edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report

January 2010

Principal Learning

Information Technology Level 3
Controlled Assessments

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

A PEARSON COMPANY

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 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/

January 2010

Publications Code DP022944

Contents

Principal Examiners' Report

Principal Learning – Information Technology - Level 3

General Comments

Most of the work submitted by the centres for the January 2010 series was found to be reasonably accurately assessed, but unfortunately the assessment of some learners was found to be lenient resulting in some of the sample not being in agreement with National Standards.

Centres are advised to review closely the quantitative requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification when assessing learners work.

The majority of centres were using the Tutor Support assignments, applied to different contexts depending on the organisations available near the centre or consortia. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating the learners, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.
The centres that derived their own centre assessment on local concepts or needs achieved higher marks.

In terms of administration, work was well presented and organised. All centres submitted the Principal Learning Learner Record sheets with their portfolios and provided evidence of awarding marks, either through portfolio annotations or comments made on a copy of the marking grid.

Most of the centres provided the appropriate evidence for Marking Grid B. Centres should address this in future series by providing detailed witness statements and/or annotated photographs.

Centres should refer to the 'Centre Guidance on Controlled Assessments requirements' for the Principal Learning.

Level 3 Unit 1 – The Potential of Technology

General Comments

Most of the work submitted by centres for the January 2010 series was found to be leniently assessed. Centres are advised to review closely the quantitative requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification when assessing learners work. Learners should be advised that when they are selecting case studies for each learning outcome that they need to choose case studies that allow them to fully explore the range of evidence required, for each of the learning outcomes, to enable them to achieve marks across the three mark band ranges.

Learning Outcome 1

Marking was sometimes over generous in crediting the role of legacy systems and emerging technologies in achieving organisational objectives. Some learners had discussed what legacy systems and emerging technologies were but failed to identify an appropriate organisation using the legacy system or emerging technology in some instances learners selected inappropriate examples of legacy systems and were then unable to discuss the elements of the legacy system: hardware, software and data compatibility issues.

Some centres had awarded marks in Mark Band 3 that were not appropriate. Centres should note that work in this Mark Band must have a full explanation of the role that legacy systems and emerging technologies play in helping organisations achieve their goals, illustrated with relevant examples from three different sectors.

The role of emerging technologies was also sometimes confused. Centres are advised to review closely the quantitative requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification for examples of emerging technologies, such as:

- mashups
- location-aware applications
- virtualisation
- nanotechnology
- RFID
- VoIP
- social software

It is important to consider emerging technologies where real examples can be studied, rather than thinking about theoretical or future technologies.

Learning Outcome 2 and 3

In general these Learning Outcomes were more accurately assessed with learners providing several relevant and current examples of technology used by organisations and individuals and providing some explanation as to how they were being used to innovate. Common examples used were the Oyster Card System, BAA Terminal 5 Baggage System.

For learners to achieve marks at the higher end of Mark Band 1 they must have identified at least one unsuccessful and one successful example of organisations **and** individuals innovating through technology. To achieve marks in Mark band 2 and 3 learners must use three relevant examples (both successful and unsuccessful) of organisations **and** individuals using technology to innovate.

Most learners did not fully explain the technology used or assess the impact of the innovations. More discussion is required on how organisations and individuals innovate through and with technology, focusing on the requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification, for example:

- to improve competitiveness eg web presence, online ordering, improved communication, automation, product miniaturisation
- to improve service eg customer relationship management, online ordering, webinars, forums
- to reduce carbon footprint eg hibernation when not in use, double-sided printing, automated building management

On the whole it was felt that learners commented on factors affecting success or failure, but often didn't develop this into considering the impact on competitiveness and service.

Learning Outcome 4 and 5

Similarly the marking of these Learning Outcomes was over generous. These Learning Outcomes are about recommending innovative technology-enabled solutions for two contrasting organisations, identifying both benefits and risks. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating learners, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.

It was found that most learners had not fully assessed the possible role of the new technology as outlined in the 'what you need to cover' section of the unit specification, ie

- underpins specific business processes
- safeguards business continuity,
- drives performance improvements
- facilitates decision making.

Learners did not fully assess the possible objectives of the new technology for example to increase sales/revenue, to improve service and to gain a competitive advantage.

