

Diploma in Digital Applications

AiDA/ CiDA/ CiCA+/ DiDA

January 2009

Moderators' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

January 2009

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

1.	Chief Moderator's Report	4
2.	D101 Moderators' Report	9
3.	D201 Moderators' Report	11
4.	D202 Moderators' Report	14
5.	D203 Moderators' Report	17
6.	D204 Moderators' Report	20
7.	January 2009 SPB Grade Boundaries	23

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication.

This is the Chief Moderator's report for the January 2009 moderation window and relates to the moderators' findings for the 0906 and 0907 SPBs. This window was the final opportunity to submit work for the 0906 SPB.

General Comments

Entry

The January 2009 series followed the cycle of previous years and attracted an entry approximately 30 % of the Summer 2008 series. There were over 50,000 entries across the four units; 17 % of these being at level 1. There was a relatively large entry for D201 (33,000) with the next most popular unit being D101 (8,000), followed by D203 (4,900) and D202 (4,000). The entries are indicative of candidates following a one year course submitting their first unit and of candidates following a two year CiDA course having delayed the submission of their first unit until the start of their second year.

Apart from D101 the entry for the level 1 units was relatively small, being only 1.5 % of the overall total. Given the low numbers involved it has not been possible to draw any general points for D102, D103 or D104 from the moderation of this work, although the comments made by the Principal Moderators in the June 2008 report regarding these units remain relevant.

Standard

The general quality of the work submitted for moderation for this series was consistent with the overall improvement achieved in the Summer 2008 series. The pass rates were consistent across the units, as were the percentage of candidates achieving the higher grades in each unit. At both levels and in all units there were some examples of exceptional work.

The level of agreement between centre assessors and Edexcel moderators was also in line with the Summer 2008 series, with the assessment guidance, use of walkthrough documents and general level of experience with the qualification all contributing to improved accuracy of assessment.

In order to continue these improvements centres are referred to the exemplar eportfolios available from the OSCA pages of the secure area of 'Edexcel Online' and also to the training on delivery and assessment available via the national INSET programme.

Awarding

DiDA follows the same processes as traditional GCSEs. As with any GCSE each unit is awarded to ensure that the standard is maintained. It is necessary to ensure consistency of the standard in each window and between each SPB and the grade boundaries may change as a result of this.

It is anticipated that - once set - grade boundaries for an SPB will remain unchanged throughout its lifetime. For both SPBs, this series, the grade boundaries determined by the awarding committee for the Summer 2008 series were re-confirmed.

Administration

Submission of eportfolio samples

Most centres met the deadline for despatch of candidates' work for moderation and followed the specified naming conventions for folders. However, some samples arrived well after the due date and several centres used registered post or other couriers that required a signature. This is unnecessary and can cause delays when moderators are not available to sign for the sample.

The majority of centres submitted correct samples of at least 10 eportfolios at each level, adding their candidates with the highest and lowest marks and making substitutions for absentees where necessary.

As in previous series some eportfolios retained absolute links to files stored locally on the centre's network and therefore these files were therefore not available for moderation.

Technical specification

Some candidates failed to adhere to the technical specifications given in the SPBs and submitted evidence in file formats that could not be opened using the Moderator's toolkit, details of which can be found on the DiDA microsite. Where centres had assessed work that could not be accessed using the toolkit there was inevitably some disagreement with the centre's assessment.

Assessor record sheets (ARS)

Most centres included a completed ARS for each of the candidates in the sample. These documents are essential as they provide the necessary confirmation of authenticity and, at level 1 identify the amount of guidance given to candidates.

Some centres indicated the level of guidance as required, but disregarded this when allocating marks.

As in previous series comments on the record sheets varied from minimal, such as "good work", to very detailed and helpful, with many assessors taking the opportunity to explain their assessment decisions and guide the moderator to the supporting evidence.

A minority of centre assessors had acknowledged missing work on the ARS but had awarded marks where no evidence of achievement had been submitted for moderation. In these instances the centres' marks could not be agreed.

Internal moderation

As in previous Winter series many entries of only a few candidates were submitted and consequently issues arising from any lack of effective internal moderation were less evident than in June 2008. However, in the instances where the accuracy of assessment varied significantly between assessors the overall moderation outcome was adversely affected by the inaccurate examples.

