

Diploma in Digital Applications

AiDA / CiDA / CiDA+ / DiDA

Summer 2008

Chief Moderator's Report

Edexcel, a Pearson company, is the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications and testing to more than 25,000 schools, colleges, other places of learning and employers, here and in over 100 countries worldwide. We deliver 9.4 million exam scripts each year. Our qualifications include GCSE, AS and A Level, NVQ and the BTEC suite of vocational qualifications from entry level to BTEC Higher National Diplomas and Foundation Degrees.

Summer 2008

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Limited 2008

Contents

1.	Chief Moderator's Report	4
2.	D101 Principal Moderators' Reports	10
3.	D201 Principal Moderators' Reports	13
4.	D102 Principal Moderators' Reports	17
5.	D202 Principal Moderators' Reports	20
6.	D103 Principal Moderators' Reports	24
7.	D203 Principal Moderators' Reports	27
8.	D104 Principal Moderators' Reports	31
9.	D204 Principal Moderators' Reports	34
10.	Summer 2008 SPB0906 and SPB0907 Grade Boundaries	37

Edexcel Limited holds the copyright for this publication.

This is the Chief Moderator's report for the summer 2008 moderation window and relates to the moderators' findings for the 0906 and 0907 SPBs.

General Comments

Entry

The summer 2008 series was the largest DiDA series to date with more than 150000 entries across the four units; 20% of these being at level 1. As expected, there was a large entry for D201 (66000) with the next most popular unit being D203 (25500) followed by D202 (21100). This is consistent with most students claiming the Award or Certificate in Digital Applications at level 2.

Standard

The general quality of the work submitted for moderation for this series indicated an overall improvement in standards from the summer 2007 series. The pass rates at both levels were reasonably consistent across the units and were higher than the 2007 series, as were the percentages of candidates achieving the higher grades, although, it is again emphasised that DiDA level 2 qualifications are designed to have parity of esteem with GCSEs grades A* to C. In general year 9 and year 10 candidates entered at level 2 did not achieve the higher grades.

At both levels in all units there were some examples of exceptional work.

At moderation there was a high level of agreement between centre assessors and Edexcel moderators, with the assessment guidance, use of walkthrough documents and general level of experience with the qualification contributing to improved accuracy of assessment.

At level 1, however, it was apparent from the assessment record sheets that a minority of centres are not giving as much guidance to candidates as they require to maximise their achievements.

In order to continue these overall improvements centres are referred to the increasing number of exemplar eportfolios with assessment commentaries 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 (<http://www.edexcel.com/training>)

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.

As assessors become more familiar with the standard and with the holistic approach to assessment and as centres' internal moderation processes become more robust, it is

anticipated that - once set - grade boundaries for an SPB will remain unchanged throughout its lifetime. For the 0906 SPBs, this series, the grade boundaries from summer 2007 were re-applied.

The grade boundaries for the 0907 SPBs determined by the awarding committee for this series, together with a full listing of the unit results for both the 0906 and 0907 SPBs may be obtained from <http://dida.edexcel.org.uk/home/results/0806>

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 did cause delays when moderators were not available to sign for the work.

The automated sample selection procedure, which does not request the highest and lowest examples, or allow for candidates withdrawing, again caused some difficulties, although the majority of centres did submit correct samples of 10 eportfolios at each level, including their candidates with the highest and lowest marks. (Please refer to section 5 of the document found on this page: <http://www.edexcel.com/dida-moderation> for additional details regarding sample selection.)

Most of the OSCA accredited centres selected as part of the quality control sample submitted their candidates' work promptly, although a minority of these centres were slow to send in the samples. Accredited centres are reminded that their samples should be prepared in accordance with the set schedule and should be ready for moderation should they be requested.

In most cases candidates' work was easily accessible from the CD. Most eportfolios had a clearly named index or home page, although in some cases the 'way in' was more difficult to find. In some instances eportfolios included absolute links to files stored locally on the centre's network and therefore these files were not available for moderation.

Technical specification

A minority of candidates failed to adhere to the technical specifications and submitted evidence in inappropriate file formats and/or eportfolios that exceeded the maximum size limit. Centres are reminded that eportfolios are viewed using the Moderator's Toolkit, details of which can be found on the DiDA microsite. Where centres had assessed work which could not be viewed using the toolkit there was inevitably some disagreement at moderation.

Assessor record sheets (ARS)

Most centres included a completed ARS for each of the candidates in the sample.

However, candidate details were not always given in full and these files were not always named consistently with the candidates' eportfolios. Comments varied from minimal to very detailed and helpful, with many assessors taking the opportunity to explain their assessment decisions and guide the moderator to the supporting evidence.

The use of ARS to authenticate the work at both levels and to identify the level of guidance given to candidates at level 1 is essential. As in previous series some centres disregarded the level of guidance when allocating marks.

Internal moderation

It was evident that some centres did not carry out effective internal moderation before submitting marks to Edexcel. This was a more noticeable problem this series, particularly at level 2, where the increase in the overall number of candidates was the result of a consistent number of centres making larger entries.

Submission of marks on Edexcel Online

Some input errors resulted in discrepancies between the marks submitted online and those recorded on the assessor record sheets. In these instances the online mark was used for moderation purposes.

Copyright

For this series moderators were instructed to consider compliance with legal requirements and apply the additional guidance regarding copyright issued via the DiDA microsite. <http://dida.edexcel.org.uk/home/teachers/guidance/copyright>. This approach will continue to be implemented in future series and centres are asked to note that candidates need to make a genuine attempt to comply with the requirements as outlined in the above guidance to support the award of high marks in strand d.

Generic Strands, Level 1.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

It was evident that many candidates would have benefited from greater guidance with planning to ensure that they had initial workable plans for their projects. Centres are reminded that candidates can still 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.

Where teachers had been involved in agreeing initial plans and had given feedback, the quality of the planning process and usefulness of the plan to the candidate was far more apparent.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

The eportfolios submitted for this series were generally functional and provided access to most of the required evidence using the Moderator's Toolkit. In some cases, however, links on the CD did not work and evidence had to be searched for in the accompanying folders.

Many candidates made use of text, colour and 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.

The majority of the candidates demonstrated at least some awareness of audience and purpose in their eportfolios. Any adjustments made in this strand at moderation tended to result in marks being increased.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Candidates are expected to carry out an end of project review in which they comment on their final publications in relation to the requirements of the brief. They should also consider the underlying processes and their own performance. They can achieve up to 4 marks by doing so with guidance.

Most candidates used the scaffolding documents provided via the SPBs, with the revised scaffolding of the 0907 SPB encouraging many candidates to adopt a more evaluative approach.

Many useful comments about the publications were noted, but in general the candidates' reviews would have benefited from guidance leading to a more detailed approach to this work.

Generic Strands, Level 2.

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.

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 provided some 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 again seen which did not add to the usefulness of the plans.

In some instances candidates started the project with plans that were not workable, thereby making the process of tracking difficult. The aim is to ensure that all candidates experience the benefits of a workable plan and centres are asked to note the level of guidance indicated in the published assessment guidance for the production of an initial, workable plan.

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 there was rarely any adjustment of the timings or re-planning of subsequent tasks. Similarly many candidates included contingency time within their plans, but omitted to explain the use of this time.

Some candidates used Gantt charts to plan the project. Where candidates had included comment boxes or kept a separate diary/log, these Gantt charts were often useful. However, in many instances the charts were difficult to view on screen and failed to communicate progress through the project.

Where full marks were agreed for this strand the candidates provided evidence to show that they had created an effective plan which 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 (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios, which were easy to access and navigate. 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 there was some differentiation in the emphasis given to the final publications and the supporting evidence, together with detailed commentaries explaining the context for the work.

Some candidates omitted to provide links to all specified items of evidence, requiring the assessor and moderator to attempt to locate 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 and/or included files in formats that could not be viewed using the moderators' toolkit; the latter problem again being a cause of disagreement at moderation.

Although some candidates produced concise and detailed commentaries to introduce their evidence most limited their introductions to brief comments and frequently spelling errors were left uncorrected, thereby detracting from the overall quality of the work.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Candidates should carry out a comprehensive review of the project, considering the publications / products, the project process and their own performance, drawing on the feedback they receive from reviewers. Sensible suggestions for improvements should be included.

Most candidates were able to make relevant comments about all three aspects of the project, although many 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 further outcomes. Suggestions for improvement were often omitted or tended to be non-specific.

Where full marks were agreed for this strand the candidates provided a detailed evaluation of all three aspects of the project, included some consideration of feedback from reviewers and made specific and valid suggestions for improvement of the final publications / products.

D101: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 23663 candidates were entered for this unit, 21791 of these for the 0906 SPB and 1872 for the 0907 SPB. The overall pass rate of 71.5% is higher than that achieved in the previous summer series, although there remains scope for further improvement. There was also some improvement in the rates for the higher grades, with 16.6% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2.

Most candidates had therefore taken account of the requirements of the SPBs when creating their publications, but many would still benefit from undertaking more effective testing and feedback to ensure that their publications are fit for purpose. Many candidates relied on feedback from their peers, who tended to provide non specific positive comments that were unlikely to improve the work.

Most candidates not achieving a pass grade at this level submitted incomplete eportfolios, with publications missing and other strands not addressed. Candidates achieving distinction grades submitted complete eportfolios that presented work of a good standard, demonstrating a reasonable sense of audience and purpose and fully justifying the equivalence with the level 2 pass grade.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

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

There was a reliance on the Internet as the main source of information, with search engines such as Google frequently acknowledged in error. There was also some confusion between primary and secondary sources of information.

The data collection tasks of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by most candidates, with many well-formatted data sheets. The use and recording of other primary sources was generally missing, with most candidates omitting to acknowledge their primary images.

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

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. Most candidates repeated the design of the models provided in the SPBs, with very few extending the designs to include additional features or functions. Many of the models had been well formatted.

Database. Most candidates made good use of screenshots 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. Many of the data input forms for the 0907 SPB had been well designed to incorporate user instructions and other facilities to aid accurate data entry.

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

Most candidates submitted a complete set of publications and included at least some publications completed to a good standard.

0906 SPB. The following extracts from the June 2007 report remain relevant.

Fruity recipe cards. The majority of candidates complied with the requirements for size and content for the recipe cards. Several very good examples were presented, particularly where some consistency in design between the two cards had been incorporated. Less successful recipe cards tended to be text heavy with lengthy and very detailed recipe instructions.

Recipe holder. The more successful candidates based their designs for the holder on the template provided and included some visual link to their recipe cards. The majority of candidates included the primary image required by the SPB.

Fruity friends. The fruity friends presentations tended to be well directed towards the specified audience and cover the requirements of the SPB. This was again the most successful publication of the series with many excellent outcomes seen.

Fruit fact results. The majority of candidates presented the four database reports specified in the SPB, although many had difficulty relating the search criteria to the correct students. Layout and content errors, such as repeated fields, inappropriate titles and truncated data were frequently noted.

Fruit check findings. The majority of candidates included the fruit check findings document of the SPB, with the required charts added. Some candidates annotated their charts to explain their findings. As in previous series many of the charts had not been checked prior to publication, with examples of unnecessary legends and errors in titles and axes labels.

0907 SPB

Partners list. The majority of candidates sensibly presented their lists as database reports, based on correct queries. Some general improvement in the presentation of the reports was noted with good use of titles and fewer layout and content errors.

Invitation. Many candidates omitted to include all of the information required by the SPB on their invitations and many of the images used were not well matched to the target audience

Digital posters. The posters tended to be more closely directed towards the specified audience and cover most of the requirements of the SPB, although again several examples were seen with basic information missing, such as date and venue.

Certificates. Most candidates presented certificates that covered the requirements of the SPB, although again the images chosen were not always well matched to the target audience.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

D201: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 66045 candidates were entered for this unit, 59811 of these for the 0906 SPB and 6234 for the 0907 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 80.5% and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 14.6% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. Greater experience and familiarity with the requirements of the SPB resulted in pass rates for 'Check it out' being approximately 16% higher than for 'Dance o'Clock'.

The requirements of both SPBs were 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.

In many cases, candidates obtained feedback on prototypes and were able to take advantage of suggestions for improvements from test users leading to improvement of the final outcomes thereby helping to raise levels of achievement.

Most candidates submitted functional eportfolios and many realised the potential of the context pages to provide commentary relating the outcomes to the intended audience and purpose.

The end of 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 refer to generic strands for level 2.

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 formatted data collection sheets, including brief explanations of purpose and some guidance for completion

The use and recording of other primary sources was more variable, although where candidates had gathered a range of primary information this tended to be relevant and fully acknowledged. A minority of candidates omitted to acknowledge any primary sources, even when some had been selected for the final publications.

For 0906 many candidates researched alternative recipes for their makeover cards and acknowledged sources relevant to the content of their snack attack posters. For 0907 the research tended to address the selection of suitable charities and additional tracks for the database and candidates acknowledged sources relevant to the make a catch presentation.

Many candidates made good use of their sources table to provide evidence of their consideration and subsequent actions regarding legal requirements for strand d.

Few candidates included any evidence of their consideration of the reliability of the selected sources for either SPB.

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 some useful information. The work submitted for this strand was generally accurately assessed.

With regards to the 0906 spreadsheet work, many candidates made use of the 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 had been well formatted and were well presented.

The 0907 'danceometer' spreadsheets tended to make good use of relevant features including IF functions, look ups and drop down lists for multiple-choice questions. Additional copies of the spreadsheets in formula view provided helpful supporting evidence. Most candidates produced spreadsheets that were fit for purpose and generated information that enabled the subsequent database searches to be based on suitable criteria.

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, in particular of queries in design view, had been omitted or was not clear.

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

Most candidates at this level were able to submit a complete set of publications and include at least some publications completed to a good standard. Many candidates presented successful sets of publications featuring consistent designs in terms of colour schemes, font styles and selected images.

For the 0906 SPB the following extracts from the June 2007 report remain relevant.

Reality check results. Many candidates noted the requirement of the SPB and included a separate, printable version of their reality check results as part of the information pack. These documents tended to be well formatted, although they should have been for the test buddy, which was not always the case. Several candidates did not include a separate document, but relied on a link to their spreadsheet, with a minority setting the print area to select the results section only. This approach was accepted, although it did not fully meet the requirements of the SPB.

Eat me, drink me reports. The majority of candidates decided sensibly to present the results of their database searches as database reports, although many of these reports

continued over several pages where search criteria had not been carefully selected. The reports were very well formatted by some candidates and most included the required images. In some instances layout and content problems, such as repeated fields, inappropriate titles and truncated data were noted.

Food makeover cards. Most candidates complied with the requirements for size and content for the makeover cards and some very good examples were presented. Less successful makeover cards tended to include lengthy and very detailed recipe instructions and/or be made much smaller than intended so that the content was difficult to view.

Pack folder. Most candidates presented a layout and design for the information pack folder that covered the main requirements of the SPB. Some examples were presented where the candidates had made the folder and included photographs of their folders with printed make over cards, eat me drink me reports and reality check results, thereby presenting the complete pack and highlighting any consistent features.

Snack Attack Posters. The majority of candidates included the correct number of posters and most of these included the specified content, although several relied on mouse click, rather than presenting an automated sequence. Several examples of posters well directed towards the intended audience were seen. Most candidates decided to create their sequence as a slideshow, although very few appeared to have made use of a master slide for the set areas and there were examples where animation effects had been over-used, particularly in the presentation of text.

The 0907 SPB requires a set in publications similar in scope to the above.

Danceometer. Most candidates presented their own and their test buddy's danceometer results as a series of comments related to the input data. The results tended to be well formatted and clearly presented.

Invitation. Many candidates omitted to include basic information such as time and place and the required primary image was often omitted or replaced with unsuitable clip art. Very few invitations included the required information on what would happen after the Danceometer results were submitted.

Play lists. Most candidates sensibly decided to present their play lists as database reports. Many were well formatted and covered the requirements of the SPB regarding content. Some candidates successfully addressed the requirement to limit the play time to less than 900 seconds by varying their search criteria. Some excellent printable reports were seen. Less successful examples included play lists presented as small screen shots, with missing content and unnecessary fields.

Sponsor form. Good sponsor forms reflected effective testing with column widths adjusted to suit content. The forms tended to cover the requirements of the SPB for content, although the required information on what to do with the collected money was often omitted.

Make a catch. Most candidates included effective presentations that ran automatically with reasonable timings and covered the requirements of the SPB for content, although examples that included very detailed information about each of the chosen charities tended to be over long. Previous comments regarding the inappropriate use of animation to introduce text appear to have been noted and some very good slideshows were presented, particularly where images had been carefully selected.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please refer to generic strands for level 2.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 2.

D102: Multimedia

Overall

A total of 2867 candidates were entered for this unit, 2411 for the 0906 SPB and 456 for the 0907 SPB. The overall pass rate of 71.5% is higher than that achieved in the previous series, although again there remains scope for further improvement. There was also some improvement in the rates for the higher grades, with 16.7% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2.

A number of candidates, whilst able to produce the functional components of 0906 'Crack the Code', found some difficulty in putting the levels and the other requirements of the game together to form a complete product.

Candidates who produced work for the 09/07 brief (Tell me a Story) created some very effective storybooks. There were some charming stories that were well suited to the specified audience. Candidates were also, in the main, able to produce complete storybooks that were navigable by the user. Most candidates were able to link their storybooks to their animated endings appropriately.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

Many candidates were able to produce outline designs, but only a minority produced good up-front designs that were detailed enough to allow final products to be visualised and included comments on design decisions.

It was also clear at this level that a lot of design work had been carried out retrospectively, more as an afterthought rather than as integral part of the project process.

Candidates who produced the best products for strand d were those who created good up-front designs, asked other people what they thought of them and made changes based on their feedback.

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

Many assets tables seen at this level were better than those at level 2. Some candidates included thumbnails of the assets helping the assessor and moderator to link them to the products. It was good to see that the candidates were using multimedia even in the supporting evidence.

Most candidates made some attempt to acknowledge the sources of secondary assets, however, many failed to provide the full URL of internet sources. Google and other search engines are still being quoted extensively as sources for digital assets at both levels.

Primary assets such as music tracks, photographs and video clips were often not properly acknowledged and in many instances were completely missing from the assets table.

Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products

0906 SPB

Moderators again saw some very good examples of work for this brief at this level, with some very good use of animation software.

The main screen. Most candidates were able to produce a functional main screen but the theme of the game was not always clear. A number of candidates failed to include an instruction sheet that could be printed for use whilst playing the game.

Level 1. Many good outcomes were produced for this level. However a number of candidates produced slideshows which did not change from slide to slide automatically and there were examples where the questions on the last slide only stayed on screen for a short while not giving the player enough time to read them.

Level 2. Candidates produced videos of varying quality, many excellent. Some however, again suffered from one or more of the following technical problems:

- Poor sound quality
- Excessive background noise, particularly wind if outdoors
- Obvious reading of scripts
- Failure to edit out footage that was not required
- Excessive camera movement and or zooming

Level 3. This tended to be the weaker of the levels, with many candidates apparently running out of time and/or inspiration for the production of their guessing games.

0907 SPB

A wide range of software was used to construct the storybook, however PowerPoint was used for the majority with varying degrees of success. Whilst most candidates were able to produce complete storybooks that were navigable by the user using PowerPoint, a number of candidates failed to save sound/video etc. in the correct folder and therefore these features would not work once off the school/college network environment.

Whilst some stories were very effective in their use of narrative and multimedia, with functional user interaction, others contained little in the way of multimedia other than text and images. Some storybooks at level 1 were also excessively long, sometimes upwards of 40 pages.

Many candidates seem to have had great fun in creating stop frame animations and some very good examples were seen. Some superb Flash animations were also seen, where candidates had taken real time and care to produce a 'proper' animated ending. Other candidates struggled to produce acceptable animations.

Disappointingly, some candidates made no attempt to create a 'proper' animation and merely added custom animations to still images in PowerPoint.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please also refer to generic strands for level 1.

Eportfolios for this unit still tend to disappoint, as candidates fail to take advantage of the opportunity to use multimedia appropriately to showcase their products. Many eportfolios are still basic links to the products and supporting evidence, presented without any comments introducing the evidence.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

D202: Multimedia

Overall

A total of 21174 candidates were entered for this unit, 16365 of these for the 0906 SPB and 4809 for the 0907 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 70.4% and some improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 17.8% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. Some very good multimedia products were seen for both SPBs.

Candidates' who submitted work for the 09/06 brief seem to have enjoyed producing the game and its component parts. 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 (Tell me a Story) were generally able to produce complete story books that were navigable by the user. The quality and effectiveness of the animated endings varied considerably. Some superb animated endings were seen, where students had taken real time and care to produce a 'real' animated ending. Others were very poor.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to generic strands for level 2.

In some cases the planned sequence did not recognised that there was a link between design and asset gathering with many candidates including asset gathering on their plans before the design process.

It was again rare to find a candidate that has used a project plan to any great extent to manage time well and improve efficiency. Many candidates indicated that some tasks had taken longer than they had expected but had then not updated the start dates of subsequent tasks. Many students used a separate log or diary to track their progress but in many instances they recorded "this is what I did", with many of the notes being narrations and did not show their progress or time management.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

Good designs produced at this level are detailed and give a clear indication of what the finished product might look like. Some candidates included really 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 number of candidates are still producing design documents that are clearly retrospective, in that they contain images of the finished product or timings accurate to a tenth of a second or less, that exactly match the finished product; as such these contribute nothing to the process of producing the multimedia products and should not be awarded marks.

Designs are often submitted which are not of the required type for the product being produced, for example students not using a timeline storyboard for an animation or a movie.

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

Candidates are making an increasingly impressive job of gathering and preparing digital assets. Most candidates included an assets table with information relating to some of the assets, although many either missed out some of the assets, frequently primary sound and video files, or failed to include all of the required information. Candidates are improving their ability to correctly acknowledge the sources of their assets although "Google" or "The Internet" were still quoted as a source all too frequently.

There was a much more varied method of producing assets than in the last series. The use of more appropriate software has made for much better assets. Editing was far better with evidence shown in the form of asset tables and before and after designs. Assets were far more likely to be primary rather than edited secondary images. For the 0907 SPB "Tell mew a story", many candidates created their own assets and it was good to see a few candidates use the graphics they had created for D203 in their storybooks.

Candidates are beginning to address the requirements relating to copyright for stand d, with many including statements of what their responsibilities would be should the game or storybook be used for commercially.

Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products

Some candidates produced excellent products that were fit for both audience and purpose.

Most candidates appeared to have asked test users for feedback on their products during the development process, although generally the comments they received, mainly from peers, were superficial and had little or no impact on product development.

It should be noted that not all work presented had been linked to the eportfolio, but was found in the candidates folders. This should be considered in strand E whereas some centres were penalising candidates for missing links in strand E and D.

Embedded movies were often not in the same folder as the PowerPoint file and therefore would not work as a part of the game once taken off the school/college network.

0906 SPB. The following extracts from the June 2007 report remain relevant.

Candidates used a number of different software tools to produce games with a range of outcomes. Again many candidates selected PowerPoint as their preferred software

for producing some or all of the content for the game, but there were many examples of good games which met the requirements and demonstrated that a good range of skills in Flash/Dreamweaver/Movie Maker/Mediator had been developed during the students' work on this SPB.

Some candidates, whilst able to produce the game in part or its entirety, were unable to address the correct audience, particularly at level 2 where the target audience was that of young children. Many candidates pitched the game at their own age group, rather than addressing the particular requirements of the SPB.

Splash screen. Many of candidates produced very effective splash screens, introducing the game and leading players to the game map.

Map. Most candidates were able to produce a functional and often well themed map containing links to all of the requirements of the game. A number of candidates failed to include a code sheet that could be printed by the player, for use whilst playing the game. Some of the code sheets did not include the questions, whilst others gave away the answers.

Level 1. The vast majority of level 2 candidates were able to produce the movie using still images, although a small number of candidates used presentation software for this level, which was not appropriate, as the result was not a product that met the fundamental requirement of the brief.

Level 2. Candidates produced talking heads videos with a range of outcomes. A small number of candidates did not film the talking heads (level 2) from two different camera angles. Many again suffered from one or more of the following technical problems, although camera stability was noticeably better in this series:

- Poor sound quality
- Excessive background noise, particularly wind if outdoors
- Obvious reading of scripts
- Failure to edit out footage that was not required
- Excessive camera movement and or zooming

Centres should be aware that a suitable environment is needed for filming - e.g. an office instead of a corridor and to watch out for really large video file sizes.

Level 3. Generally the most successful component, with the majority of candidates demonstrating at least some awareness of both audience and purpose in their work.

0907 SPB. It was felt that better products were produced from this SPB than the 'Crack the Code'.

Overall, many storybooks were produced in PowerPoint. A few were produced as web pages or Flash animations. At the top end of the mark range for this strand, books were carefully designed, showing a real consideration of what a children's storybook should look like (some preliminary research should be encouraged). Candidates had recorded narratives to go with the storybook pages and some had good features such as clicking on a speech bubble to listen to the story, use of different voices etc. Candidates had made good use of navigation features in PowerPoint. There were some

excellent stories that should appeal to children and that often had a 'moral message'. Overall the storybooks were better suited to the target audience than some of the games.

Many superb animated endings were seen, where candidates had taken real time and care to produce a 'proper' animated ending. Other candidates struggled to produce acceptable animations, particularly in comparison to the standard of work being carried out by many KS2 students in primary schools, as highlighted by the link on the SPB to the Digital Storytelling Project. Disappointingly, some candidates made no attempt to create a 'proper' animation and merely added custom animations to still images in PowerPoint.

Some candidates missed the requirement for the contents page to be linked to/from each page of the storybook.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please also refer to generic strands for level 2.

Eportfolios for this unit still disappoint, as candidates fail to take advantage of the opportunity to use multimedia appropriately to present or showcase their products.

Many eportfolios still fail to include even basic multimedia assets such as images and provide only basic links to the products and supporting evidence, either with or without comments to introduce the evidence. Rarely does a commentary fill in all of the gaps and help to tell the assessor / moderator all that has been going on. Many centres awarded high marks for eportfolios with little or no multimedia content.

Many 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. A significant number of candidates included superfluous/redundant files within their e-portfolio (especially the raw video files or original .fla files). These hugely increased the size of the e-portfolio.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 2.

D103: Graphics

Overall

A total of 2497 candidates were entered for this unit, 2129 for the 0906 SPB and 368 for the 0907 SPB. The overall pass rate of 74.2% is higher than that achieved in the previous summer series, with 13.5% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

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

The 0906 SPB required the candidates to produce a logo and some well designed logos were produced, however a significant number of candidates produced logos using bitmap software, or a combination of bitmap and vector software. To meet the requirements of the SPB only vector tools should be used as the logo must be scaleable.

The site plan in the 0906 SPB provided an further opportunity to use vector tools and some excellent plans were seen.

The 0907 SPB required the candidates to produce 2D designs for 2 characters that could be cut out and made. Some extremely imaginative and creative designs were seen. To meet the requirements of the SPB only vector tools should have been used for this task and almost all candidates met this requirement.

Some candidates produced 2 identical outlines and used the added features to differentiate between the two characters. Candidates who produced two completely different designs generally achieved higher marks.

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

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

The representations of the banner, the web advert and the CD cover in the 0906 SPB provide candidates with excellent opportunities to demonstrate the use of bitmap tools to edit secondary and primary sources. Some candidates took full advantage of these opportunities and produced some very good images. Centres are reminded that to achieve high marks in this strand candidates must do more than simply crop or resize images.

The 0907 SPB also provides 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 to complete the features on the 2D character designs,

but the main use was on the backdrop and the digital posters. 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 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 primary sources where this is specified and that these sources are recorded on the elements table correctly.

Strand (d) - Design and create graphic products

The majority of candidates produced a full set of products and both SPBs produced some very good work. The products and logo for the 0906 SPB should be for the 'Welcome Fair' and not for the school or college generally.

The 0907 SPB introduced a design log where candidates are encouraged to show which digital tools were used in the creation of their designs and how elements have been edited. This information supports the assessment of strands B and C.