Whilst many learners had produced some good work and had presented some recommendations for some innovative technology-enabled solutions, most learners had not fully assessed the opportunities (eg new markets, new or improved products / services, cost reduction, outsourcing) and risks (eg costs, over expansion, staffing issues).

The learners that used a SWOT analysis to identify the opportunities and risks achieved a higher grade. Centres might wish to employ methods such as a SWOT analysis or De Bono's 'Thinking Hats' techniques in order to get learners to assess the opportunities and risks that their recommendations will bring.

Centres should note that the specification requires a number of recommendations to be made and marks are awarded accordingly. For example, to achieve full marks in Mark Band 1 and marks in Mark Band 2, the learners must have presented at least three recommendations for two organisations.

Centres often awarded marks from Mark Band 3 inappropriately. To achieve Mark Band 3 learners must have presented a **set** of recommendations (more than three) for innovative technology-enabled solutions for two contrasting organisations, fully assessing benefits and risks.

Lessons to be Learned

Learners did not clearly identify the elements of the legacy system such as hardware, software and data compatibility issues.

Some learners had discussed legacy system and emerging technologies but failed to identify how they achieved the organisational goals. In some instances learners selected inappropriate examples of emerging technologies and legacy systems and were then unable to achieve the higher mark bands requirements.

For learners to achieve marks at the higher end of Mark Band 1 they must have identified at least one unsuccessful and one successful example of organisations **and** individuals innovating through technology. To achieve marks in Mark band 2 and 3 learners must use three relevant examples (both successful and unsuccessful) of organisations **and** individuals using technology to innovate.

Some inappropriate organisations chosen for learning outcome 4 and 5 that provided limited scope for motivating learners, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.

It was found that most learners had not fully assessed the possible role of the new technology as outlined in the 'what you need to cover' section of the unit specification. Learners did not fully assess the possible objectives of the new technology for example to increase sales/revenue, to improve service and to gain a competitive advantage.

Level 3 Unit 3 – Professional Development

General Comments

In this unit the learner will investigate effective communication methods; language, style, format, conventions and identify their fitness for audience, purpose and medium.
Produce a collection of business-related communications for a range of common business situations: Electronic (eg websites, blogs, emails, text messaging, and information points), print (eg newspapers, magazines, reports, brochures, and poster), voice (eg telephone, face-to-face, radio and podcast). Learners must present their ideas to the rest of the team so that the team collectively decides on the best communication model to use to communicate their findings.
Work in a team, identify the teams differing personal styles and behaviour and explain how their behaviour effected and can be adapted to suit different roles and situations. To prepare a well-researched, fully justified and persuasive proposal for stakeholders that made recommendations with written justification and create spreadsheet models and apply mathematical concepts to generating ideas and exploring possibilities to produce alternative solutions.
The majority of centres had used the sample assessment in the Tutor Support Material (TSM).

Learning Outcome 1 and 3

Most learners had given an explanation of the principles of effective communication in business today, for example the use of language, style, format, conventions, fitness for audience and purpose, and assessed the implications of using different communication media to meet objectives in a range of business contexts, using relevant examples and including comments on benefits and limitations.
Some learners had also produced a collection of business-related communications for a range of common business situations: Electronic (eg websites, blogs, emails, text messaging and information points), and print (eg newspapers, magazines, reports, brochures and posters). Very few displayed examples of voice (eg telephone, face-to-face, radio and podcast).

Learning Outcome 2

Some learners had identified the teams differing personal styles and behaviours and explained how their behaviour could be adapted to suit different roles and situations, although this component was not present in all portfolios. Centre are advised to review the 'what you need to cover' section of the specification which gives examples of personal styles and behaviours ie aggressive, responsive, professional/unprofessional, helpful/obstructive, organised/disorganised, positive/negative; verbal clues, body language; speed and quality of work and their impact on others .
Learners achieved the higher mark bands when they considered and identified each member's personal style and behaviour, allocated roles and responsibilities to suit the group member's style and then fully assessed the impact on teamwork. They also fully explained how behaviour can be adapted to suit different roles and situations, illustrated with some well chosen examples of group work activities.

