



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCSE in Information and
Communication Technology (5IT02)
Papers 05 & 06

Using Digital Tools

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 2017

Publications Code 5IT02_05&06_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

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 adopt safe, secure and responsible practice.

June 2017 is the ninth moderation session for this unit. In this series, centres could choose from Controlled Assessment Brief (CAB) 05: Animal Shelter or 06: Prom.

The CABs valid for the next series are Animal Shelter and Prom.

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 modelling 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; they must be prepared to explain and justify their design decisions.
- Activity 4 requires candidates to evaluate their products and their own performance.

Centre performance

Centres performed well in the following:

Once again, centres that provided high quality feedback to their students, either via teachers or test buddies, enabled students to review and modify their work as they progressed through the CAB; this led to better outcomes.

Logos were broadly better in this examination series. Students have shown a greater understanding of developing an original logo using digital tools rather than repurposing images from the internet.

On the whole, more Controlled Assessment Record (CAR) documents included a lot of detail which explained the decision to award a certain mark. This was very helpful and enabled moderators to agree marks.

CDs were generally well organised into folders in most cases. Less work was found to be submitted on USB sticks, which are forbidden for moderation.

Work in Activity 2 was generally assessed more accurately than in previous examination series. Candidates are more confident in creating an interactive model as opposed to a static spreadsheet.

The quality of some of the websites / webpages was very high. Students often managed to tie all of their products together using a corporate style.

Design work was of higher standard than in previous examination series. Candidates are getting better at justifying their design decisions and designs are more often upfront than retrospective.

Centres are advised to consider the following:

The following points, made in June 2016's report, are still as pertinent as ever:

"It is vital that centres can be confident that controlled assessment procedures have been followed by their candidates and that they can have faith in the integrity of the work produced. **Candidates should not store any of their controlled assessment work online where it can be accessed by other candidates or modified outside the time allotted by the centre for working on the CAB.** Aside from the fact that this contravenes the controlled assessment guidelines, it may also lead to a moderator not being able to see some of or the entire digital product in question if they do not happen to be connected to the internet when moderating.

Where work was solely hosted online and not on the disc as required, no marks could be awarded, as the correct procedures were not followed.

Please ensure that this is fully understood.

Some centres had incorrectly added up the marks awarded on CAR documents. These totals differed from marks submitted online and caused a delay in the moderation process whilst trying to ascertain the correct marks awarded. A quality check of mark totals before they are entered online is advised.

Some assessors are awarding marks in Mark Band 3 when candidates have made only a token attempt at their review document. The mark awarded is not purely based on the digital products created.

Centres should reflect on the following points, which apply to specific activities.

Comments on CAB activities

Activity 1

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

Centres should consider that 'range' in the context of the sources table(s) not only refers to a number, but a range of different types of sources, including primary and secondary. A long list of sources is not necessarily a range if they are all very similar.

CABs have very clear requirements about the logo, particularly regarding the use of colour. Candidates should be encouraged to read the CAB requirements in full before attempting each digital product. They should also be aware of the requirement for the logo to be original. Secondary images downloaded from the internet with some basic text added will not allow for high marks.

Activity 2

Candidates who did not extend their model using complex features did not score beyond Mark Band 2. In the recommendations for both CABs, some candidates misunderstood the need to explore options and show alternatives. 'What if?' questions need to be more developed than simply saying for example, 'If I raise the price of X then I will make more money'. Candidates need to consider the knock-on effects of raising or lowering variables and how that affects the reliability of the information generated.

To score marks in Mark Band 3, moderators need to be confident that a candidate has created a complex model and that it has been used to model the scenario presented. Centres should avoid crediting work in Mark Band 3 solely because some complex features have been used. The section of the review that focuses on 'What if?' questions represents a significant opportunity for candidates to demonstrate how they have used their model.

