

# Examiner's Report

## January 2010

GCE

GCE Applied ICT 6960 Paper 01

Using Multimedia Software

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/>

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

January 2010

Publications Code UA023235

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Contents

1.	Overall Comments	1
2.	Unit 10: Using Multimedia Software	2
	• Strand A	2
	• Strand B	2
	• Strand C	2
	• Strand D	3
	• Strand E	3
3.	Grade Boundaries	5

## Overall Comments

### Important information

This specification has been updated and ALL candidates will be assessed on the updated version from SUMMER 2010. This version which has a blue cover and has been sent out to centres, many centres have attended the free inset sessions.

### Moderated Units

#### Assessment Issues

Candidates need to supply explicit evidence to support their achievement of the criteria in the various marking grids. It is easier to confirm marks if the evidence is easy to find and supplied in an explicit form.

Assessors must use the e-sheets as an opportunity to explain why they have awarded marks, there are two advantages to this for the centre. If the moderator can see *why* and where marks are awarded it is easier to agree with the centre marks, secondly if the centre marks cannot be agreed then the moderator can give better guidance to help future assessment.

A number of centres still do not meet deadlines for submitting work to the moderators; the deadlines are published in advance and must be kept unless special permission has been obtained in advance from Edexcel. Permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. Centres who miss the deadline risk having the results delayed or the candidates recorded as absent.

Each unit must be on a separate CD, even if sent to the same moderator. Each unit will be forwarded to different principal moderators for monitoring and auditing purposes.

## Unit 10: Using Multimedia Software (6960)

### General comments

There was a limited range of material entered in this window, however there were some very good multimedia products better candidates included excellent videos where candidates produced, edited the video and used sound to good effect

Many candidates are still developing text based websites rather than multimedia products. It is possible to use a web type interface written in HTML to host a good multimedia product. However the design must concentrate on the multimedia part of the product rather than the layout of pages that are mostly text based.

Candidates must be made aware of the size limit for this unit which is 30Mb and it should form part of the functional specification for the product. Compression techniques are part of the specification and candidates should be taught how to control the size of the multimedia elements.

Centres often combine this unit with unit 8, in which case it is vital that the candidates produce documentation separately for each unit.

### Stand A

The better candidates had a client driving the design and development of the product, this leads to better testing and better evaluation sections. Many candidates could not achieve mark band 3 because there was no evidence of measurable objectives better candidates produced functional specifications with clear and measurable outcomes, the final product was then judged against these and the evaluation made better by referring to them.

This strand should focus on the product, centre who combine unit 8 with this need to produce a separate document for this purpose.

### Stand B

This is a multimedia unit and the design should focus on the multimedia aspects of the product. There is often a lot of work in relation to screen layout and content and very little if any relating to the multimedia elements. There was limited evidence of prototyping and refinements to designs. Many candidates did not evidence creation and editing of original material.

Those candidates with real users involved them in evaluating prototypes however there was no clear indication where feedback was incorporated.

There was a lack of evaluation by the candidates as to how the work had been developed and refined at each stage using prototyping.

### Stand C

Candidates are required to produce a working multimedia product that will function fully away from the development environment. Most met this aim within the context of the eportfolio, from where the product should be launched for the purpose of assessment.

A fully working multimedia product was evidenced in the e-portfolios of most candidates and many also met the functional requirements.

The candidates produced 'getting started with...' instructions, of varying quality and detail. Many gave instructions on putting the CD in the computer but failed to provide further information covering system requirements and installation procedures enabling a novice user to install and use the product. A few candidates incorrectly gave instructions to start the product in the candidate's user area.

#### **Strand D**

Candidates frequently produced long test plans, and often indicated that the test was successful, however no evidence was given to show the process of testing had been carried out. Evidence was usually just in a table form and there was no visual evidence to show that the testing had been done. Better candidates provided screen shots to illustrate successful testing.

Few candidates did any testing at all related to the functional specification or the client's requirements.

There was little feedback from others, apart from in the prototyping stage of the project. Involvement of others was very poorly evidenced and making use of any feedback, during testing was lacking in most e-portfolios. This is necessary to access the higher marks in the range.

#### **Strand E**

All candidates produced work which evaluated the whole of the unit but not all commented upon whether the final product met the specified requirements. In order to achieve MB3 candidates need to produce well-rounded analytical and critical evaluations. Few candidates provided any evidence of feedback on their work.

There was some evidence of points of improvement being identified but not of the feedback being acted upon, many commented very briefly on their own performance and current skill level.

The evidence in this e-portfolio was often mixed with that for unit 8, it is important that the candidates are aware of the different requirements of the evaluation for this unit. This unit requires the product to be evaluated; unit 8 requires that the project management be evaluated.

#### **Standard Ways of Working**

In most cases the only evidence the external assessors had for this aspect the file structures and names used by the candidates.

#### **General Administration**

Most samples were correctly submitted with folders clearly labelled with centre numbers, candidate number and first 2 letters of surname and first of Christian name. It would help if the e-record sheet naming convention is the same

The centre assessor should use the e-record as an opportunity to help the moderator find the evidence required to agree the marks given. The comments by centres often contained only 1 line comments, in other cases no comments at all were provided. Where the candidate has combined the work with unit 8 it is essential that the assessor indicated where the evidence can be found for this unit, some parts of the evidence for example feedback, was often hidden in the minutes of meetings for unit 8. This could easily be missed by a moderator who is unfamiliar with the work.

Grade Boundary January 2010

6960	Total	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Mark	60	47	41	35	29	24
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40



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)

Order Code UA023235 January 2010

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