Submission of marks on Edexcel Online

Some data entry errors were made when submitting marks to Edexcel Online, resulting in discrepancies between the marks recorded on the system and those recorded on the assessor record sheets. In these instances the ARS mark was used for moderation purposes.

Copyright

As in the June 2008 series candidates were penalised at moderation for non-adherence to legal requirements. However, most centres had noted the contents of the copyright statement issued in December 2007, and most candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of copyright requirements.

Generic Strands

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

The project plan is intended to be an evolving document that is in constant use during the project, aiding progress and documenting changes from start to completion. Whilst most plans submitted appeared to be workable, a minority of the candidates had produced a plan that was rarely revisited and contributed little to the overall project outcomes.

Level 1

Centres are reminded that candidates can be awarded 3 marks if they needed guidance to produce an initial, workable plan and limited guidance to help them keep track and communicate progress and 5 marks if - with limited guidance - they were able to produce an initial, workable plan and use it to track and communicate progress. It was noted that many candidates would have benefited from greater guidance with planning to ensure that they had initial workable plans for their projects.

Level 2

Most candidates were able to produce an initial plan that listed main tasks in a logical order and allocated time to each task. The majority of candidates also provided evidence of the use of their plans to track progress through the project. Most time allocations were sensible, although allocations of a few minutes were often seen which did not add to the usefulness of the plans.

As in previous series many candidates failed to achieve high marks in this strand as they omitted to include evidence of their time management. Where plans had been used to indicate that a task had taken more or less time than expected, this rarely led to any adjustment of the timings or re-planning of subsequent tasks. Similarly many candidates included contingency time within their plans, but the use of this time was rarely explained.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios that were easy to access and navigate.

Some candidates omitted to provide links to all specified items of evidence and relied on the assessor and moderator locating the missing items in the accompanying folders. In some cases, links to evidence did not work. This highlights the importance of testing the links once the eportfolio is transferred from the local network.

A minority of candidates did not comply with the technical specification and produced eportfolios that exceeded the maximum size permitted. As in previous series some candidates, at both levels, included files in formats that could not be viewed using the moderators' toolkit and this again was a major cause of disagreement with centres' assessments.

Level 1

Many candidates made use of text and colour and some of images to introduce their evidence, with most including some introductory comments on their context pages, although some simply linked evidence to buttons on a navigation bar without any introduction.

Eportfolios that comprised a series of linked html pages were generally more successful than single page designs that required significant scrolling.

Some examples of weak page designs with extreme colour schemes and difficult to view text were submitted, although the majority of the candidates demonstrated at least some awareness of audience and purpose in their eportfolios and moderation adjustments in this strand tended to increase rather than reduce centre marks.

Level 2

Several candidates produced very effective eportfolios that had been well designed to suit the stated purpose of presenting work for assessment and moderation. In these examples the eportfolios had been well designed with some differentiation in the emphasis given to the final products and the supporting evidence.

As in previous series some candidates produced concise and detailed commentaries to introduce their evidence, although most limited their introductions to brief comments that frequently spelling errors, which detracted from the overall quality of the work, were left uncorrected.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Level 1

The end of project review should include comments on the final publications in relation to the requirements of the brief. Candidates should also comment on the underlying processes and their own performance. Candidates requiring guidance to achieve these requirements can achieve up to 4 marks.

Most candidates used the scaffolding documents provided via the SPBs to structure their reviews. Many were able to provide a narrative account of their progress and performance and some useful comments about their publications were noted, but in general the candidates' reviews would have benefited from guidance leading to a more evaluative approach to this work.

Level 2

Candidates should present a concise review of the project, considering the products, the project process and their own performance and drawing on the feedback they obtained from reviewers. Sensible suggestions for further improvement of the final products should be included.

As in previous series most candidates were able to make relevant comments about all three aspects of the project, although some candidates provided a detailed and often lengthy narrative of what they had done, rather than evaluative comments. Feedback from reviewers was often limited to positive comments that would not help develop future outcomes. Suggestions for improvement were often omitted or tended to be non-specific.

Several candidates, however, did achieve full marks in this strand and produced a detailed evaluation of all three aspects of the project that included some consideration of feedback from reviewers and made specific and valid suggestions for improvement of the final products.

D101: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 8,071 candidates were entered for this unit, 6,855 of these for the 0906 SPB 'Check it out' and 1,216 for the 0907 SPB 'Dance o'clock'. The overall pass rate of 86.5 % is higher than that achieved in the previous series. There was also some improvement in the rates for the higher grades, with 28 % of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 78 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 4 % of the total entry as absent.

Most candidates had taken account of the requirements of the SPBs when creating their publications and many had carried out effective testing, with feedback used to ensure that the publications were fit for purpose. Many candidates again relied on peers for feedback. This often produced general comments, unlikely to move the work on when compared with the constructive feedback frequently seen from teachers.

Candidates achieving distinction grades submitted complete eportfolios that presented work of a good standard, demonstrating a reasonable sense of audience and purpose and justifying the equivalence with the level 2 pass grade.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (b) - Select and capture information from a variety of sources

As in previous series there was a reliance on the Internet as the main source of information, with search engines such as Google frequently acknowledged in error.

The opportunities for secondary research provided by both SPBs allowed some candidates to gain high marks in this strand, particularly where a range of sources had been selected and used to inform the final publications. However, a minority of candidates would have benefited from some guidance to identify further research opportunities.

The primary data collection tasks of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by most candidates, with many well formatted data sheets, based on the examples provided.

Strand (c) - Collate and analyse data to produce information

Most candidates provided evidence of using a spreadsheet and database to retrieve information and the work submitted for this strand had generally been accurately assessed. Where disagreement at moderation did occur, this tended to be the result of the database work being submitted in a format that could not be viewed using the moderator's toolkit.

Spreadsheet - The nature of the spreadsheet work required by the two SPBs was similar with most candidates repeating the design of the given models and very few

extending this design to include any additional features or functions. Some of the models had been well formatted.

Databases - Most candidates made good use of screen shots to evidence their database work, although there were several instances where important evidence, such as queries in design view, had been omitted or was not clear.

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

With regards to the 0907 SPB 'Dance o'clock' most candidates submitted a complete set of publications with the majority including at least some publications completed to a good standard.

Dance o'clock quiz - The majority of candidates based their quiz on the design provided in the SPB. Many candidates added colours and instructions / explanations that helped to provide a user-friendly interface. Designs that provided some emphasis to the results section were generally the more successful.

Partners lists - Most candidates presented the two database reports specified in the SPB. Several candidates did, however, have difficulty relating the search criteria to the dance o'clock quiz results and in some instances the use of inappropriate titles and inclusion of unnecessary or repeated fields detracted from the final outcomes.

Invitation - The requirements for the invitations were clearly listed in the SPB and the majority of candidates covered these requirements and presented invitations that were fit for purpose. Some candidates omitted to include the required message.

Digital posters - The required series of three digital posters tended to be reasonably well directed towards the specified teenage audience. In general this was a successful publication with many excellent outcomes seen, although some candidates omitted to include the music examples referred to in the SPB.

Most candidates decided to create their series of posters as a slideshow and again there were examples where animation effects had been over-used, particularly in the presentation of text.

Certificates - Most candidates presented two certificates that covered some of the requirements of the SPB, although these tended to be less successful publications with many candidates including images not well suited to the target audience and omitting required information such as event name and date.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D201: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 32,989 candidates were entered for this unit, 24,166 of these for the 0906 SPB 'Check it out' and 8,823 for the 0907 SPB 'Dance o'clock'. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 87.2 % and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 17.2 % of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 80 % of centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 2 % of the total entry as absent. The level of achievement at pass and merit level and the level of agreement at moderation all represent significant improvements when compared with the previous winter series.

Candidates appear to have found both the 0906 'Check it out' SPB and the 0907 'Dance o'clock' SPB to be accessible and relevant. The requirements of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by the majority of candidates and some very effective publications were seen. The more successful eportfolios included clearly presented evidence of background research and analysis that had been used to inform the content of the final publications.

As in previous series most candidates submitted functional eportfolios, although the potential of the context pages, to provide commentary relating the outcomes to their intended audience and purpose, was again an area that was not fully exploited.

The project review remains an area for further improvement. Most candidates provided an account of work done, although this often lacked evaluative content and very rarely included suggestions for further improvement based on reviewers' comments.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

Some candidates achieved full marks in this strand. These candidates provided evidence to show that they had created an effective plan that helped them to manage the project and produce the required outcomes within the given timescale. These plans allocated a sensible amount of time to tasks and sub-tasks, allowed for contingencies and identified a number of interim review points. There was also evidence that the review points had been used to check progress and obtain formative feedback from their teacher, with resulting adjustments to timings or sequence indicated and explained.

Strand (b) - Select and capture information from a variety of sources

The data collection tasks of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by most candidates, with many examples of well-designed and formatted data sheets.

As in previous series, however, the use and recording of other primary sources was more variable, with some candidates including interviews, photographs and drawings. Where candidates had gathered a range of primary information this tended to be relevant and fully acknowledged, however other candidates omitted to acknowledge any primary sources, even when several had been selected for the final publications.

Many candidates limited their acknowledgement of secondary sources to the sources of images used. However, for the 0906 SPB, many candidates researched alternative recipes for their makeover cards and acknowledged sources of information relevant to the content of their snack attack posters. For the 0907 SPB, research tended to concentrate on charities, with few candidates acknowledging their sources for details of additional music tracks, or investigating existing dance marathons.

Very few candidates included evidence of their consideration of the reliability of the selected sources.

Strand (c) - Collate and analyse data to produce information

Most candidates provided evidence of their use of spreadsheet and database packages to analyse data and produced useful information, with the majority clearly using their findings from the spreadsheet analysis to inform their database searches. The work submitted for this strand was generally accurately assessed. Where disagreement at moderation did occur, this again tended to be the result of the database work being submitted in a format that could not be viewed using the moderators' toolkit.

Spreadsheet - Many candidates made use of the 0906 level 1 scaffolding document as a basis for their models, with the more successful candidates extending this design to include additional features and functions. In general the models for both SPBs had been well formatted and were well presented. Most centres had noted the addition of the spreadsheet viewer to the moderator's toolkit, but also appreciated the limitations of the software and included screen prints in formulae view to demonstrate functionality.

Databases - Most candidates made good use of screen shots to evidence their database work and in some cases these had been concisely annotated to highlight the more important features of the work. Many candidates provided all the information required by the SPBs, although there were several instances where important evidence, such as queries in design view, had been omitted or was not clear.

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

Most candidates submitted a complete set of publications with the majority including at least some publications completed to a good standard. The following comments refer to the publications of the 0907 SPB, 'Dance o'clock'.

Danceometer - Most candidates noted the requirements of the SPB and included their own and their test buddy's danceometer results as final publications. The spreadsheets tended to be well formatted to present the results clearly.

Playlists - The majority of candidates decided sensibly to present the results of their database searches as database reports. In some instances the reports were very well formatted and most included the required images. Many candidates devised search criteria that limited the length of the play lists. In other examples inappropriate titles, missing details and the inclusion of repeated fields detracted from the final outcomes.

Invitation - This publication presented more difficulties than anticipated with many candidates omitting to include basic details of the event, such as time, date and venue. The more successful invitations were well directed towards the target

audience, with content carefully selected to persuade students to take part in the event.

Sponsor form - Most candidates presented a sponsor form that covered the main requirements of the SPB, although several omitted to "tell the dancer what to do once they have collected their money". The more successful examples included tables designed to record sponsor details with column widths adjusted to reflect intended content.

Make a catch - The majority of candidates produced posters that covered most of the specified requirements, but content aimed at persuading people to sponsor a dancer was a frequent omission. Many examples of effective posters were seen, although concerns over copyright appeared to limit the selection of images by some candidates to clip art that was often not well matched to the intended audience.

Most candidates decided to create their sequence as a slideshow and again there were examples where animation effects had been over-used, particularly in the presentation of text.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D202 Multimedia

Overall

A total of 4,192 candidates were entered for this unit, 2,901 of these for the 0906 SPB 'Crack the Code' and 1,291 for the 0907 SPB 'Tell me a Story'. The unit achieved an overall pass rate of 68.9 %, which is a marginal improvement in comparison with the winter 2008 results. 17.2 % of the candidates achieved a merit or distinction grade. 55 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 6 % of the total entry as absent. There continues, over several series, to be some increase in the overall level of achievement for this unit, with the number of candidates achieving a merit grade being a significant improvement in comparison with the previous winter series.

Some good multimedia products were seen for both SPBs. Candidates who opted for the 0906 SPB appeared to enjoy producing the game and created some very good products. Most were able to produce all of the component parts and put them together to form a coherent game.

Candidates who produced work for the 09/07 brief were, in the main, able to produce complete and navigable storybooks. The quality and effectiveness of the animated endings varied considerably, although it was noted that many candidates at level 1 produced some excellent animations.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also see general comments on generic strands.

There has been some improvement in the project plans submitted by candidates over recent series and it was evident that most candidates had a real understanding of the project objectives and produced workable plans accordingly. However, some candidates copied the order of tasks from the SPB verbatim and so produced plans where tasks and sub-tasks were not in a workable order. For example, asset gathering was often indicated on the plan before product design, whereas the design should inform the gathering of assets.

Some candidates produced plans that did not allow for the developmental process, with the vital stages of prototyping, testing and refinement being omitted. A minority of candidates used Gantt charts with varying degrees of success. However many of these were very difficult to view on screen and often the poor conversion to a PDF file made viewing very difficult.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

Good designs for multimedia products are detailed, confirm important design decisions and give a clear indication of how the finished product might look. Some candidates included good comments about design decisions but few used their up-front designs to gather valuable feedback from others at an early stage in the design process.

A smaller number of candidates submitted design documents that were clearly retrospective, in that they contained images of the finished product or timings

accurate to a tenth of a second or less that exactly matched the finished product. Design work of this type contributes nothing to the process of producing multimedia products. The movie caused more difficulty than the other products with screen shots of the timeline in movie editing software frequently presented as the design.

A minority of candidates were unclear as to what designs were required by the SPB, despite having them noted on their plans. Many candidates had one or more designs missing from their eportfolios. It was also noted that where a timeline storyboard was required this was often presented without timings and therefore was of little value.

Strand (c) - Collect, edit and create digital assets

As in previous series, it was clearly evident that candidates were better at collecting, producing and editing assets for their products than they were at demonstrating the process involved. Candidates continued to improve in their ability to correctly acknowledge the sources of their assets, although "Google" or "The Internet" were again frequently quoted as a source.

In many instances assets from secondary sources seemed to have been used in their entirety, with only basic cropping and resizing having taken place. A small number of candidates simply gathered assets and made no attempt at preparing or repurposing them for their final products. In some examples it was clear that the asset had been copied and pasted directly from the Internet as it contained a live URL link. It was good to see however, that a number of candidates had repurposed the assets they had created for their D103/203 project, 'It's a Small World' for use in their digital storybooks.

Many candidates produced excellent primary assets such as music tracks, voice-overs, photographs and video clips but these were often not properly acknowledged and in many instances were omitted from asset tables. A number of candidates did not meet the requirement of the SPB to produce an original soundtrack for the Level 1 movie for the 0906 SPB.

The majority of candidates addressed the requirements relating to copyright for stand d, with many restricting their work to copyright free assets or including statements of what their responsibilities would be should the game or storybook be used commercially. In this series very few mock-up emails claiming evidence of permission to use an asset were noted.

Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products

The following comments refer to the products required by the 0907 SPB 'Tell me a story'.

In general candidates were able to produce storybooks that met most or all of the requirements of the brief and many creative and imaginative storybooks were seen.

A range of software had been used to construct the storybooks, although the majority of candidates created their storybooks as PowerPoint slideshows, with varying degrees of success. When using this software many candidates omitted to remove the background click, resulting in unexpected transitions and a resulting loss of awareness of purpose. Many of the 'slideshow' storybooks were not truly multimedia, but tended to be simplistic presentations with text and a scattering of appropriate and sometimes inappropriate images.

The number of candidates with sound/video etc missing once work had been removed from the local network was considerably reduced.

Many candidates had used textual links from the contents page rather than images, as required by the SPB and many candidates struggled to produce acceptable animated endings, presenting only still images in PowerPoint with some custom animation attached. There were however some very good stop frame animations and excellent examples created in Flash or similar multimedia software.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please also refer to general comments on generic strands.

Many candidates failed to achieve high marks in this strand, as they had not taken the opportunity to use multimedia appropriately to present or showcase their products. Many centres awarded high marks for basic functional eportfolios that lacked multimedia content.

Thorough and effective prototyping and testing are essential to ensure sure that all eportfolio links work when viewed on another system. In many instances the effectiveness of the testing of the eportfolios could be inferred as they worked correctly, however, in a number of instances links did not work or pointed to a location on a network server. Absolute links are still being used by candidates who are probably not aware that they will not work away from the school network.

For a minority of candidates assets were missing from final products, particularly images, as they had been inserted from a folder outside of those submitted for moderation.

Several candidates failed to adhere to the maximum size limit for the eportfolio and in some cases submitted work that went well beyond the permitted limit, in some instances over 150MB. A significant number of these candidates included superfluous/redundant files within their e-portfolio, particularly raw video, or movie project, files.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D203: Graphics

Overall

A total of 4,963 candidates were entered for this unit, 4,160 for the 0906 SPB 'Come to the fair' and 803 for the 0907 SPB 'It's a Small World'. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 83.3%, with 12.5 % of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 65 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 5 % of the total entry as absent. The level of achievement at pass level and the level of agreement at moderation represent significant improvements when compared with the previous winter series.

The unit relies on the distinction between graphics produced as vectors and as bitmaps. The accurate assessment and moderation of this work is therefore assisted if this distinction is made clear within the candidates' evidence. Confirmations of software used, possibly supported by selected screen prints of the work in progress, help greatly in this respect.

It is also emphasised that candidates should be encouraged to use their skills to produce original graphical elements unless the SPB specifically states that secondary sources should be used. Where secondary sources are required candidates must follow the copyright guidelines given on the microsite.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (b) - Use vector-based tools to develop images

To gain high marks in this strand candidates should be encouraged to produce original vector graphics rather than editing existing images such as clipart.

The drawing of the CD Case in the 0906 SPB provided an opportunity to use vector tools and many candidates produced accurate and well executed drawings. However some candidates used basic shapes available in the software package to produce very simple drawings and others missed the opportunity and provided only a cover design for the CD.

The 0907 SPB required candidates to produce 2D designs for two characters that could be cut out and made into 3D models. Many imaginative and creative designs were seen. To meet the requirements of the SPB only vector tools should be used for this task and almost all candidates met this requirement although, as for the CD case, some only used basic shapes provided. A minority did not include dimensions on the nets.

Some candidates produced 2 identical nets and then added features to create two characters. Candidates who produced two completely different nets were generally more successful.

In the 0907 SPB the 2D drawings were the only task that specifically required the use of vector tools, however other tasks presented candidates with opportunities to use vector based tools including the backdrop and packaging and very convincing backdrops created using mainly vector tools were seen.

Strand (c) - Use bitmap-based tools to develop images

In the 0906 SPB, the representations of the banners and wristband provided candidates with opportunities to demonstrate their use of bitmap tools to edit secondary and primary sources and many candidates took full advantage of these opportunities to produce some very good images. Many candidates made good use of bitmap tools to produce and edit images for the CD cover and digital poster.

The 0907 SPB also provided candidates with several opportunities to demonstrate the use of bitmap tools although none of the tasks specifically requested their use. Many candidates used bitmap tools on the backdrop and the scenes for 'Tell the Tale' and to complete the features on the 2D character designs. A significant number of candidates created imaginative backdrops by editing and combining ready-made elements.

To ensure candidates are awarded the marks they deserve for editing an image they need to show how the original image differs from the edited photograph or element. Some candidates made good use of the design log suggested in the 0907 SPB to show "before" and "after" versions of the elements with brief annotations to explain changes. Centres should encourage this good practice.

Centres should also check that candidates are following the requirements of the SPBs by using photographs that are from primary sources where this is specified and that these sources are recorded in the elements table correctly.

Strand (d) - Design and create graphic products

The majority of candidates produced a full set of products and candidates produced some very good work for both SPBs.

The following comments refer to the products required by the 0907 SPB, 'It's a small world'.

