minority of cases were not suitable for application to the selected materials. Risk assessments were generally functional showing learner engagement with this area of specification content but identified hazards were not always contextually realistic and measures to inhibit risk were often less well considered.

A well-considered, detailed and timebound production plan document allowed learners to move into task 4 with greater confidence in developing and producing their prototype.

Task 4

Task 4 required that learners develop their design by creation of a prototype, supported by evidence of process and formative review. A range of marks across AO4 and AO5 were available in this task. Learners had generally provided a greater depth of evidence to accrue marks against AO4.

The majority of learners had engaged well with the task to produce an assembled prototype, supported by commentary showing application of process and decisions made. A minority of learners had not provided evidence against the requirements of this task.

Photographic evidence of the final outcome was variable in quality and detail which in some cases did not support learner portfolios well.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to be able to produce a functional and assembled prototype, which considered all areas of the brief. The work of some learners demonstrated more sophisticated application of principles and techniques, creative approaches and imaginative application of aesthetic considerations.

Practical outcomes were often reinforced by detailed process evidence – including annotated images showing application of techniques. Ongoing review was in evidence, and assisted learners in making decisions to move the design forward. Learners at this level were able to work to their production plan, modify and redesign were necessary and apply some consideration of quality control measures.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to have produced more limited prototype outcomes, in some cases lacking final assembly which inhibited functionality. Application of stylistic elements was often more variable at this level. Most learners had attempted to follow through with reference to the proceeding tasks but in a minority of cases it was noted that choices of colour, shape and form related to the aesthetics of the prototype were less appropriate.

A well-constructed and evidenced prototype, supported by evidence of process generally provided learners with a useful basis from which to undertake task 5.

Task 5

In this final task learners were required to provide a summative review of their skills and outcome, evidenced as a report to the client.

This task did not always result in substantive outcomes in line with task, with a minority of learners producing no evidence in response.

Learners who were able to produce a considered review and engage with the given context were often able to achieve well. In some cases, evidence from throughout the digital portfolio was referenced to support conclusive and coherent analysis. Evaluation of skills linked back to process evidence and commentary upon the success of the outcome, with reference to the brief in evidence. Coherent and relevant documentation of the review often allowed for achievement against AO3, AO4 and AO5.

Learners who achieved less marks tended to have produced more minimal evaluations which in some cases did not address all aspects of the task or frame the evidence contextually. Learners working at this level sometimes moved to a 'WWW / EBI' approach which in some cases constrained depth of commentary.

Often a pattern was notable in that learners who had not achieved well in the earlier tasks tended not to accrue marks as successfully in response to Task 5.