

Examiner's Report

January 2010

GCE

GCE Applied ICT 6952 Paper 01

The Digital Economy

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report 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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186

January 2010

Publications Code UA023230

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Contents

1.	Overall Comments	1
2.	Unit 2: The Digital Economy	2
	• Strand A	2
	• Strand B	2
	• Strand C	2
	• Strand D	3
	• Strand E	3
3.	Grade Boundaries	5

Overall Comments

Important information

This specification has been updated and ALL candidates will be assessed on the updated version from SUMMER 2010. This version which has a blue cover and has been sent out to centres, many centres have attended the free inset sessions.

Moderated Units

Assessment Issues

Candidates need to supply explicit evidence to support their achievement of the criteria in the various marking grids. It is easier to confirm marks if the evidence is easy to find and supplied in an explicit form.

Assessors must use the e-sheets as an opportunity to explain why they have awarded marks, there are two advantages to this for the centre. If the moderator can see *why* and where marks are awarded it is easier to agree with the centre marks, secondly if the centre marks cannot be agreed then the moderator can give better guidance to help future assessment.

A number of centres still do not meet deadlines for submitting work to the moderators; the deadlines are published in advance and must be kept unless special permission has been obtained in advance from Edexcel. Permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. Centres who miss the deadline risk having the results delayed or the candidates recorded as absent.

Each unit must be on a separate CD, even if sent to the same moderator. Each unit will be forwarded to different principal moderators for monitoring and auditing purposes.

Unit 2: The Digital Economy (6952)

General Comments

The entry for this unit was much smaller than the summer this January and many entries were resubmissions. Most centres were assessing to national standards and moderated marks were in the range 3-57. It was very pleasing to see the majority of eportfolios accessing marks in the 30s and 40s and a good number in the 50s with less in the lower range. Overall the specification is being well addressed although there are still some problems relating to evidencing strand d.

There were a good number of resubmissions this January and some of the work submitted did not contain sufficient new material to justify the marks awarded. Some eportfolios contained content that was not relevant and centres are requested to ensure candidates only include files and folders containing evidence required for the 5 strands being assessed and to remove everything else.

Centres are asked to read this report in conjunction with the more detailed report of Summer 2009. This applies to all 5 strands for this unit.

Comments on strand A

Overall this strand was addressed correctly and the marks awarded by centres usually within national standards. However, some candidates were given marks in mark band 2 although few features had been covered and often not described in detail. Not all candidates are including evaluative comments relating to the design of the transactional website but concentrating too much on the products being sold. As mentioned in the summer report, candidates are still often recommending improvements relating to the products rather than the design features of the website.

Comments on strand B

Much of the evidence fell in mark bands 1 and 2 and were awarded marks accordingly. Few candidates produced diagrams that supported the requirements for mark band 3, i.e. flows in and out of the organisation and other departments within the organisation that might use the data obtained. There were instances of very similar work produced by whole cohorts which demonstrated a very structured approach.

Comments on strand C

This strand was assessed within national standards in the main. The better candidates did look at the 3 areas concerned, i.e. threats, preventative measures and legislation, from the organisation's point of view and many related the evidence to the transactional website evaluated for strand a which is good practice. The weaker candidates wrote general notes for this strand often from their own point of view which is not the correct approach.

Comments on strand D

The evidence for this strand is improving. However, the comments made the Examiner's report for Summer 2009 are still very relevant and centres are asked to refer to this for further clarification.

More candidates are showing the process behind the output which is required. However, there were instances where the evidence did not follow through using the same version of Access which led to ambiguity in the evidence presented. This appeared to be the case with resubmissions. There were several instances where candidates had included a screen shot of their tables with enforced one-to-many relationship/s in one version of Access, but the queries were shown in a newer version but with only one-to-one links evidenced. Such evidence does not support this strand properly.

As stated in the previous 2 reports: "It was disappointing to see the lack of independence to this strand demonstrated by many cohorts with evidence being virtually the same across all candidates. Such an approach does not support the higher mark bands.

Some centres appear to have supplied 3 tables to the candidates. This unit requires one large dataset file to be supplied to the candidates in csv format. The dataset needs to be large enough to contain trends. Each candidate is required to carry out the practical work independently.

Candidates should devise their own structure to include any necessary validation and also devise the queries used to manipulate the dataset in order to obtain output. Some candidates had included limited evidence of validation and testing but were awarded high marks for this strand as though these aspects had not been fully covered. There was very limited evidence to support the use of search criteria, i.e. searching on more than one field (MB2) and more than one table (MB3)"

Comments on strand E

It is disappointing to see that still many candidates are not providing the correct evidence for this strand, i.e. an evaluation of the PERFORMANCE of the database CREATED and an evaluation of their own performance over the whole unit. Many candidates are still just listing what they had done particularly referring to the order of how they used Access and problems relating to the use of Access.

Marks were often awarded in mark band 2 although the candidates had not referred to feedback received in their evaluative comments.

Still many candidates are evaluating their "ebook" and some their "eportfolios".

Candidates should pay more attention to the wording of this strand for each unit and not assume all unit evaluations concentrate on the same areas.

Comments on Administrative Procedures

Most centres submitted the CDs by the extended deadline given due to the inclement weather. However, there were still centres who submitted after this. Again It would appear that not all centres had referred to the document: "Moderation of

ePortfolios" which can be located on the "Guidance to Centres" section of the Applied GCE ICT section of the Edexcel website.

Most centres named the eportfolios with the correct naming conventions but many did not do so for the naming of the e-record sheets. Most centres provided candidate authentication in the form of individual sheets scanned on to the CD or provided hard copy hard copy format of these or a signed printout of the submitted marks. However, some centres had to be contacted to supply candidate authentication sheets. These are an essential part of the moderation process.

Some of the eportfolios had links that did not work and folders had to be examined to see if the evidence was present. It is important that CDs are tested prior to submission. It is also important that CDs are clearly labelled as stated in the above document. Some CDs submitted contained no identification.

Grade Boundary January 2010

6952	Total	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Mark	60	48	42	36	30	25
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA023230 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH