

# Diploma in Digital Applications

Levels 1 and 2

AiDA/ CiDA/ DiDA

Spring 2007

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](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Spring 2007

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2007

## Contents

	Page
1. General Comments and Administration	4-6
2. D201 - Using ICT	7-11
3. D101 - Using ICT	12-15
4. D202 - Multimedia	16-19
5. D203 - Graphics	20-23
6. D204 - ICT in Enterprise	24-27
7. 0701 SPB Grade Boundaries	28-29
8. DiDA Qualification Threshold	30-31

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication.

This is the Chair of Examiner's report for the January 2007 moderation window and relates only to the moderators' findings for the 0905 SPBs.

## ***General Comments***

### **Entry**

There was a large entry again for D201 (Using ICT) with the next most popular unit being D202 (Multimedia). More than 77% of the entries for Unit 1 were for candidates in Year 11 - although with the entries made at this time of year, this is probably indicative of the work being carried out while the students were in Year 10.

### **Standard of Entry**

The general standard of ability was satisfactory although, particularly in the case of multimedia and graphics, a significant number of candidates seemed to have tackled the Summative Project Brief (SPB) before acquiring the necessary skills to be able to do so successfully. It should be noted that DiDA Level 2 qualifications are designed to have parity of esteem with academic GCSEs grades A\* to C and candidates should be entered appropriately.

The revised assessment guidance and the use of walkthrough documents would appear to have contributed to improved accuracy of assessment in many centres.

A statement was issued on 17<sup>th</sup> August last year explaining the decision to go through an awarding process for each unit at each level for the qualification. This statement can be found at: <http://dida.edexcel.org.uk/home/news/dida-add.htm>

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 (particularly at this early stage of the qualification) and the boundaries may change as a result of this.

As assessors become familiar with the standard and with the holistic approach to assessment and as centres' internal moderation processes becoming more robust, it is anticipated that - once set - grade boundaries for a SPB will remain unchanged throughout its lifetime.

However, grade boundaries are likely to differ between SPBs for the same unit and level.

### **Level 1**

Due to the low number of entries for Level 1 it has only been possible to produce a report at this level for Unit 1. A report for all Level 1 units will be issued following the 2007 summer series.

However, it is worth making the point that many centres are not giving as much guidance to Level 1 candidates as many of them require in order to maximise their achievements. As a result, many candidates continue to under-achieve at this level. It would be far better to give candidates considerable support in producing a workable plan for example, so that they are then able to go on to produce appropriate outcomes, rather than leave them to struggle with the plan on their own which ultimately proves to be unusable.

## **Administration**

### **Submission of eportfolio samples**

Most centres met the deadline for despatch of candidates' work for moderation and followed instructions for submission of samples. Most had used the specified naming conventions for folders.

Sticky labels attached to CDs caused problems for some moderators. We would appreciate it if in future centres used a marker pen rather than a label to label CDs.

In some instances links in eportfolios referenced files stored locally on the centre's network. It would be helpful if in future, the eportfolios that are being submitted for moderation are checked prior to despatch to ensure that they are self-contained.

Some candidates had included a number of redundant files in their eportfolio. Only files which form part of the eportfolio should be included, any other extraneous files should be removed prior to submission.

### **Technical specification**

Many candidates failed to adhere to the technical specification given in the Summative Project Brief and submitted evidence in inappropriate file formats and/or eportfolios which exceeded the maximum size limit. This is not acceptable. In future work that does not adhere to the technical specification will be returned unmoderated. 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 did not adhere to the technical specification there was inevitably a big discrepancy between the centre mark and the mark awarded by the moderator.

### **Assessor record sheets (ARS)**

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

However, some did not provide all the information required, which made the moderating process more difficult. Candidate details were not always given in full. A strand by strand break-down of marks was not always provided. Comments varied from detailed and helpful to minimal and unhelpful.

The new ARS proved useful in identifying the amount of guidance given to a candidate and all centres are encouraged to use these for future assessments.

Despite indicating on the ARS that candidates had received guidance some centres appear to have disregarded this when allocating marks.

### **Internal moderation**

It was clear that some centres did not carry out effective internal moderation before submitting marks to Edexcel, as marks differed significantly between assessors within the same centre.

### Submission of marks on Edexcel Online

Some centres made data entry errors when submitting marks to Edexcel Online, resulting in discrepancies between the mark recorded on the system and that recorded on the assessor record sheet.

### Copyright

As made clear in the assessment guidance, candidates who do not adhere to legal requirements and use copyrighted material in their publications/products without gaining permission to do so will not be able to obtain more than four marks in strand (d) at Level 2 (8 marks at Level 1). *In this series, candidates were not penalised for non-adherence to legal requirements.*

## D201: Using ICT

### Overall

Candidates produced some attractive and purposeful publications for the 'Make Space' Summative Project Brief (SPB) and continued to think of exciting and unusual activities for their clubs.

Although more candidates in this series produced publications which more closely met the requirements and expectations of the SPB, too many still made omissions which affected not only the quality of the publications but also their usefulness. Although candidates appeared to have sought feedback on their work and carried out some testing, they did not always choose the most appropriate test users. Feedback was often superficial and did not address fitness for audience and purpose in relation to the requirements of the brief.

Although the number of oversized eportfolios and the incidence of illegal file formats have decreased, there are still too many candidates who are not adhering to the technical specification.

### Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Most candidates were able to identify the main tasks, break them down into sub-tasks, determine whether they would do the work at school or at home and allocate dates and/or times. However, few candidates seemed able to draw on their past experience in order to allocate sensible times to tasks/sub-tasks. Even fewer had built contingency time into their plans. In some cases, the order in which tasks were scheduled was not completely logical, e.g. it makes sense to produce the newsletter and information point directly after the survey and research - the main source of information for these publications - many candidates did not do so.

Although most candidates used their plan to carry out some form of tracking, e.g. indicating actual dates of completion or adding comments such as 'done' or 'completed', few showed that they had used their plan to monitor progress throughout the project or showed how and why they had changed their plan to take account of changing circumstances. Interim review points were sometimes added to plans, but few were used to good effect.

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 interpret and failed to communicate progress through the project.

Some instances of good planning were seen where candidates had thought out an efficient order for the tasks, allocated sensible times and used their plans to monitor progress and ensure that they completed all the tasks.

Few teachers appear to have taken the opportunity to review initial plans with candidates to ensure that they were workable. 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 evident.

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

Nearly all candidates achieved at least some marks in this strand and the general quality of research has improved since the last series. More candidates are now making use of

primary sources, often utilising images they have produced themselves or extracts from interviews they have conducted.

Most candidates used images purposefully, although some candidates chose to include images in their publications which were not particularly relevant or fit for purpose.

More candidates in this series showed that they understood the difference between primary and secondary sources of information than in previous series, but many candidates are still confused.

The process of searching for and selecting appropriate images, from both primary and secondary sources, was generally purposeful and well recorded. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for other types of information. Only a handful of candidates appear to have considered the currency and validity of different sources and showed that they were discerning in their selection of information.

Although most candidates acknowledged most of their sources, they tended to 'forget' to acknowledge the sites from which they obtained images. A large number of candidates still think that search engines such as Google are sources in their own right.

Most candidates produced a questionnaire capable of gathering at least some relevant information. However, many candidates asked questions that did nothing to help them decide which activities to select or to target their audience. Many candidates did not make much - if any - use of the information they gleaned from the survey, e.g. having found out from respondents what was the most popular time, they either did not make any use of this information or ignored it entirely and chose a time of their own.

Although most candidates ask a test user for feedback on their questionnaires, the feedback was often restricted to how the questionnaire looked. Few test users gave feedback on the purposefulness of the questions.

Better questionnaires asked purposeful questions which were used to decide activities, times, dates, etc. These questionnaires were generally well produced, with a clear, uncluttered layout and instructions for completion. Candidates who produced these questionnaires often gave thought to the make up of their respondents, realising that meaningful data would come from an even spread of genders and ages.

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

### **Spreadsheet**

Most candidates were able to produce a spreadsheet which analysed the survey data they had collected. Better spreadsheets had clear layouts and made use of formulae that produced the clearest answers. Less well produced spreadsheets were cluttered or difficult to follow. Some candidates still felt obliged to show off their IT skills, producing inappropriate or unnecessarily complicated formulae, rather than demonstrating their ability to use formulae selectively to help them undertake complex analysis of the data.

Few candidates saw that the information they analysed should drive the publications and influence the way the publications 'sold' their activities. Most candidates settled for finding out the most popular activity, time, etc, and using that information in their publications. Better candidates 'drilled' down into their data and tried to find trends which they could use to persuade people to attend the club, or investigated the data to find out if there were any problems with the first choice activity, e.g. only boys would take part. Weaker candidates often 'forgot' to use the information they found in their publications.

Charts were often let down by lack of titles, legends or axes labels.

A number of candidates omitted to provide a formulae view of their spreadsheet.

### **Database**

Most candidates imported the data successfully and provided some evidence in an appropriate format of creating the database structure.

Most candidates provided some evidence of the queries they created, although many forgot to provide evidence of query design. Queries were usually correct, although not always purposeful. Some candidates made errors when using the OR operator. Candidates don't always see the link between the queries and the usefulness of the reports to those watching the database demonstration.

Most candidates provided evidence of having carried out some basic customisation of the data entry form they had. Better candidates used drop down menus, text boxes with instructions, etc. to assist users and reduce the risk of incorrect information being entered.

### **Strand (d) - Present and communicate information**

Most candidates produced all three publications. Where this was not the case, assessors were sometimes awarding too many marks. To achieve three marks or more candidates must have produced a complete set of publications.

Few candidates were able to demonstrate that they fully understood the purpose of the publications, e.g. to promote the new Make Space club and chosen activity. Often they produced attractive looking publications which were let down by irrelevant content or the absence of key information.

Few candidates showed that they understood the need to gain permission to use images produced by other people. Many provided no evidence of having considered copyright issues and had simply used copyrighted materials without permission; others had asked for permission, but when no reply had been received, assumed that they could still use the images.

*In future series candidates will be limited to 4 marks in this strand where legal requirements have not been adhered to.*

Few candidates realised that the three publications were meant to form a set. In most cases the style of the publications was completely different and little or no attempt had been made to create visual links between them. Although some candidates used similar colour schemes or logos on the newsletter and information point, few carried this over to the database demonstration.

### **Newsletter**

Candidates appear to have enjoyed producing this publication, but sometimes included irrelevant images and information and omitted key information. Information on the chosen activity was often 'buried'. The omission of essential information such as times, days, venues and contact details, including where to send the application form, affected the quality and usefulness of the newsletter.

Few candidates produced newsletters that looked like newsletters; many produced documents which looked like leaflets. Some candidates used inappropriate software such as PowerPoint to produce the newsletter.

In many cases it was evident that proofreading and spell checking was insufficient and/or inadequate. Test users often appear to have given feedback on the way the newsletter looked rather than the quality and appropriateness of its content.

The best newsletters had an attractive front cover, an appropriate style and layout and standard components such as page numbers, issue number, date etc. The club and activity were prominently promoted and information on the venue, days, times and costs was provided. The application form could be detached without losing key information and an address for the return of the completed form was included. The newsletters were mostly error free and thought had been given to the choice and positioning of images.

### **Database Demonstration**

Candidates clearly found this the least engaging publication and often limited themselves to generating reports from the queries they had produced without giving much - if any - thought to the audience and purpose of the demonstration. Few appeared to have considered how layout, titles, additional information etc could help to make the reports more interesting and informative or how different types of report could be used to show the full potential of the database. Some candidates showed different varieties of what was essentially the same report, e.g., local groups offering sport, local groups offering education, etc.

A large number of candidates saved their reports in pdf format which limited their usefulness since the URL links could not be followed.

The better database demonstrations showed four purposeful reports with clear layouts, appropriate titles, extra information to explain the reports and some awareness of what the reports would like on screen when viewed by those watching the demonstration.

### **Information Point**

Candidates appear to have enjoyed producing this publication. However, few candidates put themselves in the place of visitors to the launch and considered how those people would use the information point. Candidates often neglected to include instructions for use, or included hyperlinks to websites (the information point was meant to run on a stand-alone computer without Internet access). In some instances, candidates had misunderstood the brief and produced a presentation rather than a self-service information point.

As with the newsletter, key information was often omitted and, in some cases, irrelevant information was included. Few candidates included two images from primary sources as required by the brief.

The best information points had an attractive welcome screen, with instructions for the user and clear links. All relevant information about the Make Space campaign, the new club, the activities and the area's needs was included.

A number of candidates saved the information point in pdf which was not an appropriate format to choose in this case, since it prevented the moderator from getting a true 'feel' for the user experience.

### **Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio**

There has been a pleasing improvement in the quality of eportfolios seen in this series. Fewer candidates provided oversized eportfolios and fewer candidates included evidence in illegal formats. However, a number of eportfolios still exceeded the size limit, often by a significant amount and candidates were penalised for this.

Most candidates produced eportfolios which were functional. A number of candidates produced technically sophisticated eportfolios, which were not actually purposeful. They often contained 'clever' buttons or animations which actually detracted from the quality of the eportfolio rather than enhancing it.

Most candidates provided at least some comments to introduce their evidence, but many simply repeated information from the SPB, rather than filling in the gaps, telling moderators things they would not otherwise know, such as the reasons behind key design decisions.

Few candidates produced eportfolios that made good use of the medium to present their achievements and showcase the project outcomes.

Although it was evident that some testing had been carried out, it seems to have been largely focused on ensuring functionality. Few candidates appear to have asked their test users to focus on usability.

Candidates who achieved high marks for this strand, kept within the technical specification and produced attractive, professional looking eportfolios, with relevant commentaries contextualising their evidence. The eportfolios were easy to navigate and scrolling was kept to a minimum.

### **Strand (f) - Review the project**

This was another aspect of the project in which candidates had improved since the previous series. A pleasing number of candidates reviewed their publication in terms of the extent to which they met the project requirements and considered how the process and their own performance contributed to the success of the project. However, some candidates simply produced a narrative explaining what they did, rather than assessing what they had achieved.

Most candidates gave some suggestions for improvement, but most were vague and some were unlikely to have any appreciable impact.

Although most candidates had included some element of feedback from others, very few understood the role of reviewer as opposed to test user. Only a handful of candidates asked someone to review their final publications and reflected on what the reviewers had said about them.

The best reviews were comprehensive, but not necessarily extensive. They concentrated on evaluating each aspect of the project, looking at what was good, what was not so good, what went wrong and why. They evaluated the project outcomes against the requirements specified in the brief. Suggestions for improvement were valid and sensible. Final reviews of publications were included and the candidates reflected on these reviews and extrapolated from them what they would do better in future.

## D101: Using ICT

### Overall

Many candidates appear to have found the 'Make Space' Summative Project Brief (SPB) to be both relevant and interesting, with many identifying a wide range of activities for their clubs. However a minority of candidates tended to focus on a personal favourite pastime and produce publications that made little mention of the Make Space campaign.

Most candidates had taken some account of the requirements of the brief 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 appear to be relying on peers for feedback on publications and this feedback tends not to contain constructive advice but general comments that are unlikely to move the work on.

The assessment guidance sets out clearly the level of guidance that Level 1 candidates may receive and the affect that this guidance has on the marks that can be awarded for any particular strand. In some cases assessors had misunderstood the marking of strands where students had received guidance or limited guidance. Centres should refer to the Assessment Guidance document for detailed information for each strand.

However, in some cases candidates who were achieving relatively low marks in strands where it was indicated they had received no guidance may well have benefited from greater guidance and gained higher marks.

Fewer oversized eportfolios were seen than in the previous series, however centres should ensure that the eportfolios conform to the technical specification to avoid candidates being ineligible for maximum marks in strand (e).

A significant minority of eportfolios were seen that still contained illegal file formats meaning that the work contained in these files could not be taken into account when awarding marks. Centres should ensure that the work contained in the eportfolios is accessible with the Moderator's Toolkit.

### Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Most candidates were able to identify the main tasks. Some candidates were able to place these tasks into a logical order, but many used the order given in the SPB. Most candidates were able to identify some of the sub-tasks required to carry out the work and some were able to identify and order the sub-tasks sensibly.

Some candidates were able to allocate sensible times to tasks and sub -asks and to track their progress against these time. However, many candidates were unclear as to start and finish dates for their work and rarely altered times to reflect reality. Few candidates had sufficiently detailed plans to allow them to monitor (looking ahead, anticipating and dealing with problems before they happen) their progress.

Many candidates at this level would benefit from greater guidance with planning to ensure that they have workable plans for their projects. Centres should note 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, monitor and communicate progress.

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

Most candidates achieved some marks in this strand and had carried out some research and created questionnaires. Many candidates included information from the Make Space website, but a surprising number failed to use this information in their publications. Some candidates concentrated on researching their own interests rather than information required to fulfill the brief.

Many candidates still appeared to be confused about the difference between primary and secondary sources and where candidates had generated information themselves they often failed to make this clear.

Candidates acknowledged some sources, but many still seem to think that sites such as Google are sources rather than search engines that can be used to access useful information from other sources.

Most candidates used the given questions from the project brief in their questionnaires and had rearranged them into a logical order. Some candidates added valid questions of their own that would allow them to collect data that could be analysed to provide useful information. Many candidates appeared to have sought feedback on their questionnaires, but few had acted on this. Often feedback focused on colours and fonts rather than the validity of the questions.

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

Most candidates had made some use of a spreadsheet to analyse the data they had collected and had made use of a database application to create their database reports. However, some candidates failed to provide evidence of the use of both packages thus limiting their achievement in this strand.

### **Spreadsheet**

Many candidates used the design provided in the brief to create their spreadsheet allowing them to carry out simple analysis of their data. Some candidates attempted to use more complex methods to analyse their data, with varying degrees of success. Some candidates failed to provide evidence of the use of formulae. In future the inclusion of \*.xls format files, as permitted by the Moderator's Toolkit, in the eportfolio should solve this problem.

The majority of candidates who had created spreadsheets were able to produce graphs from their data and many were able to present these graphs in their results document. However, many candidates included graphs other than those specified in the results document without editing the text, for example including pie charts under a paragraph introducing a column chart.

### **Database**

Most candidates attempted to use their database software to retrieve data for their database reports. However, a significant number of candidates failed to provide sufficient evidence of their database work in their eportfolios, having only the finished reports to demonstrate achievement in this strand.

In the main, candidates chose queries from the given list. However, in the designs of their queries they often failed to realise that it was not necessary to display all fields used. Some candidates failed to provide evidence of their queries in design view and some provided no evidence of queries at all.

Most candidates had produced data entry forms and some had customised these forms to facilitate accurate data entry. Many had received feedback on these forms, but this was not always useful or constructive.

## **Strand (d) - Present and communicate information**

The vast majority of candidates produced leaflets and presentations, with most making at least an attempt to produce the required database reports.

### **Leaflet**

Many candidates produced colourful leaflets that containing most of the required information, but few included all the information required in the brief. Some candidates had clearly prototyped and tested their leaflets, but others would have benefited from further consideration of layout issues, spell checking and proof reading.

### **Presentation**

Some candidates produced pleasing presentations that were fit for audience and purpose and contained the content required by the brief, plus some additional features. Most candidates produced presentations that contained at least some of the required content and some had tested their publications and responded well to feedback. However, many candidates included excessive use of animation that should have been picked up during the testing process. In most cases this use of animation called into question the candidates' sense of purpose for the presentation.

### **Database Reports**

Many candidates failed to realise that the database reports were part of the set of three required publications and the only evidence of their creation was via a series of screen shots rather than the inclusion of the reports themselves as printable documents. Where candidates had included the required documents, some had used meaningful titles and had ensured that all information was fully displayed. However other candidates included reports that displayed unnecessary and repeated information and truncated fieldnames and/or data. Again, in many cases the reports would have benefited from testing and feedback to ensure that they were fully fit for purpose.

