

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Applied ICT (6955)
Paper 01 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 2016

Publications Code 6955_01_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

General Comments

The entry this series was again reduced to previous summer series for students that are completing the GCE AS Applied ICT Double Award. E-portfolios with marks across the range were seen mainly from low 30s to mid-50s, most 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 students to select a suitable client or case study in order to produce an individual web site.

Comments on strand a

Generally, the plans were of a good standard and presented in a graphical format. There was an improvement in the explanations of how these plans were used and most centres used project management software which, although isn't compulsory, is good practice.

Comments on strand b

Again this strand caused the most discrepancy between assessed mark and moderated mark. 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 were instances where either the evidence of an investigation or evidence of the results of the investigation being documented into a clear analysis of client's needs were missing.

The design work produced was variable. Most students 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 user's choices when navigating the proposed site. Not all students included evidence of feedback on the design work which should be used to influence the initial web site prototype but this was seen in some e-portfolios.

Comments on strand c

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

The evidence presented for prototyping is still the weakest area for this strand. In all mark bands there needs to be evidence of some prototyping to improve and refine the initial design. There should be clear evidence of before and after screen shots with explanations of changes required. Evidence for a single prototype with feedback is insufficient to gain the higher marks in this strand.

Students all 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 students 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. Fewer students 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 was also good evidence of improvements to the sites which is needed for mark band 2 and above.

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

Comments on strand e

The majority of students addressed this strand better and the assessment was more realistic.

Most students presented the evidence correctly, ie 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 students within the same centre made the same recommendations regardless of the site that had been developed.

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

Comments on Administrative Procedures

There was some confusion over the posting address for some centres and requests for samples were received late from some centres. Generally, the correct documentation was provided, ie student 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 at Edexcel.com

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>

