

Moderators' Report

Summer 2013

GCSE in Information and
Communication Technology (ICT)
5IT04 - Creating Digital Products

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

Summer 2013

Publications Code UG036246

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

General Comments

In this assessment window there were two CABs available, 'People and Places' and a new CAB 'Sea and Sky'. Moderators saw examples of both being used to good effect.

Unit 4, Creating Digital Products, is a practical unit. Which gives the candidates an opportunity apply the knowledge and understanding of digital design they are taught in unit 3 to produce an interactive digital product for others to use.

In this unit candidates can create one of the following four types of interactive digital products, related to this theme:

- a game
- an interactive multimedia or web-based interactive product
- a database system with a customised user interface

For each different type of product, candidates are expected to produce products that meet minimum requirements:

Interactive multimedia product:

These should have clear pathways through the product, include accessibility features, different types of interaction and that are suited to the intended audience. They should also include animation, a range of different assets, and user input.

Database with customised user interface:

There must be a minimum of 2 related tables, 1 input form. There should be searches based on related tables, including the use of relevant multiple search criteria. There should be a switchboard or menu system that is design and suited to the audience.

The output from the database should contain enough data to demonstrate full functionality and the functioning of user interface.

Game:

Should have a scoring system, rules to progress/win, can be single player at a time or alternate plays for multiplayer's, sprite interaction (with other sprites and/or environment), and some original assets. The game should be matched to the intended audience and follow the theme of the CAB.

Web-based interactive product:

Should have interactivity, working navigation based on 5 pages and is sufficient to demonstrated the features. It should be viewable in a web browser and have accessibility features, different types of links, animation,

a range of different assets and some user-input such as a form, a request for info, a search feature, an interactive quiz or questionnaire.

In most cases the candidates met these minimum requirements, however in others cases, simpler products were seen which limited the range of marks available.

The link to the theme is an important part of the CAB. Candidates are expected to have a product that links well to the theme and audience. Centres must provide advice and feedback to candidates at the start of the process so that the candidates produce work that is in line with the expectations of the theme. In some cases the feedback section of the proposal document contained no feedback from the teacher. Failure to meet the brief has an impact on the number of marks it is possible to award candidates.

Constructive feedback from teachers and test buddies generated improved outcomes. Candidates who responded positively to feedback generally accessed the higher mark bands because their work demonstrated a better understanding of the CAB and its requirements.

Some centres have narrowed the choice of digital products available to candidates too much by instructing all candidates to create the same product type.

Centres are advised to refer to the 'Centre guidance for submission of moderation samples' document available on the website when they prepare the work to send to the moderator. Centres should also ensure against the inclusion of web-embedded or web-stored content in products. All evidence must be stored locally in the candidate's folder on the submitted CD/DVD.

Activity 1

The majority of candidates were successful in creating a product review that provided some evaluation of the product's strengths and weaknesses, user interface and its functionality. In order to access the higher marks, candidates have to have also evaluated the usability and accessibility of the product. The best candidates included a number of well-chosen screen shots that illustrated and supported the points being made in the text. Candidates who scored less well typically included only one screen shot of the product, or reviewed a product of a type that did not match the one they were proposing to make.

Candidates were required to complete a proposal for their chosen product that outlined the purpose of the product, details the characteristics of the target audience and summarises the proposed content and features. This provides an opportunity to review the proposal and amend it to ensure it fits with the CAB theme. Teachers should read and comments on this proposal before the candidates move on to the design. This is an ideal opportunity to ensure that the product matches the CAB and the audience intended. Often candidates had created and submitted more than one product review. This is not necessary, it may be that candidates choose to review more than

one product; they should then choose the best and most relevant one to submit as part of their e-portfolio.

Activity 2

This activity is all about the design and development of the product. The design process varies considerably depending on the type of product being developed. There are different templates provided for each product type to help candidates in this process.

The candidate should include how the user interacts with the product and therefore candidates must provide designs of the user interface as well as considering database structure, links and page layouts, depending on the product type chosen.

Most candidates successfully gathered and prepared content for use in their digital products. To gain the higher mark ranges candidates need to have gathered and prepared a variety of appropriate content for use in the product. A number of candidates failed to record the source of the content they have gathered within their assets table and many also failed to document the editing or optimising of the content.

In order to achieve the higher marks, the assets table should contain all of the content prepared and gathered and should not be restricted to just images; candidates should be encouraged to source text, and sound if they are used in the product.

The functionality of the products created varied considerably. It is important that centre assessors use the product and assess how effectively it works. A product cannot be awarded high marks if it does not work as the user would expect or does not meet the accessibility criteria describe.

Finally, as part of Activity 2, candidates reviewed the design and development of their product and their own performance. Several candidates answered all of the questions outlining their decisions, feedback and responses to feedback they have received and this helped them when completing their evaluation in activity 4.

Activity 3

The digital showcase provides an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate the quality of their product. Candidates are expected to repurpose appropriate content and features from their product to promote it to a target audience of their choice. Often the audience for the product is not stated making it difficult to assess if the showcase is fit for purpose. The audience of the showcase does not have to be same as that of the product. For example the product may be a game targeted at children and the showcase may be targeted at their parents.

A number of candidates did not fully use the opportunity to showcase their product. In some case it consisted simply of an image or a sequence of images in a PowerPoint. The lack of titles or a commentary made it difficult to ascertain the audience or the purpose for these.

Better candidates used video capture software to demonstrate their product, providing a voice commentary to describe the purpose of the product or “sell” the product to the intended audience. Ideally the showcase products should include repurposed images, sound and text from the digital product, aimed at attracting attention and promoting the products features.

Activity 4

Candidates were asked to evaluate the design and development of their digital product, their digital showcase and their own performance. Candidates often evaluated the development of their product and their own performance but failed to evaluate the digital showcase and this limited some candidates from achieving high marks as they had not evaluated all of the project outcomes. Other candidates failed to mention the feedback given and received and others included limited suggestions for improvement.

Preparing the Evidence

Regardless of the type of product produced a copy of the fully functional product must be included in the candidate’s submission on the CD. It is not acceptable to provide a link to a website for the moderator to view the final product as this does not comply with examination regulations.

Candidates 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. In some cases the work was not well organised making it difficult to find some of the evidence required. In some cases multiple copies of the outcomes of some or all activities were present and it was not clear which the moderator should review this can disadvantage candidates. 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.

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 marks for each section should be clearly shown on the CAR.

Where the Candidate Assessment Records (CARs) were completed in detail this aided the moderation process considerably and provided moderators with an insight into the rationale behind the marks awarded. 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.

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".

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>

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

