

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

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

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 UG039194

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

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>

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

Unit 4, Creating Digital Products, is a practical unit.

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, 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 little or no feedback from the teacher. Failure to meet the brief has an impact on the number of marks it is possible to award and therefore this is an essential part of the process for the 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. This also aided candidates in the production of their evaluation.

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 be wary of including web-embedded content from the internet in products.

The Moderator's Toolkit is published on the Pearson website. It specifies the accepted file formats that moderators will be able to view on their PCs. It is each student's responsibility to ensure that their evidence includes only files that can be read using the Moderator's Toolkit.

Centres should note that evidence created in MS Publisher is not viewable using the Moderator's Toolkit and must be converted into an accepted file format.

The CAR is an important assessment document. It is the means by which an assessor communicates their assessment decisions and the rationale behind them to the moderator. It should be used to direct the moderator to relevant evidence and to assist the moderation process. The comments on the CAR should be addressed to the moderator, not the student.

Work on the digital products themselves must be carried out under supervision in the classroom. The teacher must be able to authenticate each student's evidence with confidence.

Tools that require work to be stored online are not appropriate for this qualification, as it cannot be guaranteed that students cannot work on their digital products outside of the controlled environment.

Activity 1

Candidates are expected to evaluate only one product; many candidates submitted two or more reviews. Often these were brief and did not gain access to the higher mark ranges. 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. It is better to do one more detailed review well than several briefer reviews.

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. The better candidates 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 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. It is essential that teachers read and comment 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.

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. One common problem was giving the name of the search engine used rather than the exact URL for the sources.

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

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 showcase was not stated making it difficult to assess if the showcase is fit for purpose. 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.

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 e-portfolio 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.

The candidates should organise the work 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. 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.

Samples should be submitted with folders clearly labelled with centre numbers, candidate number and first 2 letters of surname and first of Christian name. It would help if the CAR sheet naming convention is the same.

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

