

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCE Applied ICT (6955)
Unit 5 Web Development

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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

Summer 2014

Publications Code UA040225

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Comments

The entry this series was slightly lower 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 ones in the 50s and 40s some of which were confirmed at moderation. 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. Most centres allowed the candidates to select a suitable client or case study in order to produce an individual web site

Comments on strand a

The requirement for this strand is for candidates to produce project plans in **graphical format** and this had generally been evidenced by the candidates sampled. There was an increased use of project management software which is good practice although MS Excel is also acceptable for this AS unit. Not all candidates included a version of the initial plan and some of the evidence of the plan being used to monitor the progress of the web site development was superficial or not well explained.

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.

The evidence that an investigation had taken place to ascertain the client's requirements was variable. Some candidates had used a range of techniques whereas others provided only limited evidence. Similarly the evidence of the Requirements Analysis was variable. Some had produced a detailed document clearly explaining the client's requirements for the web site whereas others only brief notes. In some instances there was no separate requirements analysis document. The requirements analysis document should cover all aspects of 5.3 of the specification

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. There was increased use of mood

boards. Not all candidates included evidence of feedback on the design work which should be used to influence the initial web site prototype

Comments on strand c

There are 3 distinct areas to address this strand, the prototyping of the design, the actual website and testing.

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. Generally the quality of the web sites produced were reflected in the marks awarded. Not all candidates who had been awarded marks in mark band 3 had included evidence of the coding used in the development of the site.

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. Some candidates only produced a test plan with no supporting evidence which is not sufficient to support marks in the higher mark bands.

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. This was generally addressed more consistently in this series

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 realistic.

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.

One centre 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.

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.

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>