## **Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio**

In general, eportfolios submitted for this series were an improvement on those submitted in previous series. Many candidates submitted eportfolios that provided access to most of the required evidence using the Moderator's Toolkit. Fewer candidates submitted evidence in illegal file formats and fewer oversized eportfolios were seen.

Many candidates made use of text and colour and some of images to introduce their evidence. A pleasing number of eportfolios were seen that demonstrated that the candidates had a reasonable awareness of audience and purpose. However a significant minority of candidates still included publications in unconverted formats and/or failed to link their evidence to their eportfolios.

However, whilst many candidates had evidently considered the design of their eportfolio, some had not. The style of presentation was often inconsistent. In many cases, the layout of the eportfolio was poor. Colour schemes were sometimes not conducive to on-screen viewing.

It was pleasing to see most candidates making at least some use of comments on their context pages to introduce their evidence, although some simply linked evidence to buttons on a navigation bar. Candidates should be encouraged to include comments that 'tell the story' of their work and introduce their evidence.

### **Strand (f) - Review the project**

Many candidates were able to provide a narrative account of their progress and performance and some general comments about their publications. However, comments on publications tended to reflect the receipt of only positive feedback and did not result in the candidates evaluating their work.

Candidates are expected to carry out an end of project review in which they comment on their final publications against 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.

## D202: Multimedia

### Overall

Candidates seem to have found the 'Energise Your Life!' Summative Project Brief (SPB) both motivating and relevant and some very good multimedia products were seen. Whilst in most cases candidates were able to produce the required project outcomes - a set of multimedia products, they were far less successful in providing reliable evidence of the process undertaken to produce them - especially the up-front design work.

It was disappointing to see again evidence that candidates had embarked upon the SPB without first acquiring the necessary software and design skills to produce effective multimedia products, fit for both audience and purpose.

It was evident that in some cases assessors gave credit for candidates' demonstration of technical competence, rather than the judging how effectively they had used their knowledge and skills to meet the requirements of the brief.

A number of candidates submitted products and/or supporting evidence in unacceptable file formats. This evidence could not be viewed by the moderator. Centres are reminded that candidates' work must be in a format that can be viewed using the Moderators' Toolkit. Where possible centres should encourage candidates to test their work on a stand-alone or virtual computer, loaded only with the Moderator's Toolkit.

A significant number of candidates submitted work in considerably over-size eportfolio, ie in breach of the technical specification. This limited the marks they could be awarded in strand (e). For 5 marks or more students must adhere to the technical specification.

### Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

To help them manage the project and meet the deadline candidates need a workable, up-front plan that identifies the main tasks, breaks them down where appropriate into more manageable sub-tasks, puts them in a logical order and divides up the available time between them, differentiating between work to be completed in class and work to be done elsewhere.

Generally plans submitted by candidates demonstrated a realistic understanding of the project objectives. Candidates were good at identifying the main tasks within the project and showed an understanding of the need to break down the tasks into smaller sub-tasks were appropriate. In many candidates' work, these tasks and sub-tasks were in a logical order. However, for a significant number of candidates they were not. Many tended to schedule the task of collecting digital assets before any design work had been undertaken and also in some instances scheduled product creation before product design!

More candidates in this series seemed to have built interim checkpoints into their plans, but there were comparatively few who had added any contingency or 'slack' time. Again, there were a number of plans that did not include sensible timings and it seemed that the plan, in some instances, was only considered as an afterthought rather than an essential part of the project process. In some cases it was clear that the plans had been produced retrospectively. For many candidates the plans would have been more workable had they been checked and approved prior to the commencement of the project.

Some candidates had chosen to use bespoke project management software to create their plan. Whilst this is perfectly acceptable, in some instances candidates had not got a firm understanding of the intricacies of the software and this hampered rather than facilitated their ability to produce workable plans.

## **Strand (b) - Design multimedia products**

Whilst many candidates were able to produce outline designs, few produced detailed designs that facilitated implementation or enabled someone else to visualise what the final product would be like. Candidates who produced the best products were invariably those who had created up-front detailed designs and used feedback from others to refine them.

It was evident that a lot of design work had been carried out retrospectively. In some cases, the designs and the finished products were identical. In others, candidates had included parts of the finished product (such as screen grabs) in their ostensibly initial design work! Candidates are reminded that retrospective designs do not contribute to the achievement of the project objectives and are to be awarded 0 marks.