Centres are reminded that the graphic products required by the SPBs must be produced using digital tools. Hand drawn images are not acceptable and should not receive any credit.

0906 SPB. The following extracts from the June 2007 report remain relevant.

Banner. Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB although some did not use the template provided and produced an incorrectly sized banner. Some candidates provided excellent representations of the banner, using bitmap editing tools to include their banner in a photo of their school/college. A significant number of candidates did not include a representation.

Site Plan. The majority of candidates produced a good site plan. Almost all candidates used vector tools for this task which contributed towards the marks for strand (b). Some candidates had not fully understood the requirements of the SPB, which stated the site plan would be printed in black ink, as they had relied heavily on colour to make their plan useable.

CD Cover. Many candidates made good use of the opportunity to demonstrate their skills with bitmap tools and produced imaginative CD covers that met the requirements of the SPB. Some candidates failed to use photographs that were derived from primary sources and/or did not include the required information.

Web Advert. The SPB states that this product should be 400x300 pixels and have a file size no more than 50KB but very few students provided evidence that their advert met

these requirements. There are several ways to do this such as a screenshot of the file properties showing file size etc.

Most candidates recognised that the web advert and the CD cover were for one club of their own choosing but a significant number of candidates chose different clubs for the two products. Some candidates did not link the products by including at least one image derived from a photograph on both products.

0907 SPB.

2D Character Designs. Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB and used vector tools to create two designs for the characters; almost all candidates produced suitable designs that would fit on an A4 sheet although not all provided clear instructions for assembly.

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 although a few candidates used ready made elements which had not been significantly edited.

Digital Posters. Candidates were required to produce two digital posters showing different scenes consisting of the backdrop plus other elements such as the characters and props. This task presented candidates with an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their ability with graphical tools. The majority of candidates made good use of the opportunity and produced some very professional looking images although a significant minority simply took photographs of the assembled characters stood in front of the backdrop. Some candidates also used animation on the posters, although the SPB states they should be still images.

Packaging. A template was provided for this task and almost all candidates used it and met the requirements of the SPB, reusing elements from other products to produce some imaginative and professional looking packaging.

Strand (e) Exhibit work in an eportfolio

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

Many candidates had attempted to showcase their products and improve the appearance of their eportfolios by using appropriate graphic techniques.

Strand (f) Review the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

D203: Graphics

Overall

A total of 25499 candidates were entered for this unit, 22308 for the 0906 SPB and 3191 for the 0907 SPB. This unit produced an improved overall pass rate of 79.0%, with 15.0% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction.

It is clear from the level of agreement at moderation that the ongoing training provided by Edexcel and the information available on the microsite is contributing to help centres to improve both the quality of candidates' work and their assessment of the eportfolios.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 2.

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

To gain high marks in this strand candidates should be encouraged to produce original vector graphic images 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 thereby limiting their marks in this strand.

The 0907 SPB required the candidates to produce 2D designs for 2 characters that could be cut out and made up into 3D characters. Some 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 a minority did not include dimensions on the nets

Some candidates produced 2 identical nets and used the added features to create two characters. Higher marks were generally achieved by candidates who produced two completely different nets.

In the 0907 SPB the 2D drawings were the only task that specifically required the use of vector tools, however the other tasks presented the candidates with opportunities to use vector based tools including the backdrop and packaging. Some 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 banner, wristband and the CD cover 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 and produced some very good images.

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 to complete the features on the 2D character designs, and on the backdrop and the scenes for 'Tell the Tale'. 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 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 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 both SPBs produced some very good work. For the 0906 SPB some candidates created products for their school or college generally rather than for the Fair. This was particularly common for the logos.

The 0907 SPB introduced a design log where candidates are encouraged to show which digital tools were used in the creation of their designs and how elements have been edited. This information supports the assessment of strands B and C.

Centres are reminded that the Tell the Tale scenes for the 0907 SPB should be created using digital tools rather than using photographs of the 3D characters arranged with the backdrop, as producing the product in this way does not contribute to strand C. A minority of candidates included hand drawn images i.e. images that have not been produced using digital tools. The SPB specifically states that this is not acceptable.

0906 SPB. The following extracts from the June 2007 report remain relevant.

Flyer. The flyer was generally very well done and most candidates included the specified information and provided evidence that it was the correct size. A significant percentage of candidates did not take the opportunity to produce their own map and simply included a ready made map from the internet. The map provides candidates with an opportunity to use either vector or bitmap tools to produce an original image and candidates who did this increased their chances of being awarded high marks in strands (b) or (c).

Banner. Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB by producing two banners that worked as a pair although some candidates added images which did not reflect the purpose of the fair. Some candidates provided excellent representations of the banner in situ by including their banners in a photograph of their school/college using bitmap editing tools.

Wristband. Many candidates made good use of embossing techniques to produce a very realistic graphic image for this product. Some candidates failed to realise that the wristband should be one colour including the logo.

CD Cover and case. The CD case was generally well done although some candidates failed to make the most of the opportunity to make good use of vector tools for this product and many did not indicate if the graphic image was actual size or give a scale if it was not. Some original and imaginative covers were seen and most candidates included a link to the digital poster plus a representation of this product.

Digital poster. This product, together with the CD cover, provided the candidates with a good opportunity to demonstrate their ability to use both bitmap and vector tools to develop images and many candidates produce imaginative and interesting posters. Many candidates used animation on the poster, which is acceptable provided the poster does not become a 'presentation' rather than a poster.

Most candidates recognised that the digital poster and the CD cover were for the same club but some candidates chose different clubs for the products.

Some candidates failed to include at least 2 images from primary sources and/or did not include annotated thumbnails to show how they had developed their primary sources.

0907 SPB.

2D Character Designs. Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB and used vector tools to create two nets for the characters. Almost all candidates produced suitable nets that would fit on an A4 sheet although not all provided clear instructions for assembly and some candidates did not add accurate dimensions. 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.

