

Examiner's Report

January 2010

GCE

GCE Applied ICT 6955 Paper 01

Web Development

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 UA023232

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Contents

1.	Overall Comments	1
2.	Unit 5: Web Development	2
	• Strand A	2
	• Strand B	3
	• Strand C	3
	• Strand D	4
	• Strand E	4
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 5: Web Development (6955)

General Comments

The entry for this unit was very small this January and many entries were resubmissions. Moderation marks were in the range 6-52.

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

Although there were very few eportfolios with marks above the middle 40s it was pleasing to see a few in the 50s and more in the 30s and lower 40s. The assessment was more in line with the requirements of the assessment guidance although there was still a tendency to award too many marks to strands a and b.

Most candidates supplied a copy of the final websites they had created in their eportfolio which is correct practice. There was more evidence of attempting to document the processes although many candidates addressed this in a very limited way.

Few candidates evidenced the use of a client properly. 5.1 of the unit specification gives clarification on this aspect.

There were some resubmissions this January and some of the work submitted did not contain sufficient new material to justify the marks awarded.

Comments on strand A

It was disappointing to see that some candidates are still not producing project plans for this strand but including action plans such as those used in DiDA. These are not acceptable evidence for this unit. Project plans with a graphical format such as Gantt charts are the requirement. Project planning software is the ideal method to do this but spreadsheet software is accepted for this AS unit. Some candidates had used appropriate software but just included a list of tasks which is not correct. Not all candidates understood how to evidence phases of a project such as detailed in 5.1 of the unit specification. The plan should then address 5.2. The plan relates to the design, implementation and handover to the client of the website and must be created "up front" in order to access the marks in this strand. There was evidence of plans having been created retrospectively and still awarded marks which is not correct.

Few plans appeared to have been used to monitor progress of the project and this is required in order to access all the marks in mark band 1.

The following comments appeared in the previous Examiner's report and were very relevant this window: "Many plans were not sufficiently detailed and many did not include the final handover of the website to the client. The evaluation and proposal is not part of this process. Phases were not always used and these should relate to 5.1. Timings were often not sensible.

Few candidates evidenced the use of the plan throughout the implementation of the websites which is required in order to access all the marks in MB1. The best evidence is updating the plan and including the different versions in the eportfolio complete with annotation explaining updates. Project logs/diaries and minutes of meetings with the client can all support the use of the plan."

Comments on strand B

It was good to see more design work being evidenced but, again, this was often very limited and did not address the requirements of the strand well.

The lack of good evidence of liaison with a client, either real or role played had a detrimental impact on evidencing this strand. Candidates often referred to "my client" but failed to produce convincing evidence of liaising with one. 5.1 of the unit specification gives further clarification.

Candidates produced some evidence of research as detailed in 5.2 of the specification but this was often very superficial and did not support marks awarded. Blank questionnaires do not support this aspect properly. More research before producing the Requirements Analysis would strengthen the evidence. Some candidates researched other websites which is a good method but did not always choose similar sites which would make the evidence more worthwhile. Many candidates failed to bring the various techniques used together and present the findings in an appropriate format. A formal report is one method that would do this.

Designs were produced but these were not always well presented or detailed. 5.4 gives more clarification on this aspect. Flow charts and structure charts did not always address the requirements of this strand and, still, many appeared to address unit 2.

Comments on strand C

Some candidates produced good websites which reflected AS candidates but others were very basic and did not incorporate good design or ICT skills as detailed in 5.4, 5.5 and 5.8. Some centres were assessing this strand on the websites only and not taking into account the other facets of this strand in order to access all the marks available - 20 marks. Candidates often included many very similar pages which did not demonstrate a range of features supporting the skills and software tools used. Pages and pages of products are unnecessary.

Standard ways of working should be evidenced by good folder structure, lack of errors in the websites produced, evidence of consideration of copyright, etc. This can be seen by the end result and a good eportfolio.

There was often very limited evidence of prototyping and this aspect was not always taken into account when awarding marks for this strand. Using target audience representatives is an effective way to prototype and be able to take the feedback obtained into account when refining the designs. Much of the feedback obtained was not convincing and did not support candidates working in the higher mark bands or the marks that had been awarded.

Good prototyping should evidence formative testing. Many candidates did include evidence of summative testing but often neglected to evidence a range of tests which would support the higher mark bands. 5.6 gives further clarification.

Comments on strand D

This strand was often generously assessed and this was mainly due to candidates not producing evidence that matched the requirements of the strand. Candidates are **NOT** required to evaluate their ebook, eportfolio, own performance.

There is still a lack of understanding of the performance of the site (does it work?) and the functionality (does it do what the client wanted as specified in strand b?). Feedback was sometimes obtained and listed but not actually used in the evaluative comments.

Comments on strand E

It is good to see this strand being assessed more realistically and many candidates did present the evidence in the form of a report to the client. Not all chose aspects that would improve the functionality of the site created but were more in the form of general notes covering the items listed in 5.7. Some aspects chosen by some candidates were totally inappropriate for the site created. Most candidates produced evidence that addressed mark band 1 or the bottom to middle of mark band 2 this window.

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

6955	Total	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Mark	60	46	40	34	28	23
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 UA023232 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