

Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2012

Applied GCE

6955 01 – Web Development

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at www.edexcel.com. For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at www.btec.co.uk.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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 Pearson about Edexcel qualifications on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2012

Publications Code UA030140

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Unit 5: Web Development (6955)

General Comments

The entry for this unit was very relatively small. This report should be read in conjunction with the Principal's report for Summer 2011, which gives more detail relating to the five strands for this unit.

Most candidates' work that was seen was accurately assessed, across the ability range, by centres. The majority of candidates achieved marks in the mid-ranges, but it was pleasing to see a number of candidates gain high marks.

The main weaknesses still related to strand a, which was often leniently assessed.

Comments on strand a

It was good to see that most candidates' work had been accurately assessed, with evidence in mark band 1. More use of project management software to produce gantt charts was seen, which is very good practice.

Some candidates used Excel correctly to produce appropriate gantt charts. These candidates made good attempts to address 5.2 of the unit specification. However, there were still candidates who simply produced a list of tasks and dates which does not address this strand. These candidates were often assessed very generously.

Some candidates produced a very limited outline plan estimate which was not realistic and then produced a second plan which appeared to be at the end of the project with more realistic timings and detail. This is not a suitable approach.

The project plan produced at the beginning of the implementation of the website should contain the necessary detail, milestones and agreed handover date with the client. To access all the marks in mark band 1 there should be some clear evidence that the plan was used to implement the website. It was this aspect that was often not evidenced properly. Few candidates explained how the plan was used, changes were made, updates included etc, yet many were given marks in mark band 2 and even 3 where this evidence was not included in the eportfolio.

Fewer candidates included the evaluation and proposal in the plan, but many still neglected to state clearly the agreed handover date of the completed website to the client.

Comments on strand b

Most candidates had some evidence of research although the use of a client was still not always convincing. 5.1 of the unit specification should be addressed, which means a client or someone role playing the client is needed. Designs still continue to be limited and did not always support the marks awarded. Most designs were page layouts with little detail of what features were to be included, i.e. font styles, sizes, colours, backgrounds, multimedia, rollovers, forms. 5.8 in the specification lists some of the features that might be included in the websites and the designs need to include them too.

Some candidates neglected to include initial designs and used screen shots from the final product in the design evidence.

Comments on strand c

Prototyping was evidenced more clearly, although not all candidates produced evidence of before and after changes.

The main weakness with this strand was the standard of the websites produced. Quite a few were placed in mark band 3 which did not include sufficient evidence of effective use of software skills. 5.8 in the specification lists features that could be incorporated into the website and it is expected that some multimedia is present for mark band 3.

There were also a few candidates who had been placed in mark band 2 and above where the website was not fully functional. This mainly related to broken links and multimedia not present or not working. It is important that eportfolios and CDs are tested to ensure the links do not relate to files still in the candidates' user areas.

It was good to see more candidates producing evidence of modifying and editing html coding during prototyping, although some of the changes were very limited and did not support candidates working at the top of mark band 3.

Comments on strand d

There were several instances of this strand being assessed generously. A few candidates had not produced a separate evaluation and had been given credit for testing evidence. Such evidence is not sufficient on its own but can be used as reference for the performance of the site in the actual evaluation. Several candidates evaluated the functionality of the site and made reference to the client needs but then neglected to evaluate the performance of the site. Some had been given marks as if this evidence was present. Both aspects are required for mark band 1 and reference to the client's needs for all the marks in mark band 1.

Comments on strand e

There was a definite improvement in the evidence produced for this strand, with assessors understanding the importance of the presentation of the evidence when awarding marks. There was one instance where all the marks in mark band 2 had been awarded but the eportfolio did not contain the evidence. This is another instance where it would appear the eportfolio had not been tested prior to submission of evidence.

Grade Boundaries

Centres are reminded that the GCE in Applied ICT is an Awarded qualification. As such, grade boundaries are subject to review each series for both written paper and coursework units.

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 publication.orders@edexcel.com
Order Code UA030140

January 2012

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

