Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2013

GCE Applied ICT (6955) Paper 01 – Web Development

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

General Comments

The entry this series was comparable to previous summer series for candidates that are completing the GCE AS Applied ICT Double Award. E-portfolios with marks across the range were seen many in the 30s with a few high scoring ones in the 50s and 40s. The majority of centres had assessed the evidence realistically and demonstrated an understanding of the standards.

There is a requirement to involve a client during the development of the web site even if this is a role played by the teacher. Lack of involvement of a client can impact on the marks achieved for this unit.

Generally candidates supplied the websites created which is correct practice. There was evidence relating to all strands but some areas for improvement were identified during the moderation process. It was noticed that some aspects of strand b and c were not always fully covered.

Comments on strand a

The requirement for this strand is for candidates to produce project plans in **graphical format** however in this series there were several examples when this had not been the case with tabular plans being submitted instead. When graphical formats had been used there was an increased use of project management software which is good practice although MS Excel is also acceptable for this AS unit. Plans need to be **detailed** in order to be placed in mark band 2 as well as evidence that the plan had actually been used to monitor progress during the development of the website.

Plans generally had been produced at the beginning of the process as required with often further versions. However the explanations of progress against the plan and how the actual development of the site compared with this could be developed further.

Some candidates incorporated all aspects of the unit, including the proposal and e-portfolio building, within the plan rather than the development of the website only.

Comments on strand b

For this strand there are three elements. The investigation into the client's requirements, the requirements analysis produced as a result of this investigation which fully documents the requirements of the website and the design work. Different centres placed more emphasis on some part of this strand than others.

There was generally good evidence that an investigation had taken place using a range of techniques including client questionnaires, user questionnaires, interviews, client meetings and researching similar websites. However the information gathered from these investigations were not always documented in a   requirements analysis which covered all

aspects of 5.3 of the specification. It is important that this document is produced to ensure that the resulting website fully meets the needs of the client.

The design work produced was variable. Most candidates had produced a series of storyboards which differed in level of detail and quality of presentation. There was also generally a navigation chart and in some instances a flowchart although this did not always clearly represent the users choices when navigating the proposed site.

Better candidates received client feedback on their design prior to proceeding with the development of the site.

Comments on strand c

There are 3 distinct areas to address this strand, the prototyping of the design, the actual website and testing. On occasions high marks are awarded purely on the final website.

There are still issues with the evidence presented for prototyping. In all mark bands there needs to be evidence of some prototyping to improve and refine the initial design. Merely producing prototypes without receiving feedback to help with the site's development is insufficient to meet the requirements of the higher mark bands. Prototypes should be produced feedback sought from the client, and possibly potential users, and then the candidate should explain how that feedback has been used in the site's development. Better candidates had clear evidence of meetings with the client with explanations of changes required, with before and after screen shots. Evidence for a single prototype with feedback is insufficient to gain the higher marks in this strand.

Candidates generally included the websites in their e-portfolios which is a requirement for this strand. The standard of websites produced had improved in this series. In order to access mark band 3 good use of software tools should be demonstrated and highlighted. Some candidates had included a range of features such as multimedia content, interactive components, simple animations, replacement text for visually disabled access but the sites lacked cohesiveness and the features included did not meet the client's needs well.

All candidates in one centre produced a detailed step by step document on how the website had been developed. This is not necessary but an explanation of the range of software tools used and different coding experienced within is development should be included for mark band 3.

The evidence for testing usually consisted of test plans and supporting screenshot evidence as required. More robust testing should include using different browsers and screen resolutions as well as user feedback.

Comments on strand d

This strand clearly requires the completed web site to be evaluated in terms of **functionality** or how well the site meets the client and user requirements and **performance** or how well it operates in a variety of environments.

In order to judge the functionality of the site reference should be made to the requirements analysis produced towards the beginning of the process as well as the client feedback gained during the production of the site, whereas evaluative comments on the performance of the site can be supported by the test results and user feedback.

There was generally sound evidence for improvements which related to the actual website.

There were some instances when the candidates own performance was included in the evaluation which is not required for this unit.

Comments on strand e

The majority of candidates addressed this strand better and the assessment was more accurate.

Most candidates presented the evidence correctly, i.e. a Proposal addressed to the client in an appropriate format. The best evidence was in the form of a professionally presented report.

The recommendation should be relevant to the web site produced rather than covering all the suggestions listed in section 5.7. There were instances when all candidates within the same centre made the same recommendations regardless of the site that had been developed.

Some centres presented evidence of research into different aspects of e-commerce produced a brief proposal and then implemented these proposals. This is not what is required. Any research carried out should be implicit within the proposal and there is no requirement for actual implementation for this unit only an indication of what methods *could* be used for implementation at the client's consent.

Some candidates presented work for this strand which was more appropriate for strand A of unit 6952 which should be avoided.

Few Assessors mentioned Quality of Written Communication in the feedback on the e-sheets for this stand.

Comments on Administrative Procedures

Most samples were received by the stated deadline and correct documentation was provided, ie candidate authentication sheets and esheets.   Some of the esheets were not named using the file naming conventions specified in the Guidance for Centres: Moderation of e-Portfolios document which can be found on the Applied GCE ICT section of Edexcel.com.   Some e-portfolio links were broken which hindered the moderation process.

There were some centres that did not send candidate authentication sheets and these had to be chased by the moderator.   Candidate authentication sheets are essential to the moderation process.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwant to/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx

Ofqual

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Rewarding Learning