Where candidates had produced detailed up-front designs, many did not give reasons for their design decisions. Few candidates appear to have used their up-front designs to gather valuable feedback from others at an early stage in the development process.

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

The majority of candidates collected, edited and created a wide range of multimedia assets for use in their products. It was very encouraging to see that in some centres, candidates were clearly experimenting with different types of software to produce their digital assets. Some good examples were music tracks using sample-based music software, audio tracks using text to speech engines, and also animated avatars. Candidates used assets from both primary and secondary sources.

The collection and referencing of assets showed a marked improvement in this series. Candidates were, however, better at collecting, producing and editing assets for their products than they were at evidencing this process. However, in many instances assets from secondary sources seemed to have been used in their entirety, with only basic cropping and resizing having taken place.

The completion of a detailed asset table is an essential part of the project process, enabling candidates to acknowledge the source of the assets they have used. Whilst some attempt was made by most candidates to acknowledge the source of secondary assets, many failed to provide the full URL. It was disappointing to see that a number of candidates are still attributing assets to search engines such as Google Images. Primary assets such as music tracks, photographs and video clips were often not properly acknowledged and in many instances ignored.

This would have been an ideal opportunity for candidates to comment on any editing that they had undertaken. In many instances editing had to be inferred because no information had been provided. Candidates should be encouraged to state explicitly what editing has taken place. They do not, however, need to provide a narrative or screenshots of the editing process.

There still seems to be some confusion about the differences between primary and secondary sources. Editing of a secondary asset does not make it a primary asset!

It was encouraging to see that centres have started to find and utilise royalty/copyright free and public domain resource banks. However, there was still a lot of evidence of candidates using copyright materials without permission, particularly copyright music in the soundtracks to movies. A number of candidates seem to think that it was sufficient to have sent an email asking for permission even if no positive response was received! This is not the case.

## **Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products**

Some candidates produced excellent products that were fit for both audience and purpose. However, many produced products that indicated limited understanding of the project requirements. Some products had been produced using inappropriate software and/or without the candidate having the necessary skills. Occasionally, the products felt like a set or package with a common theme or purpose.

The products generally demonstrated some sense of audience and fitness for purpose, although many candidates pitched all three products at their own age group, rather than addressing the particular age requirements for each product - younger children for the presentation and an adult audience for the movie.

Many products showed a good level of functional testing. However, a number did not meet the requirements specified in the SPB. This was particularly true of the presentations, many of which did not play automatically, contain sound or loop.

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

Candidates are still producing products that do not adhere to legal requirements. Claiming use for educational purpose (unless stated on the source) or stating permission applied for do not fulfil this requirement and in future series candidates will be limited to 4 marks in this strand where legal requirements have not been adhered to.

### **Movie**

It was again clear that Microsoft Moviemaker had been used by the majority of candidates to good effect and movies often included a wide range of digital assets. Some candidates had used Flash with varying degrees of success. Unfortunately, some candidates did not have sufficient mastery of the software to realise their design intentions and, as a result, produced products which were not wholly fit for audience or purpose. A significant number of candidates failed to recognise that the target audience for the movie was teachers. Many candidates simply use the movie to comment on what they had done in their e-learning packages, rather than trying to 'sell' the package to teachers. Some had aimed their movie at fellow students.

It was disappointing to see again, a large proportion of movies containing copyrighted music. However, it was very encouraging to see (and hear) that some candidates had created their own music tracks.

### **E-learning Package**

Many candidates were able to produce an effective e-learning package that provides students with information about relevant topics within the theme of Energise Your Life. Many incorporated multimedia effectively into the product and also provided some interactivity to test and engage the user. Most candidates used web authoring software to produce their e-learning packages, however, some did use presentation software, with varying degrees of success.

Some e-learning packages were no more than a few linked web pages, with limited use of multimedia. These packages contained nothing to test the user's understanding such as questions or a quiz.

Some of the weakest e-learning packages were 'text-heavy', consisting of large chunks of text and images copied/pasted, mainly from American websites, often with little or no relevance to the topic or target audience.

