

Information & Communication Technology B

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1995**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE 1095**

Report on the Units

January 2007

1995/1095/MS/R/07J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Information and Communications Technology B (1995)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Information and Communications Technology B (1095)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2378/2379	Coursework	2
2380/01	Paper 2 Foundation	8
2380/02	Paper 2 Higher	11
*	Grade Thresholds	12

Chief Examiner's Report

The general performance seems to be very slightly better than previous years although a significant number of candidates appear to be inappropriately entered at the higher tier, judging by the questions where no answer has even been attempted.

Many candidates still resort to software brand names instead of using generic terms. Very few candidates seem to have been taught web SITE design as opposed to page design.

Report on Coursework Component for ICT B Syllabus 2378

General Comments

Candidates following this course were advised to submit coursework based on a Health Centre as set out in the guidance provided at INSET.

The vast majority of Centres followed either the Wage Slip scenario or one of the sample assignments linked to advertisements found in the 'Approved Specification'.

Most Centres had taken more notice of the 2nd paragraph of 7.1, Marking Criteria for Internally Assessed Work on page 40. "Each successive statement builds upon the previous statement and candidates must have completed the lower statement before they can be awarded the next mark range."

In general, the standard of marking and internal standardisation by Centres for January 2007 was of a good calibre.

Although a number of issues did arise as set out below:

Annotation

Most Centres used the Front Cover Assessment Sheets giving the page numbers where evidence could be found. This helped with cross-referencing and aided the moderation process.

Some Centres gave extra annotation within the coursework portfolios, and this was greatly appreciated by the moderating team. Some annotation or indication where tutors are allocating marks benefits both the candidate and the moderator.

Although annotation is not essential, its use is greatly appreciated and aids the moderation teams and is an example of best practice.

It is also very strange to see a sample of coursework, with no teacher comments or marking at all.

Arithmetic errors

A small number of Centres had different marks on the MS1 form (the form sent to OCR to record candidates' marks, and the form used by moderators to select their sample), to the mark on the Cover Sheet of the candidate's work.

Before posting the coursework sample to moderators, Centres are reminded to double check that the mark on the MS1 is the same as the mark allocated to the candidate on the Front Cover of the coursework portfolios.

MS1s

When completing the MS1s, Centres need to ensure that the intended mark is clear on the copy sent to the moderator.

Quite often Centres had written on the MS1 while resting on other pages, making the whole MS1 impossible to read, or they had not put sufficient pressure on to ensure that the moderator's copy was clear enough to request a fair sample. Again this slowed down the moderation process.

Marking Criteria

A small number of Centres had not used the OCR published marking criteria on pages 40 – 43 of the approved specification. Centres should not make up their own mark schemes, as this could harm their candidates' results.

Communication Mark

Most candidates should be gaining at least one mark for the communication mark. Some Centres were being too harsh and awarding zero marks for candidates who should have been given some credit.

Assessment Objective 1

Choosing and Describing Applications

Candidates performed well, the level of evidence for this section is getting better with every session.

Using Hardware & Using Software

Again the level of evidence suggested some very good teaching and learning, most candidates reached the higher mark threshold.

Inputting Data

Most candidates were in the 2/3 mark threshold. Candidates still need give more evidence as to how their designed system reduces the possibility of data errors. Although there is now evidence of this being put right.

System Output

Depending on the assignment chosen, not all candidates were able to describe alternative outputs or the benefits and drawbacks of each.

Assessment Objective 2

Analysis

Possibly the most important aspect of coursework. Candidates who performed well here tended to perform well throughout the Unit. When done well, candidates maintained their focus and knew exactly what they were designing and why.

Design, Implementation, Testing

Centres should remember that the lower order marks relate to the Analysis and the candidate's ability to identify and complete their ICT system.

Most candidates performed well, but to secure the highest marks candidates should annotate their own work giving reasons as to why changes have been made, why some designs have been retained and others discarded.

Some Centres were very generous in awarding marks for AO2b without any of the above evidence. These Centres often had their marks adjusted.

Evaluation, Application and Effects

This was again the weakest aspect of coursework. Candidates did not compare ICT with other methods, or justify when and why using ICT is more appropriate.

Documentation

This could be improved by stating who the User Guide is aimed at. That will then focus the candidates into the type and detail of guide needed. Eg is it for the worker, client or patient?

Assessment Objective 3

A number of candidates did not attempt this AO. Those candidates, who did, attempted this in various ways. Some had tried to meet the criteria within other reports, whereas some gave this a discrete section within the coursework. Moderators reported that those Centres who tried the former found annotation more difficult to follow.

If candidates identified the person/people who would benefit from their system, then again this focuses the candidate to meet the marking criteria.

Assessment Objective 4

Again those candidates who scored well on “the use of ICT in the wider world” did so using a discrete section of coursework.

Report on Coursework Component for ICT B Syllabus 2379

General Comments

Candidates following this course were advised to submit coursework based on a Health Centre – most used the guidance as provided during OCR INSET.

Most candidates designed a multimedia presentation, either an interactive website or self diagnosis Power Point for their Health Centre.

Centres had taken notice of the 2nd paragraph of 7.1, Marking Criteria for Internally Assessed Work on page 40. “Each successive statement builds upon the previous statement and candidates must have completed the lower statement before they can be awarded the next mark range.”

Annotation

Most Centres used the Assessment Sheets giving the page numbers where evidence could be found. This helped with cross-referencing and aided the moderation process.

Some Centres gave extra annotation within the coursework portfolios, and this was greatly appreciated by the moderating team. Some annotation or indication where tutors are allocating marks benefits both the candidate and the moderator.

Although annotation is not essential, its use is greatly appreciated and aids the moderation teams and is an example of best practice.

It is also very strange to see a sample of coursework, with no teacher comments or marking at all.

Arithmetic errors

A small number of Centres had different marks on the MS1 form (the form sent to OCR to record candidates' marks, and the form used by moderators to select their sample), and then a different mark on the Cover Sheet of the candidate's work.

Before posting the coursework sample to moderators, Centres are reminded to double check that the mark on the MS1 is the same as the mark allocated to the candidate on the Front Cover of the coursework portfolios.

MS1s

When completing the MS1s, Centres need to ensure that the intended mark is clear on the copy sent to the moderator.

Quite often Centres had written on the MS1 while resting on other pages, making the whole MS1 impossible to read, or they had not put sufficient pressure on to ensure

A significant number of Centres had not used the OCR mark scheme and/or Cover Sheet. Centres must not make up their own mark schemes.

It would also help if Centres would get their MS1 to the moderator by the May deadline. Then send the coursework promptly.

Report on the Units taken in January 2007

Please do not send coursework in plastic folders, as they are very slippery and difficult to deal with.

Digital Submission

Not many Centres submitted work on disk. I was hoping that by now, more Centres would be submitting work on a different media than paper.

Submitting the same work for 2378 & 2379

Although it is possible for candidates to submit one portfolio for both 2378 & 2389, candidates **MUST** identify where the extension task begins.

The full portfolio can be assessed for the 2378 mark, but only the extension task can be assessed for the 2379 mark. Therefore it is possible for these candidates to get different marks for 2378 & 2379.

If the extension task is not clearly identified then the whole of the portfolio will be assessed as 2378 only.

Producing A System

Moderators look for a complete working system, and Centres should be encouraged to send in digital evidence of websites rather than paper based portfolios. It is becoming apparent that some Centres are producing more and more reports. Moderators look at work using the marking criteria not volume of work.

Centres should be encouraging their candidates to show more flair in their design and working system.

Assessment Objective 1

Choosing and Describing Applications

In the main candidates performed well. Although only a few candidates commented in detail on the benefits and drawbacks of a selection of different types of hardware and software that could have been used, for the 4/5 mark threshold.

Using Hardware & Using Software

Again candidates performed well. Although some candidates did not describe the benefits and drawbacks of their chosen hardware very well.

Inputting Data & System Output

Candidates linked these sections together and provided some excellent evidence.

Overall the performance at AO1 level was greatly improved from the summer 2006 session.

Assessment Objective 2

Analysis

Candidates who performed well here tended to perform well throughout the coursework. When done well, candidates maintained their focus and knew exactly what they were designing and why. Overall those candidates who scored highly had put in a lot of work into this section. Probably more than the 5 marks merited but candidates benefited in the final mark.

Design, Implementation, Testing

Most candidates performed well, but to secure the highest marks candidates should annotate their own work giving reasons as to why changes have been made, why some designs have been retained and others discarded.

Some Centres were very generous in awarding marks for AO2b without any of the above evidence. These Centres were more likely to fall outside of tolerance and have their marks adjusted.

Evaluation, Application and Effects

This was the weakest aspect of coursework. Candidates did not compare ICT with other methods, or justify when and why using ICT is more appropriate.

Documentation

Candidates performed well here, there was some good evidence of testing and refining user guides.

Assessment Objective 3

Candidates attempted this in various ways. Some tried to meet the criteria within other reports, whereas some gave this a discrete section within the coursework. Moderators reported that those Centres who tried the former not only found the annotation more difficult to follow, but in some cases the Centre had not given the candidate their full credit.

Candidates need to link their discussion of AO3 to their task, some are too generic to score in the top range. If candidates identified the person/people who would benefit from their system, then this focuses the candidate to meet the marking criteria.

Assessment Objective 4

Those candidates who scored well on “the use of ICT in the wider world” did so using a discrete section of coursework.

2380/01 Paper 2: Foundation Tier

General Comments

The examination paper allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability in this subject, and the questions catered for a differentiation in the level of the candidate's ability. The levels of achievement in this examination were wide ranging, but only a few candidates achieved very high marks. In the majority of cases, candidates attempted to answer every question, but some questions were answered far better than others. Candidates should be encouraged to attempt all the questions on the paper rather than leave blank spaces.

Some candidates used vague words like 'stuff', 'things' and 'something' for which they cannot be awarded marks. Candidates should be encouraged to use the correct technical terms.

Some questions were generally well answered such as 1, 2, 3(a), 3(b), 6, 7, 8(a) and 8(b) but on other questions such as 4 and 5 candidates did not score good marks.

Candidates did not always read the questions carefully in order to understand what was required in the answer. Such candidates answered questions from the incorrect point of view eg in question 1 (c) many gave benefits to the patient rather than benefits to Wordsworth Dental Practice. They need to read the question and clarify whether it should be answered from the patients' or the dental practice's point of view.

Candidates need to be discouraged from answering questions using the single words 'quicker' and 'easier'. In order to gain the relevant marks these words need to be qualified by saying how it is quicker or easier.

Candidates need to be aware of the need for full answers. If there are two lines for the answer, then single word answers will not gain full marks.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 This question was generally well answered, although a surprising number of candidates did not gain full marks. Common mistakes included confusing the use of a database with a spreadsheet and in some cases confusing the use of a database with diary software.
- In some cases, where candidates had changed their answers, it was difficult to read their final answers to this question.
- 2 (a) This was generally well answered although some candidates gave the answer 'phone' without indicating a mobile phone.
- (b) This was not well answered. Candidates could not get marks for simply rephrasing the question – it would remind patients about their appointment/the patients will not forget their appointment – nor for general references to quick and easy without any qualification.

Report on the Units taken in January 2007

- (c) This question was not well answered. Many gave benefits to the patient rather than benefits to Wordsworth Dental Practice. Many candidates simply used the answers 'quick', 'easy', 'fast' with no qualification. There were candidates who wrote about the uses of email rather than the benefits to the dental practice of using email to communicate with their patients.
- (d) This question generally was well answered.
- 3 (a) Most candidates were able to gain one mark here, by mentioning the confidentiality but few were able to gain the second mark for amplification of their answer.
- (b) This question was very poorly answered. Many gained one mark for the use of a password, but only a few were able to gain the second mark.
- 4 (a) A minority of candidates earned a mark here, the majority for listing DTP. Most lost the mark for writing a brand name in their answer instead of a type of software. Several misinterpreted the question as to which is the more suitable poster so gave 'Poster 2' as an answer.
- (b) This question was well answered by candidates who could express the processes in written words. The majority struggled to do this (a typical response was the 'picture was made bigger by enlarging it') but could still earn four marks by simply listing four clear changes made to Poster 1. Unfortunately some candidates listed more than one change for one answer eg the picture has been made bigger and rotated but could only get one mark and then ran out of changes to get the 4 marks. Enlarging the picture and rotating the picture were most accurately described. There were candidates who resorted to little diagrams to try and clarify their answers. Candidates need to write down the whole process starting with highlighting/selecting the item that is to be changed. The question focused on the changes made and how they can be done and not on improvements made to the poster which is how some candidates interpreted it.
- 5 (a) Generally well answered, with most candidates gaining at least one mark here usually for listing 'a computer'. Candidates who did not achieve marks in this question either missed the word 'hardware' in the question (and gave answers such as 'internet') or simply listed *any* hardware that sprang to mind without focusing on the question eg mouse, keyboard, monitor.
- (b) The majority of candidates gained the mark here.
- (c) Generally well answered.
- (d) The idea of running a virus check or scan earned many candidates a mark. Simply having an anti-virus programme installed was insufficient to gain the mark. It has to be used.
- 6 (a) This question was not well answered.
- (b) Many achieved one mark here by referring to the uniqueness, but few gained the second mark for the amplification of the answer. Other candidates showed no understanding of a key field and its use in a database.
- (c) Generally not well answered. Very confused answers were given, with many different fields being listed.

Report on the Units taken in January 2007

- (d) (e) This question was well answered and showed a clear understanding of what fields and records are.
- (f) This question was not well answered. Few candidates were able to list three uses of the database. Many candidates listed *benefits* of a database rather than ways the practice would *use* a database. Only one mark could be given to candidates who gave three examples of one use eg to store names of patients, to store addresses of patients, to store telephone numbers of patients which amounts to storing patients' personal details.
- 7 This question allowed for a full range of answers. Some candidates gave very well designed forms for this question. Candidates were easily able to earn the full eight marks. Some only earned six marks (for mentioning the correct criteria) because they drew a table from a database as opposed to a form that patients could fill in. There were a few candidates who did not attempt the question at all and some who drew posters for the practice, gaining no marks.
- 8 Overall, this question was not well answered. In answering each part of the question the 'purpose' and the 'use' were muddled up by the candidates. Very few candidates were able to express how the dental practice would use the different parts of the keyboard in the operation of their business.
- (a) Most candidates gained one mark here but the concept of inputting text was poorly expressed.
- (b) Most candidates gained one mark here but the concept of inputting text was poorly expressed.
- (c) This question was not well answered. Most candidates simply repeated the idea of 'editing' in their answers. Very few mentioned the purpose of navigating around software.
- (d) This question was not well answered. Few candidates mentioned the concept of shortcuts and the uses offered by the candidates were, in general, too vague for marks to be awarded.

2380/02 Paper 2: Higher Tier

General Comments

In some centres there was disregard for the instruction not to write outside the box on each page. A number are routinely issuing four-page answer booklets for students to overspill their answers. In isolated cases a candidate has written all of their responses in the booklet and none on the printed pages. This will be problematic if in future the scripts are scanned for on-screen marking.

Some candidates are not putting the Centre and candidate numbers on their scripts and it would appear that invigilators and examination officers are not checking them. The attendance registers in some cases are not being checked against the scripts when packing for despatch.

Questions

- 1 Most were able to state **what** had been changed but fewer could give clear explanations of **how** the changes could be made eg not highlighting the text before changing font characteristics. Generally however a well answered question with most candidates gaining 6-8 marks.
- 2 Main problem was students are still putting brand names here instead of the generic name.
- 3 Most candidates answered this well, though there were a few inappropriate (radio) or even ludicrous (messenger pigeon) answers.
- 4 (a) Many candidates saw the word “database” and launched into validation and verification. Others suggested deleting the database entirely! Some responses revolved around installing and removing database software instead of managing database files. Very few full answers. Many candidates talked about deleting the database not protecting it.
(b) Very vague and generally poor answers.
- 5 Most candidates identified appropriate factors but few gave amplification related to the needs of the dental practice.
- 6 Overall, the responses were very poor for what should have been a straightforward question.
- 7 Not many candidates scored more than half marks; some centres do not even seem to teach the basic flowcharting symbols. Most candidates failed to show any form of data store.
- 8 (a) poor syntax lead to lost marks in many cases.
(b) generally well answered.
(c) less than one percent of candidates gave a correct answer.
- 9 (a) About two thirds of candidates identified the key field
(b) Many candidates referred to the unique nature of the reference number but could not give amplification. A worrying number of candidates stated that a key field was for fast searching.
- 10 This was probably the question that attracted the poorest answers of the whole paper.
- 11 Very few candidates showed an appreciation of website structure diagrams.
- 12 Most candidates identified three of the file types, but hardly any identified pdf.
- 13 The majority of answers were vague, scoring no more than half marks.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
(Specification Code 1095/1995)
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
2377F	Raw	40	-	-	-	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	55	-	-	-	48	40	32	24	16	0
2377H	Raw	40	39	35	31	28	23	20	-	-	0
	UMS	80	-	64	56	48	40	-	-	-	0
2378	Raw	64	60	51	42	34	28	23	18	13	0
	UMS	120	-	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2379	Raw	64	60	51	42	34	28	23	18	13	0
	UMS	120	-	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2380F	Raw	55	-	-	-	37	31	25	19	13	0
	UMS	55	-	-	-	48	40	32	24	16	0
2380H	Raw	80	54	47	40	33	25	21	-	-	0
	UMS	80	-	64	56	48	40	-	-	-	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
1095	200	180	160	140	120	100	80	60	40	0

	Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
1995	400	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U	Total No. of Cands
1095	4.87	21.21	43.07	65.35	79.79	88.04	93.81	96.87	100	1212
1995	0.35	12.85	44.79	67.36	82.99	93.06	96.18	97.57	100	288

1500 candidates were entered for aggregation this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2007