Learning Outcome 3,4,5 and 6

The Mark Band 3 learners had produced a bibliography that demonstrated how they investigated the challenge or opportunity in a business context, using a range of appropriate sources to gain a sound understanding of its nature and scope. They also used

an appropriate spreadsheet model and complex mathematical concepts to explore and understand business dynamics and find solutions that demonstrated sound awareness of audience and purpose.
Some learners use of mathematical concepts were a little restricted (limited use of the sum function and macros) and they could have used the spreadsheet model to fully explore business dynamics such as sales forecasting, cash flow, five-year plans, net present value and profit and loss. These learners achieved the lower mark bands. Other mathematical concepts could include statistical analysis, probability, estimation, projection and trends to create a cost proposal.
Some learners prepared a complete well-researched, fully justified and persuasive proposal for stakeholders that made recommendations with written justification that considered ethical, social, professional and legal constraints. Most learners had taken account of legal and other constraints and marks were awarded appropriately depending upon the depth of their analysis.

Learning Outcome 7

Most of the work seen for 'teamwork set up and monitoring' was in agreement with national standards.
The higher mark band learners produced an effective team plan and made notes throughout the team activity to monitor progress and record team discussions, which included initial meetings, agreed objectives, allocated roles, a clear plan or schedule, decisions made and their individual contribution to teamwork. They agreed objectives and identified what need to be done, for whom and by when. They also used Gantt Charts to track and record team progress, created a document to record the allocation of roles and responsibilities, provided evidence of how the team worked cooperatively, provided examples of effective communication, created a record of team meetings to monitor progress and provided a summary to demonstrate consideration for others and how they respond constructively to feedback.
The learners that achieved the higher mark bands also provided a continuous commentary on progress.

Learning Outcome 2 and 8

There were limited portfolios with work seen at Mark Band 3 'evaluation' as one of the requirements for mark band 2 include that the learner should have made evaluative comments on the performance of the team, "including feedback from a reviewer". It wasn't always clear in the evaluations presented that such feedback had been sought or referred to, therefore, it was considered that some work in this section had been over-generously marked.
The learners should evaluate their own personal performance, identify some strengths and weaknesses, record and respond to feedback from others, identify areas for improvement, contribution to team effort and interaction with others. They should also identify feedback offered to others on the team activity including contribution to teamwork, such as what went well and what went badly, effectiveness of team, personality mix, contribution of individuals and provide feedback from a reviewer.
Some detailed Observation Report and Peer assessment seen for the presentation and teamwork elements of Mark grid B.

Lessons to be Learned:

Centres that derived their own centre assessment on local concepts or needs achieved higher marks.
Very few examples of voice (eg telephone, face-to-face, radio and podcast) were seen for LO.1, this limited the opportunity for the learner to achieve the higher mark bands.
The learners that achieved the higher mark bands used a 'blog or diary' to provide a continuous commentary on progress achieved both on their own and the team's progress during team activities. The use of blogs provided a valuable platform and opportunity for the learner to provide commentary on team and individual performance and progress throughout the assessment activity.
Some clear evidence that the learner had investigated the challenge and used a range of appropriate sources to gain an understanding of requirements. These Mark Band 3 learners had produced a bibliography that demonstrated how they investigated the challenge or opportunity in a business context, using a range of appropriate sources to gain a sound understanding of its nature and scope.
Record of feedback from a reviewer is also required for the high mark bands.
Some poor spreadsheet models seen that evidenced limited use of mathematical concepts. The learner should have used an appropriate spreadsheet model and complex mathematical concepts to explore and generate sound alternative solutions that demonstrate sound awareness of requirements. Most of the models seen had not provided alternative solutions and therefore limited the learner 's opportunity to achieve the higher mark bands.
The use of Gantt charts to track and record team progress was effective. The learners that achieved the higher mark bands also provided a continuous commentary on progress.
Observation reports and Witness statements seen for Mark grid B evidence did not clearly support the marks awarded by the centres.

Level 3 Unit 4 – Creating Technology Solutions

General Comments

In this unit the learner is asked to identify the role and interaction of key components of a database and is asked to apply industry standard approaches to design, develop and test small-scale technology-enabled solutions.
Create database systems with a three-tier architecture relational database, program code and user interface. Use an event-driven programming language such as Visual Basic for Applications (VBA) to customise and enhance the functionality of the database systems they produce.
In general the assessment of the work seen was found to be generous. Most of the level of technical detail and analysis was not indicative of level 3 work. The majority of work seen was descriptive but lacked depth of knowledge and application.

