

# Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2011

Applied GCE

Applied GCE

Information and Communication  
Technology (6962)

Paper 01 - Customising Applications

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186

January 2011

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## General Comments

There were very few submissions in this moderation window. It was pleasing to see that most centres submitted the sample required on one disk and included the e-sheets and candidate authentication sheets all labelled according to the correct naming conventions as detailed in the document "Moderation of e-Portfolios: Guidance for Centres". Many candidates' e-portfolios were in the correct file formats, within the stated file size of 25 MB and most contained a clear index file which started the e-portfolio. It was also good to see many assessors giving clear feedback in the e-sheets explaining the assessment decisions made and marks awarded. Refer to the section on administration at the end of this report which details some poor practice relating to the submission of work for moderation.

On the whole most candidates addressed the strands correctly. However, there are still instances of candidates being placed in too high a mark band for the evidence produced.

There were very few instances of evidence of centres adopting a very structured approach in this moderation window which was a positive step. It is worth reiterating here that whilst it is acceptable for the Assessor to act as "client" and give the same brief to all candidates; the brief should be sufficiently open ended to enable candidates to adopt an independent approach to a solution - as is required for the higher mark bands.

### Comments on strand (a)

Good evidence in this strand facilitates effectively addressing the requirements of all the other strands. Quite a lot of candidates address this strand very well but, as in previous windows, some failed to include details of how they would "judge the effectiveness of the solution" by presenting measurable success criteria.

### Comments on strand (b)

It was nice to see how many candidates addressed this strand well with detail and clarity in their objectives - strand (a). Prototyping was present across the board and it was clear some candidates had spent a great deal of time and effort providing detailed prototypes and detailed evaluations of each. It would appear that where candidates do this very well there is good evidence of liaising with a client and clear evidence that they have developed the product following feedback, fully documenting the entire process.

At times however candidates present details of what they have done rather than what they plan to do including screenshots of the final product and/or copies of final programming code. Others consider design to be a collection of hand drawn screen designs with little attention to the programming aspects that are so important and, at times, little or no evidence of prototyping. In this unit it is important that we see how the programming

is going to be done. It would be difficult to gain the higher mark bands without some kind of structure diagram or process specifications such as flowcharts or pseudo code.

### Comments on strand (c)

Most centres are providing projects which are suitable for A2 and it was very pleasing to see candidates using loops and different types of selection appropriately. However, at times, there is evidence of candidates being placed in too high a mark band for the evidence present. Standard ways of working are important in this strand. With regards to programming code that includes good use of indentation and comments clearly explaining the purpose of the code and clearly showing where candidates have written/modified code to include at the very least iteration and selection moving to different types of selection, iteration and a sequential search to (for the highest mark band) amending information using a sequential search. At times moderators found it very hard to see what code had actually been written by the candidates and what had been generated using wizards etc.

### Comments on strand (d)

Those candidates who had included good measurable objectives in their specification did this very well indeed, as did those who had worked closely with a client. On the whole this strand is being approached very positively with candidates including detailed test plans and evidence of the results. There was some very good evidence of formative testing in conjunction with clients/prototyping and refinements. However, there are still cases of test plans being put forward with no actual proof of results which makes it very hard for moderators to agree assessment decisions.

### Comments on strand (e)

Evaluations are getting better without doubt. There are a significant number of marks for evaluation in this unit and again, those candidates with a good functional specification including clear objectives and success criteria and those who worked closely with a client produced some excellent evidence. Many candidates are now ensuring there is a clear evaluation of the code they have written themselves and there were some very thoughtful considerations of alternative solutions. However, some candidates are still not appreciating the importance of this aspect of the evaluation. It is worth reiterating that Mark Band 1 requires candidates to comment on the effectiveness of their coding and reach some conclusion about whether or not it was the best way to meet the requirements. Mark band two requires consideration of alternative solutions and the justification for the use of coding. Mark band three requires full justification for the use of coding.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH