

Information & Communication Technology B

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1995**

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

Report on the Units

June 2007

1995/1095/MS/R/07

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.

This report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this 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 Communication Technology B (1995)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short course)

Information and Communication Technology B (1095)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2378	Coursework	2
2379	Coursework	6
2380/01	Paper 2 Foundation	10
2380/02	Paper 2 Higher	12
*	Grade Thresholds	17

Chief Examiner's Report

The general performance in coursework seems to be very slightly better than previous years although judging by the questions where poor answers were given, a significant number of candidates appeared to have been ill prepared for the written examination component or are being inappropriately entered at the higher tier. Teachers need to ensure that candidates are equally prepared for the written examination component of the course.

Candidates achieving the higher grades had a balance of good coursework and technical knowledge required for the written component. For the full course adequate preparation based upon the pre-release material is essential. OCR INSET will focus upon this essential preparation in the Autumn term.

In general terms many candidates still resort to software brand names instead of using generic terms. Candidates must also focus their answers upon the context given.

Coursework Component for ICT B Syllabus 2378

General Comments

Candidates following this course were guided to submit coursework based on a Health Centre in line with 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 by Centres for June 2007 was of a high calibre.

Although there was evidence of a significant minority of Centres NOT performing any kind of internal standardisation. This led to some Centres having their sample returned and being asked to remark all coursework portfolios.

A number of issues continue to cause concern: -

Annotation

Most Centres used the Front Cover Assessment Sheets giving the page numbers where evidence could be found. This helped with cross-referencing and supported 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 helps the moderation teams and is an example of best practice.

It is also very strange to see a sample of coursework, with no tutor marking on it at all, not even a tick of acknowledgement or agreement.

Arithmetic errors

There were a large number of arithmetical errors this year, far more than in previous years. Too many 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 candidates work.

This slowed the moderation process considerably. Also Centres were very slow in returning the Coursework Amend Form back to the moderators.

In a minority of cases, when adding up the marks on the Cover Sheets, that mark did not match the mark in the Total column.

In other words Centres gave us 3 different marks for one candidate. This must be addressed for the next examination period.

Before sending your coursework sample to moderators' 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 MS1 form, Centres need to ensure that the intended mark is clear on the copy to be sent to the moderator.

Too many Centres had written on the MS1 form while resting on other pages, making the whole MS1 impossible to read, or they had not put sufficient pressure on to ensure that the moderators 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.

Centre Authentication Form (CCS160)

OCR now requires this form duly completed by all Centres.

Please send these forms to your moderator either with the MS1 or with the coursework sample.

Writing Frames

Some teachers often award marks for any content in the space provided, others seem very particular about what is written. This sometimes gives the moderators the impression that no-one has actually read the content and credit has been given for anything written in the space.

Writing frames are limiting the students scoring potential, often far too rigid for our higher scoring candidates. Individuality and experimentation is being stifled.

Witness Statements

In a significant number of instances witness statements are being too loosely applied. Comments are too generic and are sometimes being used to support a whole section. Correct use of witness statements (in most cases) will be to support the odd mark or two within a section and will have specific comments to support that decision.

Internal Standardisation

Most Centres have set procedures for this and do it very well. It is recommended that all Centres put in place a system for standardisation of coursework by all tutors, who teach or assess the unit. If not then some Centres may have marks adjusted because of one "rogue" assessor, or have the whole sample sent back and asked to remark the whole cohort.

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 candidates 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 AO2 without any of the above evidence. These Centres were the most vulnerable in having their marks adjusted.

Evaluation, Application and Effects

This was still 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 AO3. 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 using the whole portfolio to support the awarding of marks for AO3 are being too generous in many cases, **AND** rarely offer any annotation to support their claims.

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.

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 very strange to see a sample of coursework, with no tutor marking at all to suggest either agreement or acknowledgement.

Arithmetic errors

There were a large number of arithmetical errors this year, far more than in previous years. Too many 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 candidates work.

This slowed the moderation process considerably. Also Centres were very slow in returning the Coursework Amend Form back to the moderators.

In a minority of cases, when adding up the marks on the Cover Sheets, that mark did not match the mark in the Total column.

In other words Centres gave us 3 different marks for one candidate. This must be addressed for the next examination period.

Before sending your coursework sample to moderators 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 MS1 forms, Centres need to ensure that the intended mark is clear on the copy to be sent to the moderator.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Centres had often written on the MS1 while resting on other pages, making the whole MS1 impossible to read.

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

Digital Submission

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

Work submitted on disk was not always retrievable by moderators, eg Centres were using different versions of PowerPoint/Publisher/Dream Weaver. Please remember to request permission to submit work electronically from OCR and inform them of the software you are using so that appropriate moderators can be chosen for your Centre.

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 printing off more and more irrelevant work. Moderators look at all coursework using the marking criteria, not volume of work.

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

Centre Authentication Form (CCS160)

OCR now requires this form duly completed by all Centres.

Please send these forms to your moderator either with the MS1 or with the coursework sample.

Writing Frames

Writing frames are limiting the more able students' scoring potential. Some writing frames are far too rigid and diminish individuality and experimentation.

Assessment Objective 1

There are some bad habits beginning to creep into this Assessment Objective. For instance many of the reports on Hardware/Software and Input/Output are becoming too generic.

For 2379 we expect more in depth reports than for 2378 and also we expect links to the system and theme the candidate is working on.

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 the more able candidate provided some excellent evidence.

Overall the performance at AO1 has improved from the previous summer session, but Centres must be aware of making their reports too generic or we will see a downward trend here.

Assessment Objective 2

Analysis

Candidates who performed well here tended to perform well throughout the coursework. With a good analysis, candidates were able to maintain their focus and knew exactly what they were designing and why. Overall those candidates who scored highly for this section, performed well in the other sections.

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 full 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.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

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: Foundation Tier (Written Examination)

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.

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, 6(a), 6(b), and 9 but on other questions such as 7 and 8 candidates did not score good marks.

Candidates did not always read the questions carefully in order to understand what was required in the answer. This was quite often the case in Q5(a) where some candidates chose a password which they would not forget, which generally is less secure.

Candidates need to look at the marks awarded for a question to guide their responses. For example, in question 5 candidates needed to realise that for 3 marks part (a) would need 3 valid reasons and part (b) would need 2 points made.

There were fewer candidates answering questions using the single words 'quicker' and 'easier' than in the past, which is an encouraging sign. 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. All candidates must ensure that the examiner can clearly see the candidate's answers, making sure that the lines joining the task to the software is unambiguous.
- 2 (a) Although this was generally well answered there was a minority of candidates who could not identify two output or two storage devices correctly. A common mistake was thinking that a scanner is an output device.
- 3 (a) This was not well answered. There was little indication that the majority of candidates did not know what is contained in a new software box. Many mentioned the box would contain cables or types of software.
(b) This was not well answered. The word 'media' was clearly not understood by the majority of pupils
(c) This was not well answered. There was little indication that pupils understood the idea of agreeing to a licence by breaking the seal of the envelope. 'To prevent the CD from falling out' was a common misconception.
- 4 (a) This question usually answered correctly although a common mistake was to use the Patient Surname field.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

- (b) This question generally was well answered.
- (c) Most candidates were able to gain one mark here, but many could not give a correct answer to (ii)
- (d) (e) These questions were very poorly answered. Very few candidates were able to gain any marks in these questions. The answers demonstrated a lack of knowledge and understanding in the concepts of fields and records. It may also reflect the fact that some centres carry out their data handling and data storage exercises using spreadsheets and not databases.
- 5 (a) This was generally well answered with the majority of candidates being able to provide good reasons for choosing the alphanumeric password.
- 5 (b) Again, generally well answered.
- 6 (a) Generally well answered, with most candidates gaining at least one mark here usually for listing either the size of the images etc being loaded or the number of people accessing the site.
- (b) This question was very well answered.
- (c) Generally well attempted, although many candidates only gained one mark, for saying a virus is a program. Many candidates preferred to explain what a virus did, rather than what a virus is.
- (d) Generally well answered although some candidates gave not running or having an anti virus program. The question is about how a virus gets into a computer, not how to prevent it.
- 7 This question was not well answered. A large majority of candidates did not understand the meaning of encryption or how it would be used by the dental practice. A common mistake was to talk about passwords being encrypted.
- 8 Although candidates knew the difference between calculators and spreadsheets, and were able to describe them, the majority were unable to give suitable advantages of using spreadsheets. Many answers were based on the 'easier', 'quicker', 'more accurate', 'always right' type of answer.
- 9 Some very impressive designs were presented and most pupils were able to earn the full 4 marks here. Occasionally, the question was left out or a poster was designed instead of a home page for a website.

2380/02: Higher Tier (Written Examination)

General Comments

The paper worked well with most candidates attempting all the questions. Most papers were also completed, with no large amounts of graffiti, so candidates clearly didn't have too much time left over.

Standards of answers seemed to be a little lower this year. Very few candidates scored sufficiently high marks this year as the detail was missing from many answers. Most candidates appear to be crowded into the 30-40 band.

A number of indications from the paper suggest that the performance of candidates is getting lower. Firstly the standard of SPG is decreasing each year as is the quality and depth of answers. The general level of written English was poor as was the ability of candidates to answer the question as written. From this it is assumed that reading and comprehension levels are lower. Many candidates misinterpreted the questions or seemed unable to read the question fully.

Very few scripts got over 50% of the marks awarded, often there was little detail or relevance in many candidate answers, which should be expected at Higher Level.

Individual question comments

Question 1: A good starting question. This question was answered very well with most candidates scoring at least 3 out of the 4 marks available. A few candidates scored lower than this. Some candidates lost marks because they ticked more than 4 statements showing they had not read the question properly before attempting it.

Question 2: A generous interpretation of "combined" was needed in many instances and a significant minority of candidates did not understand the term multimedia at all. But this question required candidates to imply a combination, and many candidates lost marks in this question because they did not comment on the fact that multimedia involved the combination of using graphics, sound and video and rather just stated that multimedia was graphics, sound or video. Part A answered well. Not all candidates achieved 2 marks for part b, but most candidates gain at least 1 of the 2 marks available. Most candidates answered part b with download speeds and many candidates understanding the need for a higher spec machine. Some gave the reason that lots of people access the site at once.

Question 3: Some centres had obviously done work on this topic, but those that didn't or couldn't read the question, completely missed the point. Many did not understand that an IT answer was required. Most candidates chose microphone/voice recognition, but a few opted for scanner. A few also mentioned the need for OCR software, which was pleasing. Some mentioned concept keyboard!

Question 4: Most candidates attempted the question and answered reasonably well although not many gained full marks. Many candidates missed out on marks by repeating answers, especially for CD & DVD which can obviously only be credited once. Some candidates did not answer each device separately making it harder for themselves to gain marks as they were not so precise in their answers, tending to give generalisations. A large number of candidates seemed to think that memory sticks were easy to break! Common misconceptions were DVDs only containing Videos/CDs only music. There was woeful lack of knowledge about how much storage space was on each type.

Question 5: This question was generally well answered with most candidates getting one mark for each section; however, very few candidates were getting full marks. Many candidates were not knowledgeable about PDA. Some candidates thought notebook referred to pen and paper. Most candidates knew something about networks, but many repeated the same dis/advantages for laptops/palmtops. Candidates picked up on the word network, but did not always relate it to data storage, capacity, shared peripherals etc. Some mention of wireless networks but not as much as expected, few candidates mentioned the fact that laptops took up less space, a few candidates mentioned that the desktop would be difficult to steal. The main fault was that candidates did not mention the dentist surgery and were far too general in their answers. It showed that many candidates should not have been taking the higher level as they were unable to provide detail to get the second mark for each device. This also happened in questions 7 and 9. It still seems that teachers are not making candidates aware that the marks shown mean that that is number of different answers required for full marks. Candidates must look at the number of marks allocated to each question in order to inform them of how many valid points they need to be making.

Question 6: This question provided many wrong answers as candidates had no idea what was expected of them. The term media completely threw them and most gave answers about the type of software found rather than what would actually be in the box was answered very poorly as candidates clearly did not understand the term 'media'. Question 6b showed that very few candidates understood that the seal was connected to the license of the software. The majority of candidates thought the seal was to stop the CD being scratched. However, most candidates picked up one mark out of the two available for making comment that the seal ensured the user that no else had used/tampered with the software or that it ensured it was new.

Question 7: Very few candidates gained 6 marks. Lots of waffle and repeats, some candidates going into far too much detail about how to download illegal software. Many did not understand about software licensing. Once again, candidates had not noticed how many marks were allocated to the question to give them an idea of how many points were needed. Many tended to expand one or two ideas rather than giving six ideas. Some candidates were very knowledgeable about aspects of stealing books. Some good answers, and most got download and copy, with a variety of other answers to do with security and internet fraud not perceived as theft.

Question 8: Generally answered well, and as with question 1 a number of candidates lost marks by ticking more than 6 boxes. Very few candidates ticked 6 correct answers. The majority of candidates got 4 answers correct. A few candidates ticked everything.

Question 9: Many candidates missed the point of this question and marks were generally poor. Most candidates commented in their answer on the value of having 'more than one password' rather than discussing the benefits and drawbacks of 'different types of password' which is what the question was asking. It seems that where answers are short and require little detail most candidates can achieve good marks. It is when they are required to give detail that many gain few marks. This was not just for question 9 but also those that needed more detailed answers, for example questions 5, 7 and 13. Detail was lacking from most candidates across the centres.

