UNIT 5: Web Development Commentary on Assessment of Student Exemplar Edexcel Inset TRAINING SEPT 07-08

Assessment criteria – Unit 5: Web Development – part a)		
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3
 The Learner produces an outline project plan for the design and creation of the website showing: the main tasks to be carried out the order in which tasks are scheduled for completion, though this is not entirely sensible the time allocated to complete each tasks, but not entirely realistic Whilst working on the project, the Learner makes limited use of the plan to monitor progress, and needs frequent prompting. 	The Learner produces a detailed project plan for the design and creation of the website clearly showing: • the main tasks and most subtasks to be carried out • that tasks are scheduled for completion in a sensible order • that a realistic amount of time has been allocated to complete each task. Whilst working on the project, the Learner makes good use of the plan to monitor progress, needing only occasional prompting.	 The Learner produces a comprehensive project plan for the design and creation of a website clearly showing: all the main tasks and subtask to be carried out that tasks are scheduled for completion in a sensible order that makes efficient use of time and resources that a realistic amount of time has been allocated to complete each task, with some allowance for contingencies built-in. Whilst working on the project, the Learner makes effective use of the plan to monitor progress, independently.
(0-4)	(5-6)	(6-8)

Comment: -

The candidate has produced a project plan and has used Excel for this which is acceptable for this AS unit. (Please note that it is recommended that specialist Project Management software is used for the A2 unit 8.) The main tasks are listed and then there are some sub tasks. These are then shown in Excel. However, this is very brief and does not show dates or any liaison with a client. 5.2 has not been fully addressed The evidence does not support the higher mark bands. There is a list of possible causes of delay (risks). There is also a list of things to do and whether were done. This is not a proper project plan. It can be seen that some dates at the beginning were not met but there is not explanation as to why this was the case. A further column with comments would have strengthened this evidence. There is no evidence to support the plan being used to monitor progress. This means that not all marks in mark band 1 can be accessed.

(The use of a project management applications package may have enabled the candidate to address these areas more effectively. However, it should be noted that, although 5.2 states "Ideally, you will use ;project management software to produce your plan, p93 of the specification states "it is not necessary to use project management software to produce the project plan, although learners should ideally be able to produce a graphical representation of their plan, as well as a straightforward numbered list.")

Mark Awarded 3

Assessment criteria – Unit 5: Web Development – part b)		
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3

The Learner:	The Learner:	The Learner:
 carries out a limited investigation of the client's requirements produces documentation giving some outline details of the proposed design for a website to meet these requirements, but with some gaps and omissions. 	 carries out an adequate investigation of the client's needs produces documentation giving details of the proposed design for a website to meet these requirements 	 carries out a thorough investigation of the client's requirements produces documentation giving comprehensive details of the proposed design for a website to met the client's requirements.
(0 - 8)	(9 – 12)	(13 – 16)

Comment: There is an Analysis section. The candidate has covered many of the items listed in 5.3 of the specification, ie purpose of the site, target audience, how the site can be accessed which includes hardware. This analysis makes no mention of an actual meeting with the client and could be just a response to a brief from the Assessor which is not the correct interpretation of this unit. 5.1 clearly stated "working closely with the client and end-users". The Assessor can pose as a "client" but there needs to be interaction even if it is a role play situation. Meetings/interviews with a client plus, perhaps, the use of questionnaires to ensure the discussions cover the relevant points are all good practice.

There is a section on Design. The candidate explains the designs but this evidence does not explicitly mention the client needs. The storyboard and initial explanation do show the links between the pages and the basic contents including logo, colour, font size, some of the features to be used etc. There is a flow chart/site map. There is no mention of accessibility although this is evidenced in the Prototyping section. The lack of evidence of communication with a client keeps this evidence in mark band 1 as there is insufficient evidence of an investigation actually having taken place.

