

# Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2012

GCSE ICT 2010 (5IT02) Paper 1  
Using Digital Tools

### **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Pearson about Edexcel qualifications on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186.

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

January 2012

Publications Code UG030687

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

## **5IT02 – Using Digital Tools**

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.

January 2012 is the second moderation session for this unit. Many candidates have tackled the controlled assessment well, producing a wide range of products and publications in response to the Controlled Assessment Brief (CAB). Whilst a few candidates did not apply the necessary skills in the context of research, investigation and modelling, most had produced good evidence of their ability to apply their ICT knowledge and skills of ICT across all activities and at all levels.

The focus of the May 2010 Upcycle Now CAB, the only CAB valid for moderation in this window, is upcycling and candidates were tasked to complete four activities in relation to this. Activity 1 involved research and two digital products; Activity 2 was focused on modelling and recommendations; Activity 3 involved design and creation of two main digital products; and, in Activity 4, candidates evaluated their products and performance.

### **Where centres have done well**

The most successful outcomes were in centres where the candidates were well prepared and had developed a range of transferable skills. Constructive feedback from teachers and test buddies generated improved outcomes. Candidates who responded positively to feedback accessed the higher mark bands because their work demonstrated a better understanding of the CAB and its requirements. Centres made some good use of the redesigned Candidate Assessment Record addressing their comments to the moderator. When this included clarification of where professional judgment had been applied, it aided the moderation process.

### **Where centres could improve**

Several centres did not apply the mark bands accurately within each topic and activity, which led to lenient assessment. Some centres have underestimated the demands of the qualification. Where links within products were broken, it was not clear whether this was the result of a poorly created CD for the moderator or whether it had always been thus.

Centres need to be mindful that there is no need to submit a candidate's whole folder of evidence. The guidance provided states that only the evidence listed on the checklist is required. Centres need to be more aware of the contents of the Moderator's Toolkit which lists the accepted software and file formats for evidence. Some candidates lost marks because they failed to convert some documents (e.g. those created in MS Publisher) into an accepted format. Centres are also reminded that this is a digital qualification and that all evidence is required in that format. Hand-drawn designs must be scanned and cannot be moderated if submitted in hard-copy only. Centres are advised to refer to the 'Centre guidance for submission of moderation samples' document available on the website when they prepare the work to send to the moderator.

### **Activity 1**

The Event Profile is not assessed, but provides a mechanism for organising the thoughts and decisions of the candidate and helpful information for the assessor. There is space available for teacher feedback and where this was used by the teacher, it made a difference to the candidates' decisions and, often, the outcomes.

Candidates were successful in finding out about upcycling. However, candidates must record their sources in the sources table. In order to access the higher marks, candidates must show discrimination in their choice of sources. This was not often achieved since candidates chose to list only those sources used and not those they decided not to. In a few cases comments in the activity 1 review rectified this.

Candidates were tasked to create an original logo for the event, reflected the upcycling theme. Many based logos on the traditional recycling symbol using images they had sourced from the internet. However, the best logos were those created from scratch and which contained a number of elements combined to fully represent upcycling and what it means.

Candidates had to search online to find possible stallholders for the event and save these details for an email list. Many candidates created a database with validation. This task was generally well done with some clearly formatted and useful lists, achieved by exporting the list or report into word processing software and saving it in a suitable format. In some cases, it was necessary to find the list within the database. Candidates are not required to submit the database, but should provide the list as a separate document. Some candidates commented on difficulty of finding

suitable stallholders in their locality, having to make assumptions to overcome this by extending the 'local' area.

The majority of candidates created an invitation, but did not all meet the criteria. A significant number of candidates lost sight of the fact that this was intended for stallholders and created a general purpose invitation. Others were directed towards the stallholder(s) but lacked a persuasive tone that would have encouraged the stallholder's participation.

Invitations were often formatted as pdf, png, doc and rtf. When created as a png, it was particularly successful when embedded in the email showing that candidates had thought about the issues surrounding 'spam' and 'junk' mail where attachments from unknown senders could be ignored.

Most candidates answered all the Activity 1 review questions, providing some very detailed and useful reviews for assessors and moderators. Good reviews outlined the candidates' decisions, feedback, responses, the feedback and comments on the final outcomes, occasionally including screenshots of key details as an enhancement. The review is a key document and should be used to record any feedback received and responses to it.