Learning Outcome 1

The learners that used live databases to interrogate were able to provide a more detailed explanation as to the database role ie identify tasks performed, inputs and outputs, data processing and provide an overview of security. Discuss database interaction ie compatibility of components, linking systems, sharing and transferring data. Identify all of the key components such as input, output, storage devices, user interface, data structures and database reports.
Some examples used of online database systems did not allow the learners to fully investigate the roles, interaction and key components of the database systems and only achieved mark band requirements.
A generic overview of an access database system was also sometimes given that did not provide the opportunity to achieve the higher mark bands.

Learning outcome 2 and 3

Some learners had produced a comprehensive functional specification that covered all of the requirements of the database such as hardware and software, inputs, outputs, processing, performance, security requirements and success criteria.
Many of the specifications were vague when setting the success criteria, and there was little evidence of validation being planned for or used within the systems produced.
Normalisation was referred to in some cases in design, but many of the databases that were implemented showed little or no evidence of normalisation.
Some examples of coding provided slight differences in the marks awarded between the centre and the moderator, and these arose because of the requirement at mark bands 2 and 3 to use some program code to customise the application. The program code used should handle database objects and controls, locate and edit information. This was not present in some of the samples provided and centres should ensure that evidence of program code is seen in future series. Some learners provided screen prints of macro code that did not handle database objects and controls or locate and edit information.
For the learner to achieve the higher mark bands evidence of the normalisation process and clear evidence of the database structure is required, such as tables, relationships, primary and foreign keys, data types and validation rules.
Clear evidence of efficient data handling procedures that meet all of the specified criteria (eg add, import, export, amend, delete data and extract information) met the specified requirements.
Testing for functionality, performance and usability was poor in some cases which limited the learner 's opportunity to achieve the higher mark bands.

The learners that achieved the higher mark bands produced a detailed test plan that evidenced thorough testing for functionality, performance and usability.

Learning Outcome 2 and 3

The Mark Band 3 learners developed a HCI user interface to group properties and objects, buttons, validation and automation. Produced accurate report formats (eg features, field selection, grouping and sorting) that met all of the specified requirements, including an effective user-friendly interface that aided accurate data entry and reports that presented information effectively. Some use of list and dropdown boxes used for data entry. Produced a test plan that evidenced thorough testing for functionality, performance and usability.

Learning Outcome 4

Some poorly formatted Operational Information was presented by the learners to demonstrate how to use the system. A troubleshooting section should be included in the user guide in every case, and learners should use a simple layout along with a contents page in order to help the user understand how to use the system. Overall the operating information was brief with no or little troubleshooting advice. Format of instructions and screen prints did not demonstrate awareness of user needs. Work in this section was marked too generously in some cases. Over-use of arrows pointing to different parts of a screenshot can make user guides more complex and hard to understand.
Where work was over-credited this was due to it not being clear how data entry was being aided by the forms and the fact that many of the reports were fairly generic in layout and formatting.

Learning Outcome 5

To be eligible for Mark Band 3 the learner must have reviewed the system using acceptance testing and observation, making full use of the feedback to identify errors and possible enhancements. Prioritised action to be taken and produced an effective workable implementation schedule, demonstrating an astute awareness of user needs.
Some learners had created a testing document and asked others to fully review the system using acceptance testing and observation. Making full use of the feedback to identify errors and identify possible improvements.
Most of the work seen was limited to Mark Band 1 as Mark Band 2 requires the learners to prioritise action to be taken and produce an effective implementation schedule that demonstrates an awareness of user needs.

Lessons to be learned:

The learners that used live databases to interrogate were able to provide a more detailed explanation as to the database role and interaction of key components.
Testing for functionality, performance and usability was poor in some cases which limited the learner's opportunity to achieve the higher mark bands.
Providing a print out and annotating the program code would demonstrate how it was used to maximise efficiency, for example handling database objects and controls, locating and editing information would support the mark band requirements.
In LO.5 most of the work seen was limited to Mark Band 1 as Mark Band 2 as it requires the learners to prioritise action to be taken and produce an effective implementation schedule. The actions do not have to be implemented.
An electronic copy of the database would make the process of moderating this unit simpler for the moderator, as it is difficult to assess the functionality of the database system.