Some reports for 05: Animal Shelter have been quite limited in their scope. This is an opportunity for candidates to showcase the model they have created and, more importantly, the ability for the model to be used accurately. Simple print screens of changes made do not fully meet the CAB requirements. The effect of the two grant sizes should be explored with the impacts fully evaluated.

Many candidates missed the key requirement of the demo for 06: Prom to show how the model can be used to generate two different ticket prices. The demo is not simply a 'how to' guide for the model. It should clearly show, with justified reasons, how changes to the model can be made and the impact on the different ticket prices.

Activity 3

Where the templates provided with the CAB were used, designs were completed well. Some candidates are still using a screenshot of the final product in place of design, which is inappropriate and should be marked accordingly, which did not always happen. To score marks in Mark Band 3, the design work should be detailed enough that the product(s) could be created by a third party, and design decisions should be fully justified.

Websites created for 05: Animal Shelter were generally of a high standard. Improvements could be made where candidates did not apply a consistent approach to the layout, colour scheme, and font choices. Many candidates also missed the point that the website is supposed to persuade people to donate, volunteer and sponsor. To this effect, the use of tone and images should be considered.

The above is also true for many webpages seen for 06: Prom. Centres are reminded that the major product for Activity 3b is a webpage and not a website. The audience for the website are potential schools / teachers looking for a prom company to organise their prom. Many candidates created a webpage that was aimed at students who would be attending a prom.

Activity 4

The following comments from the June 2016 report still apply:

'Evaluations were well organised into sections. The higher achieving evaluations covered all of the required areas including feedback given and received. Where evaluations simply told the story of the CAB without identifying sensible areas for improvement it was difficult to support higher marks. Candidates might find it useful to use techniques such as De Bono's thinking hats or the SWOT analysis before they write their evaluations to ensure that they are actually evaluating rather than simply describing.'

'Evaluations that developed comments and suggested effective improvements scored higher marks than those that were more narrative in nature. As stated above, candidates should avoid generalisations such as 'professional' and be more specific about the nature of the suggested improvements rather than stating, for example, 'more colour' or 'more images'. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar was once again generally good.'

Preparing the evidence

The following points, made in the June 2016 report, are still relevant:

'A minority of centres were late with their samples this series. It is vital that deadlines are met so that moderation can commence promptly.'

As stated in the introduction, centres should ensure that the CABs(s) they are using with their candidates are going to be valid for the moderation window they are to be submitted in. This information is available on the Pearson Qualifications website:

<http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/ict-2010.coursematerials.html#filterQuery=Pearson-UK:Category%2FControlled-assessments>

Centres are reminded that work should be submitted on CD or DVD. USB sticks are not appropriate.

Some work was once again seen in formats not covered by the Moderator's Toolkit. Centres are reminded that moderators cannot read work submitted in these formats, the most common being Microsoft Publisher. The easiest and most sensible way to avoid this is to produce a PDF version of the Publisher file and submit that as the final product.

Publisher is still the most prevalent piece of software that is used that is not in the toolkit, but there were other examples this series. Moderators are unable to accommodate requests from centres to install additional software or set up local web servers in order to view the sample. The guidelines in the Moderator's Toolkit are clear and should be followed by all centres. The toolkit can be found at:

<http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/ict-2010/teaching-support/moderators-toolkit.html>

Centres are reminded that the samples should consist of work from candidates requested along with the work of the highest- and lowest-scoring candidates. Several centres did not provide the highest- and lowest- scoring work in the first instance in this examination series, which slowed down the moderation process and created extra work for moderators, and no doubt members of staff in centres too.

Once the evidence is copied on to the moderation CD, it must be thoroughly checked. All the evidence for the required sample should be on one CD or DVD if possible. CDs and / or DVDs should be appropriately packaged to ensure that it remains intact through the journey to the moderator. There were fewer instances of discs being sent with no case in a plain paper envelope in this series.

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 Controlled 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 centre assessor has awarded marks and provide details of any professional judgement applied. Some CARs arrived with