

Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2011

Applied GCE

Applied GCE

Information and Communication
Technology (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/>

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

General Comments

The entry for this unit was very small this January and many entries were resubmissions. Moderation marks were in the range 14-40.

Centres are asked to read this report in conjunction with the more detailed report of Summer 2010. This applies to all 5 strands for this unit. It is disappointing to see that weaknesses identified in previous Moderator reports to Centres and points highlighted in the Principal Moderator reports to Centres issued at the end of each series had not always been addressed.

Overall, the assessment was 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 evidence of attempting to

document the processes although most 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.

Centre Administration

Most centres submitted the CDs by the deadline. The centres submitting this window had followed 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.

Centres had named the eportfolios and esheets with the correct naming conventions. Candidate authentication in the form of individual sheets were scanned on to the CD, or provided in hard copy format or there was a signed printout of the submitted marks.

Strand A

Despite a good performance from candidates in this strand in general, 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 sufficient evidence to address the strand.

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 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.

The evidence for this strand was very limited for all the eportfolios moderated.

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 designs often consisted of many repetitive pages showing lots of products on the websites but little in the way of features and skills to be used in the production of the website.

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.

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. Many centres are still assessing this strand on the websites only and not taking into account the other facets of this strand in order to access all of the 20 marks available. Candidates often included many 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. Many candidates do not seem to understand the difference between implementation and prototyping.

It was good to see more candidates providing explicit evidence of testing and including a range of different kinds of tests rather than just concentrating on whether links worked. Those candidates that had prototyped well were able to show good evidence of formative testing.

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?). The better candidates often referred to the testing undertaken when evaluating the performance of the website which is good practice. Feedback was sometimes obtained and listed but not actually used in the evaluative comments.

Strand E

This strand was not well evidenced this window with most evidence falling into mark band 1. Few candidates presented the evidence in a format addressed to the client using correct grammar to reflect this. However, the assessment was realistic in most cases.

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 publications@linneydirect.com

January 2011

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