

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2012

GCSE ICT (5IT02)
Paper 1 and Paper 2
Using Digital Tools

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 visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

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 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 2012

Publications Code UG032520

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

5IT02 – Using Digital Tools

Unit 2, Using Digital Tools, is a practical unit. Candidates broaden and enhance their ICT skills and capability. They work with a range of digital tools and techniques to produce effective ICT solutions in a range of contexts. They learn to reflect critically on their own and others' use of ICT and to adopt safe, secure and responsible practice.

June 2012 is the third moderation session for this unit, and the first in which two Controlled Assessment Briefs have been available. In this series centres could choose from Upcycle Now or Get Up, Get Moving. Around two thirds of centres submitted work for Upcycle Now.

Centres are reminded that January 2013 is the final available session in which to submit work for Upcycle Now. Centres submitting work in June 2013 should use Get Up, Get Moving, or the new CAB, Community Spirit.

In both CABs candidates are asked to complete four activities.

Activity 1 involves research and using the results of that research to create a profile and some digital products.

Activity 2 focuses on modeling and the use of some of the meaningful information generated by that modelling to create further products.

Activity 3 asks candidates to design and create two products; and they must be prepared to explain and justify their design decisions.

Finally in Activity 4 candidates are required to evaluate their products and their own performance.

Where centres have done well

The most successful outcomes were seen where candidates had clearly been focused on both producing good quality work and also meeting the requirements of the brief precisely. Good quality feedback from teachers and test buddies was also a feature of the highest scoring portfolios. Those candidates who responded to feedback and made modifications to their work as a result benefited in terms of the marks awarded.

Where the Candidate Assessment Records were completed in detail this aided the moderation process considerably and provided moderators with an insight into the rationale behind the marks awarded. It was clear that these centres had thought carefully about their assessment of the work and were committed to supporting their

carefully about their assessment of the work and were committed to supporting their students by providing such a level of detail. It is much easier to trust in the professional judgment of assessors when this level of documentation is present.

Where centres could improve

General points

It is very important to enter candidates for the correct CAB in this unit. Some centres in this series entered their candidates for Upcycle Now which carried a paper code of 01 but submitted work for the Get Up, Get Moving CAB, which carries a paper code of 02 and vice versa. As a result of this moderators received work from the opposite CAB that they were expecting. While this doesn't effect the moderation, centres need to be aware that grade boundaries for each CAB are independently set. Both CABs have the same boundaries in summer 2012, but centres must ensure they get this right. Entering for the wrong CAB may disadvantage candidates.

Some centres are submitting discs that are disorganised and include either irrelevant files, multiple copies of activity files or what appears to be the vast majority of the candidates' home directories from their network. When this happens moderators can be at a loss as to which file represents the final version of the work that the centre has assessed, and this can lead to marks being adjusted.

Lots of work was seen in this series in formats not covered by the Moderator's Toolkit¹. Centres are reminded that moderators cannot read work submitted in these formats. Formats seen in this series included many MS Publisher files, un-exported Serif WebPlus files and Microsoft Movie Maker project files rather than the final exported movies. Centres must understand that they run the risk of disadvantaging their candidates if they persist with this approach and that it is wise to check the contents of discs carefully before submitting.

When candidates receive feedback from their teacher or test buddy they should be encouraged to consider this as constructive criticism. Some reviews were dismissive of the feedback received, to the detriment of their work in the end, as they had not made modifications that could have improved their mark.

It is important that candidates receive sufficient quality of formative feedback in order to be able to make modifications to their work, and if this is not available from the test buddy then the teacher must take the responsibility for this so that all students have something to work from.

Centre assessment was in the main accurate; however, inaccurate assessment occurred most often in activities 1a and 2a. In 1a candidates must show some

¹http://www.edexcel.com/quals/gcse/gcse10/ict/unit_2/Pages/Moderators_Toolkit.aspx

discrimination in their selection of sources for marks in Mark Band 3; this can be done in the sources table itself or in the review. In 2a, centres must be sure that the student has created a complex spreadsheet *model*, not just a complex spreadsheet, to access Mark Band 3.

Activity 1

It is vital that candidates submit a sources table for this activity. In order to achieve marks in Mark Band 3, discrimination in selection of sources must be evident either in the sources table or the review, and candidates at this level should be considering the issue of copyright.

Logos were generally very well done, and always better when created from scratch rather than by combining several pieces of clipart or wordart. Where logos were poorly done, they became more of a collage or montage of several found images rather than something that could be used in a variety of different products and situations. Logos should always aim to represent the general idea of the CAB.

Candidates should always be aware of the exact requirements of the CAB in terms of purpose and audience. Some invitations for Upcycle Now missed the fact that they should have been aimed at potential stallholders.

