edexcel

Moderators' Report

Summer 2013

GCSE in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) (5IT02) Using Digital Tools

PEARSON

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Introduction

Unit 2, *Using Digital Tools*, is a practical unit. Candidates broaden and enhance their ICT skills and capability. They work with a range of digital tools and techniques to produce effective ICT solutions in a range of contexts. They learn to reflect critically on their own and others' use of ICT and to adopt safe, secure and responsible practice.

June 2013 is the fifth moderation session for this unit. In this series, centres could choose from the May 2011 CAB: Get Up, Get Moving or the May 2012 CAB: Community Spirit. The vast majority of centres submitted work for Get Up, Get Moving. Both these CABs, and no others, will be available again in June 2014.

Some centres submitted work based on the now-invalid Upcycle Now CAB. While dispensation was granted in this session to avoid disadvantaging candidates, no Upcycle Now work will be accepted in June 2014 in any circumstances.

In both CABs candidates are asked to complete four activities:

- Activity 1 involves research and using the results of that research to create a profile and some digital products.
- Activity 2 focuses on modeling and the use of some of the meaningful information generated by that modeling to create further products.
- Activity 3 asks candidates to design and create two products; they must be prepared to explain and justify their design decisions.
- Activity 4 requires candidates to evaluate their products and their own performance.

Where centres have done well

Centres that provided high quality feedback to their students, either via teachers or test buddies, enabled students to review and modify their work as they progressed through the CAB; this lead to better overall outcomes.

Controlled Assessment Record (CAR) documents that included a lot of detail, which explained the decision to award a certain mark were very helpful and enabled moderators to agree marks.

Discs were generally well organised into folders in most cases.

Some students made good use of 'before-and-after' images in their reviews when describing the improvements they had made to their work.

Work in Activity 2 was generally assessed more accurately than in previous series.

The quality of some of the audio clips for Community Spirit was very high; students have clearly engaged well with this particular task.

Where centres could improve

The following points, made in January's report, are still pertinent:

"It is vital that centres can be confident that controlled assessment procedures have been followed by their candidates and that they can have faith in the integrity of the work produced. Candidates should not store any of their controlled assessment work online where it can be accessed by other candidates or modified outside the time allotted by the centre for working on the CAB. Aside from the fact that this contravenes the controlled assessment guidelines, it may also lead to a moderator not being able to see some of or the entire digital product in question if they do not happen to be connected to the internet when moderating."

Some centres had students that had made use of online software such as Wix and Weebly in this series, but whose work was hosted online and freely available to others. In one case the work had even been 'liked' and shared via social networks. This kind of practice leaves students open to being accused of, or becoming victims of, plagiarism and should not happen in future series.

 "Some candidates did not appear to be receiving sufficient feedback on their work for them to make considered improvements. Centres should ensure that each candidate has access to a test buddy and teacher feedback of a good quality throughout the CAB."

Centres must ensure that their students have access to good quality feedback as the evidence is clear that when this happens, student outcomes improve.

Centres should reflect on the following points, which apply to specific activities.

Activity 1

In order to achieve marks in Mark Band 3, discrimination in selection of sources must be evident either in the sources table or in the review, and candidates at this level should be considering the issue of copyright. Fewer students used "Google" as a source in this series, which is a promising sign.

Logos were better for Community Spirit than in Get Up, Get Moving, where collages of clip art or other images were seen again. Logos should be relatively simple and re-usable in a variety of contexts while reflecting the theme of the CAB.

The quizzes from Get Up, Get Moving were sometimes placed inappropriately in Mark Band 3. Higher marked quizzes should be free from technical problems such as broken links and the ability to 'click through' the quiz as if it were a standard presentation; the additional information about the campaign should also be present.

Activity 2

Some students did not extend their models using the additional ideas from the CAB. Some students presented their reports for Get Up, Get Moving as part of the spreadsheet, which is fine, but did not do so effectively, making poor use of layout.

Where students did not score beyond Mark Band 2 this was because they did not extend their model using complex features. In the recommendations for Community Spirit some students misunderstood the need to explore options and show alternatives. 'What if?' questions need to be more developed than simply saying for example, "If I raise the price of X then I will make more money". Students need to consider the knock-on effects of raising or lowering variables and how that affects the reliability of the information generated.

Generally modelling was better in Get Up, Get Moving than in Community Spirit. Students need to take careful note of the ideas for extending the model and ensure that they produce a complex model that is used

Activity 3

Where the templates provided with the CAB were used, designs were completed well. Some students are still using a screenshot of the final product in place of design, which is inappropriate and should be marked accordingly, which did not always happen.