2D Character Designs - Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB and used vector tools to create two nets for the characters. The majority of candidates produced suitable nets that would fit on an A4 sheet although not all provided clear instructions for assembly. Some candidates did not add accurate dimensions to their nets. Although the SPB does not state that the nets should be different for each character the candidates who did this generally gained higher marks for this strand. Almost all the characters could be assembled into 3D characters.

The majority of candidates included the required number of photographs of the assembled characters.

Backdrop - The SPB encourages candidates to use a combination of digital elements such as photographs and vector drawings to produce the backdrop and many candidates took advantage of this opportunity, although some used solely vector tools and others mainly bitmap tools. The standard of the resulting backdrops was generally very good and candidates made sure they worked with their characters.

Tell the Tale - Candidates were required to produce three scenes of a story plus a final screen including text "over to you". Each scene had to consist of the backdrop

and characters plus other elements such as props. The majority of candidates made good use of this opportunity and produced some very professional looking images although a significant minority simply took photographs of the assembled characters arranged in front of the backdrop.

Centres should note that the SPB states that each scene should be a still image and that they should run in a scrolling sequence without user input. Not all candidates met this requirement, some included animation and in several instances the sequence did not scroll automatically.

Packaging - A template was provided for this task and almost all candidates used it and met the requirements of the SPB, successfully re-using elements from other products. Candidates were asked to produce a representation of the completed packaging and the majority of candidates met this requirement with many examples of imaginative and professional looking packaging being presented.

Strand (e) - Exhibit work in an eportfolio

Please also refer to general comments on generic strands.

The majority of candidates produced an eportfolio that was fully functional and many included detailed comments on the context pages. Many candidates had attempted to showcase their products and improve the appearance of their eportfolios by using appropriate graphic techniques and some were particularly successful in this.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D204 - ICT in Enterprise

Overall

A total of only 1,170 candidates were entered for this unit this series, 665 for the 0906 SPB and 505 for the 0907 SPB. The unit produced an overall pass rate of 83 %, with 15.8 % of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 68 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 10 % of the total entry as absent. As for the other units the levels of achievement, in comparison with the previous winter series, are much improved.

Several good examples of collaborative working were seen. The project diaries and planning comments demonstrated how well the teams had worked together. Care should be taken when preparing these documents to make sure the contributions of each team member to the group activities is recorded.

Strand a - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

In this unit planning is a team activity. Most candidates presented plans that differentiated between team and individual tasks, as required, and indicated who was responsible for completing each task.

Strand b - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For the 0906 SPB each candidate is expected to investigate an individual potential enterprise idea whilst for the 0907 SPB each candidate should research part of a campaign and the costs for five promotional items. A range of primary and secondary sources should be used to carry out this research. The sources used should be acknowledged in enough detail to allow someone to find the information at a later date.

In general there was little evidence that candidates had carried out primary market research and what was included was rarely detailed enough to enable the team to use it as a basis to make sound decisions.

Secondary sources were usually limited to the Internet. Some candidates indicated the sources used by providing a list of web addresses. Detail to show what information was found and where this was used in the project - e.g. costs of items should also be included.

Almost all candidates had included some costs in their spreadsheets but in most cases there was nothing to show where these costs came from. More successful candidates included screen shots of websites with the costs shown thereby confirming the reliability of the information provided.

Most candidates produced useful mind maps.

Modelling was an area of general improvement, where purposeful models allowed the team to explore a range of options and carry out what if scenarios to inform the decision making process. Most models were presented as working spreadsheets and this allowed the moderator to use them and judge their effectiveness. The presentation of individual findings to the team members was also an area of

improvement and in most cases appeared to enable the teams to make informed decisions on which enterprise ideas to adopt.

Strand c - Create a corporate identity

The SPBs require the teams to agree a set of principles before creating their corporate image. Each team member is expected to design a corporate image (logo, strapline, colour scheme, font style, contact details etc) and demonstrate it to the team. Most candidates produced an individual design but there was often no record of agreeing any principles beforehand. Similarly most teams agreed their final identity but few provided any explanation as to why the chosen identity was selected or why others were rejected.