- a) Many pupils simply described the benefits of passwords in general and the use of more than one password. Very few obtained full marks.
- b) Question 9b was understood by most candidates and most gained the mark. The question was well answered if Part a) was well done. Some good answers, although some candidates spent too much time talking about hackers and various ways of hacking into the system. Most gave firewall, but some suggested security arrangements such as locking things away.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Questions 10: Some good answers about encryption. Most candidates knew that encryption was some type of code and that it protected sensitive files, but very, very few really understood the correct explanation. Most candidates got scrambled, and the need for a password to access data. Some candidates made a serious attempt at the encryption question, suggesting that this topic had been taught, but many candidates had a very poor knowledge and understanding about encryption, which is not an A* type question. Candidates that had some knowledge generally did not provide enough detail to gain full marks.

Question 11: The marking of this style of question has been tightened up considerably from the January 2007 paper and this showed in the marks gained. Tightening up on this question had the effect of not many candidates getting full marks, even though all they had to do was mention a aspect of the software then relate it some way to the Dental Practice. As a result this was question was the lowest scoring question on the paper with a great number of candidates scoring zero. Most candidates provided answers that compared the different packages, but had no reference at all to the Practice. Some threw in a reference at the beginning hoping that it would cover the whole question.

Candidate answers were generally “too vague” as they had no relevance to the Wordsworth Dental Surgery. Most candidates wrote a lot deal about comparing each package with reference only to the table provided i.e. ie they were merely interpreting the figures given without justification of why each comparison would be beneficial or not to a dental practice. Some candidates provided some very good answers that were well thought out and detailed but, lacked the reference to the dental surgery, so gained zero marks.

Question 12: Very badly answered, virtually no-one understood the proper use of Styles and most candidates only had a vague knowledge of Templates. Few candidates produced a good answer. Quite a few did not understand the question and were unaware of what templates were and few understood house styles. Hardly anyone got full mark for using styles.

Candidates had little understanding or knowledge about templates or styles. Another line would have been useful as it may have encouraged more detailed answers, as there was plenty of space on the page.

Question 13: Generally well answered, most candidates scoring half marks or more. The majority of candidates picked up 2 marks for this question as they had a basic knowledge of what a spreadsheet did. However, often the same advantage was expanded on rather than another point given. Most candidates came up with a comparison, although some tended to speak more about the benefits/features of the spreadsheet, and didn't mention the drawbacks of using a calculator.

Question 14: Despite most candidates undertaking a database as part of their coursework, they seem to have little understanding or knowledge about databases. Question 14 B (i) and B (ii) were “easy” marks to gain, but so few did. Most candidates went no further than explaining a field was a column and a record was a row, which is Key Stage 3 terminology, not higher level GCSE. About half the candidates answered Part a) well, many candidates answered Part b) in terms of columns and rows, but did not understand the difference between the two answers. Candidates still in spreadsheet mode at this point did not read the question and realise they were talking about databases. Some good answers, about preventing errors. Very few candidates achieved full marks.

Question 15: Generally answered very well with a large number of candidates gaining high marks. As always this question provided the most entertainment. Some truly original ideas and designs. Common mistakes were lack of Home and Submit buttons and no Form on the order page. Some designs may not have been very well drawn out, but had the essential elements included for which they were given credit. However, there are still candidates that do not understand a box or border is required and this should be stressed to centres via this report, as

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

some lost 6 or more marks by not having a border/box. Candidates need to remember that they need essential elements on any web page, such as a link to Home, logo/company name and a standard design for the pages required. Some candidates are still misreading the question and just designing one page instead of two. Some candidates produced a flow chart, which did not generate any marks. Surprisingly, some of the weaker candidates picked up quite a lot of marks on this, feeling more comfortable with the design of a web page.

In some centres there was blatant 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.

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.

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**ICT Syllabus B (Specification Code 1095/1995)
June 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
2377F	Raw	40	-	-	-	37	33	29	26	23	0
	UMS	55	-	-	-	48	40	32	24	16	0
2377H	Raw	40	38	34	30	26	23	21	-	-	0
	UMS	80	-	64	56	48	40	-	-	-	0
2378	Raw	64	62	53	44	36	30	25	20	15	0
	UMS	120	-	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2379	Raw	64	62	53	44	36	30	25	20	15	0
	UMS	120	-	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2380F	Raw	55	-	-	-	36	30	25	20	15	0
	UMS	55	-	-	-	48	40	32	24	16	0
2380H	Raw	80	53	46	39	33	27	24	-	-	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	3.2	14.6	34.4	55.3	69.4	80.0	89.6	96.6	100	14813
1995	2.6	14.2	38.5	63.8	78.8	88.4	94.6	98.6	100	9077

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: general.qualifications@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