Level 3 Unit 5 – Managing Technology Systems

General Comments

Centres should refer to the 'Centre Guidance on Controlled Assessments requirements' for the Principal Learning.

Learning Outcome 2 and 3

Some marking of this component was considered to be a little generous when compared to national standards. Learners spent a considerable amount of their portfolios defining the various methods of implementation available, but then did not sufficiently, in some cases, apply these principles to the proposal in hand. Centres should ensure that learners clearly show why the chosen method of implementation safeguards business continuity, including planning, procedures and people management. Gantt charts were a useful addition to this section.
Some learners demonstrated some of the requirements of system change, but for higher marks learners should demonstrate a sound awareness by discussing the purpose of the system change, applying the principles of change management including planning, procedures and people and focus more on procedures and the people elements of the change management process.
In some cases no workable plan was presented for the required system change and business requirements were unclear.

Learning Outcome 4

Marking of this component was generally in line with national standards. Where differences did occur between centres and moderator marks this was due to learners not considering software bugs sufficiently in their work. This was implied in some cases by reference to operating system patches, but needs to be addressed directly as it is part of the 'What You Need to Cover' (WYNToC) section of the specification.
Some learners produced a risk assessment that identified several types of problems in technology systems such as human errors, equipment errors, natural disasters and deliberate acts and gave an indication of the risks involved.
Most learners briefly explained the risks involved, the likelihood of risk occurring, the effect of the risk and provided some advice on how to handle the problem in each case.
To be eligible for Mark Band 3, learners must have fully assessed the impact of several types of problem in technology systems such as software bugs, viruses and/or user errors. They must also have explained the risks involved, impact on the user, business, system and data, fully assessing the impact and providing detailed advice on how to handle the problem in each case.

Learning Outcome 6

Work in this section was mostly in line with national standards. Centres should ensure that learners include recovery procedures in their documentation in all cases.
To be eligible for Mark Band 3, the learners must have produced comprehensive support information which is easy to follow, covering the requirements of the WYNToC such as :

- Security: securing data and systems from internal and external threats (eg firewalls, virus checking, passwords, access rights, physical security).
- Maintenance: routine and non-routine procedures (eg managing file systems and storage, database administration, replacing consumables and damaged components, updating security software, installing patches).

- Capacity planning: forecasting hardware and software requirements linked to business growth and replacement policies (eg planning for the anticipated number of hits on a database or web page).
- Backup and recovery procedures: frequency; backup media, procedures for recovery.

To achieve full marks in this band, the technical support information must be user-friendly and presented clearly, demonstrating astute awareness of audience needs.
Some technical support information was poorly presented and demonstrated little awareness of audience needs.

Mark grid B – Moderation

Some centres demonstrated an example of good practice by providing detailed observation reports, test plan, implementation plan, password convention, user request log, solution log as evidence for Mark Grid B.

Lessons to be learned:

Centres should ensure that learners clearly show why the chosen method of implementation safeguards business continuity, including planning, procedures and people management. Gantt charts were a useful addition to this section. Show a sound awareness by discussing the purpose of the system change and focus more on procedures and the people elements of the change management process.
The candidates should produced a risk assessment that identifies several types of problem in technology systems such as human errors, equipment errors, natural disasters and deliberate acts and gave an indication of the risks involved, likelihood of risk occurring, the effect of the risk and provided some advice on how to handle the problem in each case.
The technical support information should demonstrate how to safe-guard business continuity, identifying security, password and access rights, maintenance procedures, replacing consumables, backup and recovery procedures and forecasting hardware and software requirements.

Level 3 Unit 6 – Multimedia and Digital Projects

General Comments

Centres are thanked for providing CDs and DVDs containing the multimedia products themselves. USB drives are less appropriate and centres are discouraged from sending these.