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. This task presented candidates with an opportunity to demonstrate their ability with graphical tools. The majority of candidates made good use of the 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.

The SPB states that each scene should be a still image and 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 reusing elements from other products. Candidates were also 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 refer to generic strands for level 2.

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 generic strands for level 2.

D104 : ICT in Enterprise.

Overall

A total of 1293 candidates were entered for this unit, 878 for the 0906 SPB and 415 for the 0907 SPB. The overall pass rate of 64.4% is consistent with that achieved in the previous summer series and 11.8% of the candidates achieved the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to generic strands for level 1.

Strand (b) - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For the 0906 SPB each candidate was expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea for a product, using a range of both primary and secondary sources to raise money for Cash 4 Kids. There was some evidence that candidates had tested their ideas on potential customers and in some cases there was enough detail to enable the team to make sound decisions, based on the research.

Secondary sources were usually limited to the Internet. Most candidates provided a list of web addresses but some did not indicate what information was found and where this was used in the project.

Mind maps were produced by most candidates and these continued to be of a better standard than in previous series.

Each team member was expected to create a spreadsheet model for their allocated idea to help them explore options and facilitate decision making. Most candidates used the spreadsheet design provided in the SPB with little attempt at customisation or improvement. However, some candidates did use formatting tools to improve the presentation of the model.

Some candidates provided evidence to confirm where the costs used in the spreadsheet came from. This allowed the moderator to judge the reliability of the information presented.

The presentation of individual findings to the team members was an improvement on previous series and in some cases enabled the team to make an informed decision on which enterprise idea to adopt.

The requirement for this strand in the 0907 SPB was different from previous series. Each candidate was required to research three promotional items and produce a spreadsheet to show the costs for each. A budget of £250 was available.

Most candidates carried out the research and produced an appropriate spreadsheet but there was some confusion as to the required number of items to be investigated by each candidate. In some instances the team split the three items between them and therefore only investigated and produced a spreadsheet covering one item each.

There was generally clearer evidence of sources of costs with some candidates choosing to show them on the spreadsheet whilst others created a separate document. Some candidates produced screen shots of the websites used.

Strand (c) - Create a corporate identity

For both the 0906 and the 0907 SPB the team was required to agree a name and strap line for their enterprise. Each team member was expected to design a corporate image for the enterprise using the agreed name and strapline. Most candidates presented their own design in the eportfolio, which was an improvement on previous series.

The team had to agree a final identity and explain why it was chosen. Most teams agreed the final identity but some did not provide any explanation as to why the chosen image was selected or why others had been rejected.

The team had to share out the task of producing a complete set of documents. This should have provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate team working, as each document had to conform to the agreed corporate image. Most candidates produced a complete set of documents and many identified who in the team had created each one. Some, however, did not identify the authors of the documents and it was difficult to see who had contributed to the team activity. In some cases the documents were inconsistent - it is vital that all team members use the same logo, strapline and provide full contact details on all documents produced.

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 advertise their chosen product (0906) or campaign (0907).

Most candidates had remembered what they were promoting - although many items did not promote the product or campaign but just included the name of the enterprise and the logo.

The use of 'freebies/giveaways' was a popular choice of promotional item but most did not allow the viewer to find out more about the product/campaign. The inclusion of a telephone number or the web address would have been appropriate. Where posters/digital posters had been used they continued to be an improvement on previous series and tended to contain all necessary information.

For both SPBs the candidates' own promotional items along with the complete set from the whole team should have been presented 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 the candidates had often omitted to indicate which team member had produced which items.

The quality of the websites both in content and design was also an improvement on previous series, with most candidates indicating the contribution of each individual

team member. Most websites allowed the viewer to find out how to buy the product/how to find out more about the campaign.

Strand (e) - Use an eportfolio to present an enterprise proposal

Please also refer to generic strands for level 1.

Most candidates acknowledged that the focal point of the eportfolio was the proposal. The proposals usually contained the set of business documents, the promotional items and the website along with the financial model for the chosen enterprise product/campaign. However, the introduction to the team and the justification of the selection of the product/campaign were often missing.

Strand (f) - Carry out an end of project review

Please also refer to generic strands for level 1.

Candidates who had completed a diary or kept some sort of log throughout the project and used its content as a basis for their reviews tended to do better in this strand.

D204 : ICT in Enterprise.

Overall

A total of 9984 candidates were entered for this unit, 7943 for the 0906 SPB and 2041 for the 0907 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 71.6% and some improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 16.6% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction.

The quality of the work produced was generally better than previous series and some good evidence of collaborative working was noted. The use of the project diary allowed the moderator to see how well teams had worked together. In some instances, where teams were limited in size, the teacher, or an assistant, had become part of the team in order to provide feedback to the candidates. This approach is acceptable and tended to produce very good outcomes.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to generic strands for level 2.

In this unit planning is a team activity. The plan should differentiate between team and individual tasks and indicate who is responsible for each task. As in previous series a detailed diary tended to support a comprehensive final review.

Strand (b) - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For the 0906 SPB each candidate was expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea for an event, using a range of both primary and secondary sources to raise money for Cash 4 Kids. There was some evidence that candidates had tested their ideas on potential customers and in some cases there was enough detail to enable the team to make sound decisions, based on the research.

The requirement for the 0907 SPB was different from previous series. Each candidate was required to research the costs of five promotional items including a letter to a prominent person and an advert on wheels.

Secondary sources were usually limited to the internet. Most candidates provided a list of web addresses but some did not indicate what information was found and where this had been used in the project.