## **Activity 2**

Modelling challenged most candidates with many not understanding the concept of profit and loss for an event and how changing the variables could impact this. Some candidates showed sound practical spreadsheet skills, but not using formulae and functions efficiently impacted on the usefulness of the model. Some candidates chose the simpler model, and went on to develop this into a more complex model that allowed them to test a number of 'what-if' scenarios. A few candidates created their own model from scratch.

Candidates should have investigated a number of venues with different capacities. Many chose only one venue and did not relate its capacity to the event's final profit or loss. There was a lack of understanding that the number of visitors could impact the number of demos, the number of kits required as the 'give-away' and the level of income from the chosen 'recycling' point. Candidates should have investigated a range of sources, recorded these within the spreadsheet or the sources table so that could show evidence of selection or discrimination in their decision making. Some of the costs were not realistic. Some models were enhanced by spinners, paste links, lookup and other features. It is important that candidates

understand the concept of modelling and state assumptions made so that others can interpret the outcomes. Few considered the fact that not all visitors would want all the refreshments or that they might not all bring an item for recycling.

The key outcome of the model was the recommendations for the local council which could be used to support a request for sponsorship. Candidates did not understand how the model outcomes should be integrated with the recommendations; thus many recommendations were not fit for purpose. Many presentations contained some data from the model, e.g. charts, tables, but not in a format that could have been easily understood by the audience. Many slides had far too much text and used graphics that were too small. Some were overcrowded and not business-like. Some quoted very unrealistic profit/loss figures and model outcomes were not used as justification for their recommendations.

Very few candidates produced suitable speaker notes. It appears that candidates have little experience of speaker notes and how they are used. In some cases, these were a repetition of the text on the slides and did not offer any further explanation or justification. The recommendations often missed the point about sponsorship.

Activity 2's final product was a web page for other candidates which would raise interest and persuade them to get involved. Candidates had not recognised that this was for candidates of their own age to persuade them to come to the event. Many were very general and would not have appealed nor persuaded the candidates' peers to come along. Where candidates were selective in the information they included they were able to produce a useful webpage. Many candidates ignored the CAB criteria and produced a website rather than a single page which involved far more work than was required.

Finally, as part of Activity 2, candidates reviewed their products and performance. Most candidates answered all the questions, enhanced their evidence with relevant screenshots, and provided good quality reviews, outlining their decisions, feedback, responses to feedback and comments on the final outcomes.

### **Activity 3**

This Activity is all about the design and development of digital products - the movie of how to upcycle their chosen item and an interactive discovery board to be used at the planned event.

Some movie timelines did not contain details of timings, transitions, effects and assets and there were examples of reverse engineering where the design had clearly been created after development of the movie. Some movies did not include the required primary still images. Good movies included music and a voiceover, showing clearly the materials needed, how they were used and what the upcycled product would look like. The finished movies must be tested to make sure they play as intended and exported from the authoring software in a suitable format eg as a wmv.

The Discovery Board required a flowchart and detailed storyboards. A significant number either did not include a flowchart or it was very simple and showed the flow in one direction only. In some cases these were produced in software not accessible using the Moderator's toolkit. Many produced the Discovery Board in MS PowerPoint, but did not adhere to the CAB requirement that the product should be viewable in a browser by converting this to html. Some sound and video files did not play as intended and some links were broken which meant that the moderator could not use the final product. The CD for the moderator must be tested to ensure all products work as the candidate intended. Benefit of the doubt has been given where links did not work as long as the asset could be identified within the evidence.

Most candidates answered all the review questions about this activity with some writing detailed comments.

#### **Activity 4**

Candidates were asked to evaluate their finished products and their own performance using the Activity Review documents. Where candidates had made good use of the reviews in the first three Activities, they were able to produce a detailed and informative evaluation.

#### **Preparing the Evidence**

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, which impacted on the moderation process. Links from the checklist should be checked to make sure that all works as intended. Evidence must be checked to ensure it is all accessible using the Moderator's Toolkit.

Once the evidence is copied onto the moderation CD, it must be thoroughly checked again. All the evidence for the required sample should be on one CD. Centres should label the candidate work clearly and cross reference the CAR using the same naming convention: Centre Number\_Candidate Number\_First 2 letters Lastname\_First Initial.

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. The Assessor Witness Statement (AWS) which is the final page of the CAR should be scanned or provided as a hardcopy to authenticate the work submitted.



## **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>

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UG030687 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