Learning Outcome 1

The tasks set for LO1 tended to be very open-ended, which was not to the benefit of most learners. Learners would be better served investigating specific examples of the use of multimedia, and drawing out the different types of multimedia during the course of that investigation. Instead, most learners started with generic descriptions of the types of multimedia without context, which seemed to confuse them.
The contexts used for the remaining tasks were sound, but learners were not set tasks with sufficient scope in the main when it came to the multimedia products in some cases. Examples included simple Movie Maker videos and PowerPoints. While PowerPoints are acceptable to a degree, timeline based animation was often absent, especially as a primary asset, and Movie Maker videos provide no interactivity for the user and aren't in the spirit of the suggested types of product in the specification.
The marking of the websites and multimedia products varied in accuracy. Some centres were under the impression that timeline based animation could be included simply by copying an animation from an online source, and that a simple Movie Maker video constituted a multimedia product, as opposed to the suggested "computer game, simulation, discovery board, e-book, virtual tour or e-learning package"

Learning Outcome 2, 3 and 4 (Website)

It was felt that most of the virtual tours presented did not provide a great deal of interactivity and were more representative of slideshows than true virtual tours. The websites did not always meet business requirements. Testing of functionality, usability, performance, readability and accessibility was found to be weak.

Learners that were awarded higher marks identified all key business requirements and had drawn up a clear audience profile. They also produced detailed up-front design documentation for a website that meets most of the business requirements and gives a clear picture of what is intended.

The effective multimedia assets adhered to legal requirements. These assets also supported the business purpose. For example, a website marketing a band or song would be expected to include video clips and audio. The quality of the assets assists in making the judgement over the appropriateness or effectiveness of them.

Learners that achieved higher marks tested for functionality, usability, performance, readability and accessibility, and demonstrated astute awareness of audience and purpose.

Learners that did not achieve high marks in this Learning Outcome did not clearly refer to audience needs and in some cases produced websites that were simply a linear set of slides or pages.

Learning Outcome 2, 3, and 5 (Multimedia product)

The learners established most key business requirements and drawn up an audience profile for a product, to achieve higher marks clarification of requirements is required.
• produced detailed up-front design documentation that meets some of the business requirements and gives a picture of what is intended
• gathered appropriate multimedia assets, edited images, edited video and voice that adhere to legal requirements
• carry out functionality, usability, performance, readability and accessibility testing with the user demonstrating some awareness of audience and purpose

It was felt that most of the multimedia products presented did not provide a great deal of interactivity; some were more representative of slideshows than true virtual tours.
They also tended to produce detailed upfront design documentation that met most of the business requirements and gave a clear picture of what is intended. Examples of documentation seen was computer game – scripting, flowchart, level structure diagram; virtual tour – structure diagram, storyboard, scripting; e-learning package – storyboard, scripting, structure diagrams.
Learners that achieved a higher mark tested for functionality, usability, performance, readability, accessibility, and demonstrated an astute awareness of audience and purpose.

Evidence for this section could be combined with the informational website, and therefore could be linked to the business purpose of the website, but separate design should also be evident**.**

Learning Outcome 6

To achieve full marks in this Learning outcome, the learner must have fully evaluated each of their products, giving a sensible assessment of their fitness for audience and purpose, and made some sensible suggestions for improvement in each case, noting how each improvement would enhance the product, demonstrating astute awareness of audience needs.
Some evaluations were generally marked too generously and focused on the difficulty encountered by the learners rather than the quality, and most notable by its absence, impact of the multimedia products and websites. Accessibility was also poorly addressed.

Lessons to be learned:

Centres need to note the specification suggestion of a "computer game, simulation, discovery board, e-book, virtual tour or e-learning package" for the multimedia product.

Evaluations should take impact and accessibility into account.
Centres should investigate existing multimedia as a "way in" to the assignment.

The quality of images and video could be improved in some cases.

Movie Maker and PowerPoint aren't the most appropriate tools for the multimedia products.

Timeline animations should be created where possible as a primary asset, not copied and pasted.

The best quality work contained a good mix of primary and secondary assets, with assets being created for purpose where necessary.

Statistics

Level 3 Unit 1 - The Potential of Technology

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	52	46	40	34	28	22
Points score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 3 - Professional Development

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	77	68	59	50	41	33
Points score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 4 - Creating Technology Solutions

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	79	70	61	52	43	35
Points score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 5 - Managing Technology Systems

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	45	39	33	28	23
Points score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 6 - Multimedia and Digital Projects

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	52	45	39	33	27	21
Points score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Notes

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme or marking grid.

Raw boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a learner to qualify for a given grade.

Please note: *Principal Learning qualifications are new qualifications, and grade boundaries for Controlled Assessment units should not be considered as stable. These grade boundaries may differ from series to series.*

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

Publication Code DP022944 January 2010

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