Each team member was expected to create a spreadsheet model for their allocated idea/set of 5 promotional items to help them explore options and facilitate decision making. Spreadsheet modelling still tended to be simplistic, although some candidates had taken into account several factors and constructed models that allowed the team to consider 'what if' scenarios and therefore explore a range of options. In some cases this informed the decision making process.

Some candidates provided evidence, either in the form of screenshots or a list of websites used, to show where the costs used in the spreadsheet came from. This allowed the moderator to judge the reliability of the information presented.

The standard of the presentations of individual findings to team members was improved and in some cases these enabled the team to make an informed decision on which enterprise idea to adopt.

Strand (c) - Create a corporate identity

Both SPBs required the team to agree a set of principles before creating a corporate image. Each team member was expected to design a corporate image (logo, strap line, colour scheme, font style, contact details etc) for the enterprise/campaign. However, whilst most candidates produced an individual design there was often no record of the team's agreement of any principles. Most candidates evidenced their own design in the eportfolio and identified this for the moderator.

The teams had to agree a final identity and explain why it was chosen. Most teams agreed their final identity but few provided any justification of their selection or explanation as to why other proposals had been rejected.

The teams had to share out the task of producing a complete and consistent set of documents. This provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate team working, as each of these documents had to conform to the agreed corporate image. Most candidates presented a complete set of documents although many candidates did not identify which team member had created each one.

Candidates should familiarise themselves with the layout and common elements of standard documents before attempting to create their own and team members should be encouraged to provide feedback to each other on the quality and consistency of the documents presented.

Candidates must be encouraged to use a consistent logo, strapline and contact details on all the documents presented for this strand.

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 advertise their chosen product/event.

For the 0907 SPB the team should have taken into account the production of the letter to the prominent person and the advert on wheels. There was some confusion with the promotional items for the 0907 SPB in that although each candidate should have researched five promotional items for evidence for strand b, for strand d they only needed to produce 3 of the items. Therefore a team of 3 candidates should have produced 9 promotional items including one letter to a prominent person and one advert on wheels.

Ideally the team should have agreed a marketing strategy from the outset, so that items produced by individual team members worked together as part of a co-ordinated, targeted promotional campaign.

The use of 'freebies/giveaways' was a popular choice of promotional item but most did not allow the viewer to find out more about the product/campaign. The inclusion of a telephone number or the web address would have been appropriate. Where posters/digital posters had been used they continued to be an improvement on previous series and tended to contain all necessary information.

For both SPBs the candidates' own items along with the complete set from the whole team should have been presented 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 the candidates had often omitted to indicate which team member had produced which set of items.

The quality of the websites both in content and design was also an improvement on previous series, with most candidates indicating the contribution of each individual team member. Most websites allowed the viewer to find out how to buy the product/how to find out more about the campaign.

Strand (e) - Use an eportfolio to present an enterprise proposal

Please also refer to generic strands for level 2.

Most candidates acknowledged that the focal point of the eportfolio was the proposal. The proposals usually contained the set of business documents, the promotional items and the website along with the financial model for the chosen enterprise product/event. Some candidates remembered to include the required introduction to the team and the justification of the selected event/campaign.

However, many candidates had not remembered that the purpose of the proposal was to sell the idea to a potential sponsor/attract people to the campaign and convince them that the event/campaign would be a success.

Strand (f) - Carry out an end of project review

Please refer to generic strands for level 2.

Candidates who had completed a diary or kept some sort of log throughout the project and used its content as a basis for their reviews tended to do better in this strand.

DiDA Grade boundaries - Summer 2008 results

In the June 2008 exam series grade boundaries for the SPB06 were confirmed at the same levels as the previous series. SPB0907 was Awarded for the first time in Summer 2008 and the results are shown below. SPB0906 results have also been included in the tables below for reference.

The grade boundaries on most units for the SPB07 were raised.

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 21791 candidates, SPB0907 1872 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	17.2	31.6	51.1	72.0	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	9.3	27.7	48.3	66.4	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	16.6	31.3	50.9	71.5	100.0

D201 - Using ICT [SPB0906 59811 candidates, SPB0907 6234 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	3.1	14.8	41.5	82.0	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.4	12.3	31.4	66.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	3.2	14.6	40.6	80.5	100.0

D102 - Multimedia [SPB0906 2411 candidates, SPB0907 456 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 candS	17.4	36.7	55.6	71.8	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	16	0
Cumulative % of candS	12.7	28.3	51.1	70.0	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	16.7	35.3	54.9	71.5	100.0

D202 - Multimedia [SPB0906 16365 candidates, SPB0907 4809 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 candS	5.8	19.0	44.0	72.9	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	17	0
Cumulative % of candS	3.9	13.7	33.9	61.8	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	5.4	17.8	41.7	70.4	100.0

D103 - Graphics [SPB0906 2129 candidates, SPB0907 368 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 candS	14.0	30.3	51.8	73.7	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	32	27	22	17	0
Cumulative % of candS	10.3	29.1	56.0	77.2	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	13.5	30.1	52.4	74.2	100.0

D203 - Graphics [SPB0906 22308 candidates, SPB0907 3191 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 candS	2.6	14.5	43.5	79.3	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
Cumulative % of candS	5.1	18.0	41.6	77.0	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	2.9	15.0	43.3	79.0	100.0

D104 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0906 878 candidates, SPB0907 415 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 candS	12.4	28.7	45.6	67.2	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	0
Cumulative % of candS	10.6	28.9	43.9	58.6	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	11.8	28.8	45.0	64.4	100.0

D204 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0906 7943 candidates, SPB0907 2041 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 candS	4.3	16.7	42.4	72.1	100.0
0907					
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	17	0
Cumulative % of candS	4.5	16.3	41.3	69.6	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of candS	4.3	16.6	42.2	71.6	100.0

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our
Customer Services on 0844 576 0031
or email: <http://www.edexcel.com/ask>
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

