

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
in Applied ICT 5IT0 02
Paper 04 Music Festival
Paper 05 Animal Shelter

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 5IT0_02_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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 2016 is the eighth moderation session for this unit. In this series, centres could choose from 04: Music Festival or 05: Animal Shelter.

Centres tended to opt for CAB 04: Music Festival however it was pleasing to see a large number of centres entering the new CAB 05: Animal Shelter.

The Music Festival CAB will not be valid for any future series. Centres must be aware that any work submitted in future series that uses an invalid CAB will not score any marks. The CABs valid for the next series are Animal Shelter and Prom.

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 modelling and the use of some of the meaningful information generated by that modelling 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

Once again 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 led to better outcomes.

Logos were broadly better in this series. Students have shown a greater understanding of developing an original logo using digital tools rather than repurposing images from the internet.

More CAR documents on the whole 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.

Work in Activity 2 was generally assessed more accurately than in previous series. Candidates are more confident in creating an interactive model as opposed to a static spreadsheet.

The quality of some of the mobile application prototypes and websites was very high. Students often managed to tie all of their products together using a corporate style.

Design work was of higher standard than in previous series. Candidates are getting better at justifying their design decisions.

Where centres could improve

The following points, made in June 2015's report, are still as pertinent as ever:

“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 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.”

Where work was solely hosted online and not on the disc as required, no marks could be awarded, as the correct procedures were not followed. Please ensure that this is fully understood. Letters explain that it is not the fault of candidates that work is hosted online will not change this fact.

Some centres had incorrectly added up the marks awarded on CAR documents. These totals differed from marks submitted online and caused a delay in the moderation process whilst trying to ascertain the correct marks awarded.

Some assessors are awarding marks in Mark Band Three when candidates have made only a token attempt at their review document. The mark awarded is not purely based on the digital products created.

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.

Centres should consider that “range” in the context of the sources table(s) refers to not just a number, but a range of different types of source, including primary and secondary. A long list of sources is not necessarily a range if they are all very similar.

CABs from 04: Music Festival onwards have very clear requirements about the logo, particularly regarding the use of colour. Students should be encouraged to read the CAB requirements in full before attempting each digital product. They should also be aware of the requirement that the logo is original. Secondary images downloaded from the internet with some basic text added will not allow for high marks.

Activity 2

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 both CABs 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.

To score marks in Mark Band 3 we need to be confident that a student has created a complex model and that it has been used to model the scenario presented. Centres should avoid crediting work in Mark Band 3 solely because some complex features have been used. The section of the review that focuses on ‘What if?’ questions represents a significant opportunity for students to demonstrate how they have used their model.

Audience and purpose must be taken into account by students. Some recommendations presentations seen for 04: Music Festival seemed to have missed the CAB requirement that the presentation was to be delivered by the Finance Department and not the student themselves.

Some reports for 05: Animal Shelter have been quite limited in their scope. This is an opportunity for candidates to showcase the model they have created and more importantly the ability for the model to be used accurately. Simple print screens of changes made do not fully meet the CAB requirements. The effect of the two grant sizes should be explored with the impacts fully evaluated.

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. To score marks in Mark Band 3 the designs work should be detailed enough that the product(s) could be created by a third party, and design decisions should be fully justified.

Websites created for 05: Animal Shelter were generally of a high standard. Improvements could be made where students did not apply a consistent approach to the layout, colour scheme, and font choices. Many students also missed the point that the website is supposed to persuade people to donate, volunteer and sponsor. To this effect the use of tone and images should be considered.

Activity 4

The following comments from the previous reports still apply:

“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.”

“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

The following points, made in previous reports, are still relevant:

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

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://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/ICT/2010/Controlled%20assessments/5IT02-CAB-availability-v2.pdf>

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

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://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/ict-2010/teaching-support/moderators-toolkit.html>

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.”

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>