

Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2011

Applied GCE

Applied GCE

Information and Communication
Technology (6964)

Paper 01 - Programming

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.

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 was increasing evidence that the requirements of all aspects of the unit were beginning to be appreciated by the centres and candidate work seen supported this. It was again disappointing to see that, some centre assessors are still giving either no, or almost meaningless, feedback. Comments like 'well done' or 'nice screenshots' do not aid either the candidate or the moderator. Assessors are advised to use the e-sheet to explain how they reached a grading decision and to indicate if the candidate worked independently which is a requirement of the higher mark bands.

Lack of proof reading was still very evident throughout a high number of submitted portfolios with alarmingly many examples of evidence containing uncorrected errors. With the introduction of Quality of Written Communication to strand b it is important that candidates are recommended to proof read their work thoroughly.

Strand (a) - Needs Analysis

Candidates had little problem in finding two existing systems but again a significant percentage could not describe how these systems matched their client's requirements. There was still a distinct lack of evidence from the majority of candidates when it came to being able to evaluate fully the benefits and perceived drawbacks of the chosen systems in order to give their client an informed conclusion. The production of a proper needs analysis for a client with complex needs is central to this strand and centres are again reminded to refer their candidates to section 4.1 of the unit specification. Some candidates are still not submitting evidence that they have carried out and produced outcomes from at least two different investigations as part of their needs analysis this is a requirement in order to access the top of mark band 1 and move into mark band 2.

Strand (b) - System Specification

The main requirement of this strand is that the chosen system needs to be recommended to the client through a detailed and informative systems specification (section 4.7 of the unit specification). The completed report should be written as a non-technical explanation justifying as to why all the components, both hardware and software have been chosen and for the higher mark bands candidates' should offer their client alternatives to those components chosen.

This latter point was either omitted completely or very briefly mentioned in a large number of candidates' evidence for this strand.

Again as in previous moderation series candidates selected furniture, which they claimed to have ergonomic qualities but failed to explain why they would be suitable for their client. Quality of Written Communication was judged in this strand but the standard was in the main corresponding to the mark band awarded.

Strand (c) - System Build

As mentioned in previous Principal Moderators reports the system being built does not need to relate to the system recommended in strand (b) but there should be some indication as to the requirements and anticipated use of the system.

The evidence for the configuration activities still did not reflect the candidates' level of work. It is important that centres advise candidates to address several of

the activities listed in 4.9 of the unit specification. Many candidates still did not address working safely.

Strand (d) - Testing

It was again pleasing to see evidence of some good practice with candidates giving detailed accounts of how they tested the final system and also some end user testing. Photographs and screen dumps of error messages were included.

Candidates should be encouraged to produce annotated evidence of a variety of tests that have been undertaken if they wish to achieve a mark in grade bands two or three.

Strand (e) - Evaluation

The evaluation in this unit is about the performance of the built, tested and configured system and whether or not it met the needs of their client not about the performance and structure of the candidate's eportfolio. Feedback from others was often omitted and when present was found to be vague and lacking evidence of who provided the feedback and why.

It was again evident that many candidates found it difficult to accurately evaluate the work undertaken in this unit and comment reflectively on their own performance.

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>

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481
Email publications@linneydirect.com
January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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