Mark Awarded 8

Assessment criteria – Unit 5 Web Development – part c)		
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3
 The Learner: makes limited use of prototyping and user feedback to refine the initial design selects and uses software tools, although not always appropriately carries out some limited testing and quality control, but not sufficient to identify all shortcomings produces a functional website that meets some of the client's requirements Whilst working on the website the Learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, but needs frequent prompting. 	 The Learner: makes good use of prototyping and user feedback to refine the initial design selects and uses software tools appropriately carries out adequate testing and quality control to ensure that the website works as intended produces a fully functional website that meets most of the client's requirements. Whilst working on the website the Learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, with only occasional prompting. 	 The Learner: makes effective use of prototyping and user feedback to refine the initial design selects and uses software tools competently carries out extensive testing and quality control to ensure that the website works as intended and is easy to use produces a fully functional website that meets all of the client's requirements in an effective way. Whilst working on the website the Learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, independently.
(0 – 10)	(11 - 15)	(16 — 20)

Comment – There is a section on Prototyping which again does not refer to the client's requirements. There is some reference to feedback "from the design of both prototypes" and, at the end of this section, there are some quotes from a third party which relates to testing the actual website rather than prototyping the designs with the client. There is evidence of 2 designs and some brief comments from third parties. The candidate would have strengthened the evidence by explaining who gave the feedback. Some refinement has taken place. The candidate has explained the features of the different pages produced and what software was used, ie Photoshop, Flash, Word. The web authoring package used is not mentioned.

The website is included in the eportfolio which is good practice and provides the evidence of the production of a functional website which is required for this strand. The website includes some of the features listed in 5.5 and 5.8 which includes graphics, animation, colour, buttons, counter, tables. The form is a pdf and there is no evidence of the accessible text mentioned in the prototyping section. There is the insertion of a time feature.

There are folders in the eportfolio and one called "Website_files" which contains the appropriate files. There is no acknowledgement of the graphics which could have been covered in section b. The website appears to have been proof read and spell checked. Although the "Products" page has a lot of scrolling, it does have a button so that the user can return to the top of the page and then access the main menu.

There is some evidence of prototype testing in that section. There is a section on summative Testing and 3 questionnaires to support the use of third parties to help in the process. The questionnaires show the site being viewed in different Browsers which is good practice. There is evidence of tests failing and corrections being implemented.

There is a fully functional website that meets **most** of the requirements listed in the evidence for strand b. There is some evidence of prototyping and user feedback to refine the initial design. The testing and quality control is evident and some standard of ways of working have been addressed. There is insufficient evidence to support all the marks in mark band 2 as the prototyping did not involve the client and is not very well documented.

Mark Awarded 13

Assessment criteria – Unit 5: Web Development – part d)		
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3
The Learner makes some evaluative comments about the performance and functionality of the site.	The Learner evaluates the performance and functionality of the site, incorporating feedback from others, and recommends at least one sensible improvement.	The Learner fully evaluates the performance and functionality of the site, incorporating feedback from others, and recommends at least one sensible improvement, explaining how this will enhance the site.
(0-3)	(4 - 5)	(6)

Comment – The evaluation section starts off with a lot of information of what the candidate did and much of it is more relevant to the Testing evidence required for strand c. The candidate mentions the initial requirements were met although the website included in the eportfolio did not contain accessible text or the rollover mentioned on the initial page. There are some evaluative comments on the performance and functionality at the end of this section. There is reference made to feedback from others and there is a sensible suggestion for improvement, ie an online ordering system. There is sufficient evidence to address mark band 2 although the evaluative comments are only just enough.

Mark Awarded 4

Assessment criteria – Unit 5: Web Development– part e)		
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3
The Learner produces an outline proposal for enhancing the functionality of the site to support e-commerce, but not sufficiently detailed to give a clear overview of what is involved.	The Learner produces a detailed proposal for enhancing the functionality of the site to support e-commerce. The proposal is appropriately presented and gives a clear picture of what is involved.	The Learner produces detailed proposals for enhancing the functionality of the site to support e-commerce, including consideration of how they might be implemented. The proposal is effectively presented, and gives a clear and realistic picture of what is involved.
(0-5)	(6 – 8)	(9 – 10)

Comment – there is a proposal for enhancing the functionality of the site but it is not set out in the form a report to the "client" although it is clearly presented with suitable headings. The proposal is sensible and addresses 5.7. Some aspects have not been checked, eg the use of defiantly and not all the text is totally legible. However, the overall content is good and meets the requirements of mark band 2.

Mark Awarded 8

Overall Points score 36/60

Overall Comment – The candidate is clearly capable of a higher grade but the lack of the use of a proper client and the poor evidence for strand a has limited the achievement. The evidence reflects a candidate just working at C grade.