Most candidates presented the required set of business documents although some did not identify who in the team had created each one. It is important that each individual's contribution is confirmed. For the 0906 SPB, a business card should have been produced for each team member. In most cases only one was evidenced.

Where existing templates are used for the documents they must be customised appropriately. Contact details, together with the logo and strapline, should be included on all documents and should be consistent throughout.

Strand d - Promote a product or service

For both SPBs each team member was expected to produce three promotional items and contribute to the production of a team website to promote their chosen product/campaign.

The team should have agreed a set of promotional items to attract attention and persuade people to buy/join you. In a few instances, teams had produced a set of three items between them, which is not what was required.

Most candidates had remembered what they were promoting - Cash 4 Kids or the campaign but some items did not promote the product/campaign but just included the name of the enterprise along with the logo.

Some smaller items such as balloons, key rings, pens and pencils etc. do not lend themselves to include detail about the product/event but they could have included the website address to allow the viewer to find out more about what was being promoted. Where posters had been used they were an improvement on previous series and tended to contain appropriate information such as contact details, costs, dates etc. Successful sets of promotional items had been checked to ensure the information provided was consistent.

For both SPBs, the candidates' own items along with the complete set from the team should have been evidenced in addition to the team's website. This was not always the case, with many candidates not including the items that other team members had produced. Where the complete set was included some candidates had not indicated which team member had produced which three items. The complete set of items for the team for the 0907 SPB should include one advert on wheels and one letter to the prominent person.

The quality of the websites both in content and design was an improvement on previous series and most candidates indicated the contribution of each individual team member to its production.

Strand e - Use an eportfolio to present an enterprise proposal

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

More candidates included the proposal as the focal point of the eportfolio as required. The proposals usually contained the set of business documents, the promotional items, the website and the financial model for the chosen enterprise. Many candidates also included an introduction to the team and enterprise and focused on the purpose of the proposal to sell the idea to a potential sponsor and convince them that the enterprise would be a success.

Strand f - Carry out an end of project review

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

March 2009

DiDA Grade boundaries - January 2009 results

The grade boundaries for SPB0906 and SPB0907 as set for the June 2008 series were confirmed for this series and so remain the same.

All units have a maximum raw mark of 42, which converts to a maximum UMS of 42 for level 1, or 84 for level 2.

D101 - Using ICT [SPB0906 6855 candidates, SPB0907 1216 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	31	25	19	13	0
Cumulative % of cand	28.7	46.3	67.8	87.4	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	24.3	43.8	65.9	82.0	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	28.0	46.0	67.5	86.5	100.0

D201 - Using ICT [SPB0906 24166 candidates, SPB0907 8823 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.0	17.1	46.2	89.6	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.7	17.4	40.5	80.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	4.2	17.2	44.7	87.2	100.0

D102 - Multimedia [SPB0906 128 candidates, SPB0907 244 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	30	24	19	14	0
Cumulative % of cand	7.0	21.9	33.6	64.1	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	48.4	57.0	68.0	79.9	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	34.1	44.9	56.2	74.5	100.0

D202 - Multimedia [SPB0906 2901 candidates, SPB0907 1291 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.7	17.0	40.0	72.9	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	17	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.5	17.5	33.1	60.0	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	4.7	17.2	37.9	68.9	100.0

D103 - Graphics [SPB0906 229 candidates, SPB0907 11 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	15	0
Cumulative % of cand	21.0	36.7	52.4	75.1	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	32	27	22	17	0
Cumulative % of cand	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	20.0	35.0	50.4	72.1	100.0

D203 - Graphics [SPB0906 4160 candidates, SPB0907 803 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.2	12.0	43.8	85.1	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.7	14.8	34.0	73.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	2.4	12.5	42.2	83.3	100.0

D104 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0906 32 candidates, SPB0907 104 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	6.3	18.8	21.9	50.0	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	26.0	43.3	55.8	67.3	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	21.3	37.5	47.8	63.2	100.0

D204 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0906 665 candidates, SPB0907 505 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	7.7	23.3	58.2	85.7	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	17	0
Cumulative % of cand	1.0	5.9	39.8	79.4	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	4.8	15.8	50.3	83.0	100.0

* cumulative % data at 09/03/2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our
Customer Services on 0870 240 9800 _
or visit our website: www.edexcel.com

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