Some students appear to have been under the impression that they were creating a website rather than an e-newsletter in Community Spirit. This was evident from the filenames and how they referred to the product in the review. Centres should use the examples provided with the CAB as a starting point for this activity.

Activity 4

Evaluations were well organised into sections. The best evaluations covered all of the required areas including feedback given and received. Where evaluations simply told the story of the CAB without identifying sensible areas for improvement it was difficult to support higher marks. Students might find it useful to use techniques such as De Bono's thinking hats or the SWOT analysis before they write their evaluations to ensure that they are actually evaluating rather than simply describing.

The following comments from the previous series' report still apply:

"Evaluations that developed comments and suggested effective improvements scored higher marks than those that were more narrative in nature. As stated above, candidates should avoid generalisations such as 'professional' and be more specific about the nature of the suggested improvements rather than stating, for example, 'more colour' or 'more images'.

The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar was once again generally good."

Preparing the evidence

A minority of centres were late with their samples this series. It is vital that deadlines are met so that moderation can commence promptly.

Some centres did not provide the work of the highest and lowest scoring students along with the indicated sample. This work should always be included.

As stated in the introduction, centres should ensure that the CABs(s) they are using with their students are going to be valid for the moderation window they are to be submitted in. This information is always available at http://www.edexcel.com/migrationdocuments/GCSE2010/5IT02-CAB-availability.pdf

Centres are reminded that work should be submitted on CD or DVD. USB sticks are not appropriate.

The following points, made in January's report, are still relevant:

"A minority of centres are still submitting discs that are disorganised and include either irrelevant files, multiple copies of activity files or what appears to be the vast majority of the candidates' home directories from their network. When this happens moderators can be at a loss as to which file represents the final version of the work that the centre has assessed, and this can lead to marks being adjusted. Multiple versions of files were a particular issue in this series even when discs were otherwise well organised."

There were fewer cases of this happening in this series but it remains a problem with a small number of centres and could disadvantage students.

"Some work was once again seen in formats not covered by the Moderator's Toolkit. Centres are reminded again that moderators cannot read work submitted in these formats, the most common being Microsoft Publisher. The easiest and most sensible way to avoid this is to produce a PDF version of the Publisher file and submit that as the final product."

Publisher is still the most prevalent piece of software that is used that is not in the toolkit, but there were other examples this series. It is not acceptable for a centre to state that they have no alternative and ask moderators to install additional software or set up local web servers in order to view the sample. The guidelines in the Moderator's Toolkit are clear and should be followed by all centres. The toolkit can be found at: http://www.edexcel.com/quals/gcse/gcse10/ict/unit_2/Pages/Moderators_Toolkit.aspx

Centres are reminded that the sample should consist of the work of the candidates requested **plus the work of the highest-** and **lowest-scoring**

candidates. Several centres did not provide the highest- and lowest-scoring work in the first instance in this series, which slowed down the moderation process and created unnecessary extra work for moderators and no doubt members of staff in centres, too.

Centres should submit only the final products and publications as listed on the evidence checklist. These should be organised into the Activity folders as directed in the CAB. Some candidates submitted a single folder containing all their evidence or indeed multiple copies of the outcomes of some or all activities and this should be avoided in future series; the final product should be clearly identified by filename and reference in the index page. Evidence must be checked to ensure it is accessible using the Moderator's Toolkit.

Once the evidence is copied on to the moderation CD, it must be thoroughly checked again. All the evidence for the required sample should be on one CD or DVD if possible. CDs and/or DVDs should be appropriately packaged so as to survive the journey to the moderator intact. There were fewer instances of discs being sent with no case in a plain paper envelope in this series.

Each candidate folder should be named according to the following naming convention:

[Centre #]_ [candidate #] _ [first two letters of surname] _ [first letter of first name]

For example, John Smith with candidate number 9876 at centre 12345 would have a controlled assessment project in a folder titled: '12345_9876_SM_J'.

The Candidate Assessment Record (CAR) should be completed and provided electronically as part of the submission. Comments should be directed to the moderator and should explain where the internal assessor has awarded marks and provide details of any professional judgement applied. Some CARs arrived with little or no explanation of the marks awarded, which should never be the case.

The Assessor Witness Statement (AWS), which is the final page of the CAR, should be scanned or provided as a hard copy to authenticate the work submitted. Some centres provided statements that were not signed or 'signed' by the student typing their name into the document; this should not happen in future series.

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