Activity 2

It is clear from this activity that where students grasp the idea early on that they are creating a model that will enable them to ask 'What If?' questions about the event or situation that they are modelling, they do much better and score higher marks.

Centres should reflect carefully on the notion that in order to score marks in Mark Band 3 candidates need to create a "complex spreadsheet model". A complex spreadsheet model is one that will include some complex functions or make use of some complex features of the software, but also one that will generate sufficient meaningful and reliable information in order to fully inform the decision making process.

Candidates should create models that allow them to change variables and consider the reliability of the results of those changes. Examples might include, "What if we charge stall holders £x, how will this affect profit/loss?" They might go on to then consider the likely effect of this change on the number of stall holders that will attend at the new price.

In Get Up, Get Moving candidates might consider the realism of planning a week of exercise in which every activity is a rigorous, challenging one and instead ask "What if

we introduce some gentler activities in-between more challenging days in order to give this person a break, will their BMI still fall sufficiently?"

A Mark Band 3 candidate will be able to do the above, and crucially their model *will be sufficiently complex to enable them to do so without additional changes to the model itself*. They should have tested the model to ensure that it is capable of producing the required information, and have included some information on any modifications made in their review.

The consideration of realistic and meaningful information should carry through to the digital products created in Activity 2. Candidates should again focus closely on the requirements of the CAB. Some candidates focused too much on maximising profit from the upcycling event rather than breaking even, and asked the council for sponsorship as a means to make even more profit, revealing that they hadn't understood the purpose of the presentation.

Activity 3

Some candidates created hand drawn designs for their products for this section. This is acceptable if the designs are then scanned and included on the disc with the rest of the candidate work, but it is not acceptable to include paper-based designs. What is equally unacceptable is the inclusion of "designs" that are simply screenshots of the finished product, and candidates should be strongly dissuaded from this approach in future.

Where candidates clearly justified their design decisions in the first part of this activity they scored the highest marks. Areas where design decision can be justified include but are not limited to: colour scheme, choice of layout, use of background music or sound, screen orientation and choice of file format.

Generalisations such as "eye-catching" or "memorable" can often tend to indicate weaker justifications and these kinds of phrases need additional explanation. Candidates could consider why, for instance, would a discovery board need to be eye-catching?

Centres should remember that in Activity 3 there are two products; one is considered the major product and carries more weight than the other. In the two CABs eligible in this series the discovery board and website were the major products, with the video and podcast being the minor products. Centres need to bear this in mind because it was evident in some cases that candidates had spent more time on the minor products than the rest of the activity to the detriment of the quality of the major products.

Having said that, there were some outstanding videos and podcasts produced in which candidates made excellent use of camera angles, transitions, background music and narration. Where candidates used text-to-speech software or websites to produce their voice-over this was generally quite successful and is a valid approach for candidates who are unsure over their own vocal abilities.

Activity 3 is another area where candidates need to focus on the CAB requirements. This was most evident in the discovery board where some boards implied that the event was taking place at some point in the future whereas in fact the board was meant to be in place at the event as it was taking place.

Activity 4

In general evaluations were very well organised and candidates made good use of subheadings to structure their work.

Evaluations that developed the comments and suggested effective improvements scored higher marks than those that were more narrative in nature.

The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar was generally good.

Preparing the Evidence

Centres should submit only the final products and publications as listed on the evidence checklist. These should be organised into the Activity folders as directed in the CAB. Some candidates submitted a single folder containing all their evidence or indeed multiple copies of the outcomes of some or all activities and this should be avoided in future series. Evidence must be checked to ensure it is accessible using the Moderator's Toolkit.

Once the evidence is copied onto the moderation CD, it must be thoroughly checked again. All the evidence for the required sample should be on one CD or DVD if possible. CDs and/or DVDs should be appropriately packaged so as to survive the journey to the moderator intact. There were some instances of discs being sent with no case in a plain paper envelope in this series, which inevitably resulted in the disc arriving broken. Each candidate folder should be named according to the following naming convention:

[centre #]_[candidate #]_[first two letters of surname]_[first letter of first name].

For example, John Smith with candidate number 9876 at centre 12345 would have a controlled assessment project in a folder titled: "12345_9876_SM_J".

The Candidate Assessment Record (CAR) should be completed and provided electronically as part of the submission. Comments should be directed to the moderator and should explain where the internal assessor has awarded marks and provide details of any professional judgment applied.

The Assessor Witness Statement (AWS), which is the final page of the CAR, should be scanned or provided as a hardcopy to authenticate the work submitted.

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 publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UG032520 Summer 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