There were a number of e-learning packages where images were missing and broken links were evident. Where possible centres should encourage candidates to test their work on a

stand-alone or virtual computer, loaded with the Moderator's Toolkit to ensure moderators are able to view products as intended.

### **Presentation**

Some presentations were fairly well aimed at primary school pupils, and showed a sound awareness of audience and purpose. Some candidates, however, included graphics and text that would probably shock and scare that age range! Some had too much text-based information which was too difficult/boring for the target audience! Some presentations were purely text based, with no other multimedia assets at all. Timings were not always appropriate. In some instances the audience was not given sufficient time to read the text before the next slide transition. Better prototyping and testing was needed to alleviate these issues.

### **Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio**

The work in this strand has improved since the summer moderation series, with the majority of the eportfolios being well constructed and functional and including comments or commentaries to introduce the evidence. Most candidates produced an eportfolio that allowed the evidence to be located and viewed. Most hyperlinks worked as intended, suggesting that some effective functional testing had been carried out.

In some candidates' eportfolios, some links did not work. It is important that candidates' test their eportfolios for functionality on a stand-alone computer which has the Moderator's Toolkit installed. Where links did not work moderators had to look within the folder structure for the 'missing' evidence. The job of locating missing evidence was made more difficult when candidates did not have an appropriate file/folder structure.

Some candidates used presentation software to create their eportfolios. Whilst any suitable software can be utilised to create eportfolios, presentation software is not ideal, as it does not allow evidence to be located in a systematic way.

Few candidates used multimedia effectively to showcase their achievements.

Many candidates are failing to adhere to the maximum size limit for the eportfolio and in some cases are submitting work that is well beyond the permitted limit. Where this is the case they are limited to a maximum of 4 marks for strand (e)

### **Strand (f) - Review the project**

The end-of-project review was not well attempted by the majority of candidates. Most produced mainly narrative comments about the products and the project process. There was little or no evaluation. Some candidates incorporated feedback from others and a few included valid suggestions for improvement.

Very few candidates were able to produce a comprehensive evaluation of all three aspects of the project, incorporating feedback from others and including valid suggestions for improvement.

## D203: Graphics

### Overall

The 'Get Set for 2012' Summative Project Brief (SPB) has again inspired candidates to produce work of an excellent standard. Overall there has been a general improvement in the standard of eportfolios seen in this moderation series and a greater proportion of candidates seemed to be familiar with the requirements of the SPB and were therefore able to produce work which is more in keeping with the expected standard for this level.

Many candidates failed to include an accurately completed elements table. In some cases elements were used and not recorded or elements were recorded with 'Google' as their source. Centres are reminded that candidates must only use elements from secondary sources when they have permission to do so.

Most candidates met the technical specification and did not exceed the maximum size limit for the eportfolio. Few candidates included files which could not be read using the Moderator's Toolkit.

### Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

To help them manage the project and meet deadlines, candidates need a workable, up-front plan that identifies the main tasks, breaks them down where appropriate into more manageable sub-tasks, puts them in a logical order and divides up the available time between them, differentiating between work to be completed in class and work to be done elsewhere.

Candidates should also be encouraged to keep a project log which will help to 'fill in the gaps' by giving details which may not be shown on the plan.

To gain full marks in this strand candidates should have used and updated their plan throughout the project. Any changes to estimated times or the order in which tasks are completed should be recorded in the plan with details of how the changes will be managed. In general the project plans submitted by candidates demonstrated a reasonable understanding the project objectives and requirements by identifying most tasks and sub-tasks in a logical order, but some candidates failed to allow sensible times for tasks and did not make any adjustment to show the actual times taken.

Only a limited number of candidates produced a fully workable plan and used it throughout the project to maximise efficiency and communicate progress',

### Stand (b) - Use vector-based tools to develop images

There was an overall improvement in the standard of vector work and it would appear that more candidates are now using appropriate software. Some effective and well-designed logos were produced, although there were still some candidates who failed to recognise that the logo should be produced using only vector tools. The 2D drawing was generally well done, but not all candidates met the requirements of the SPB because they failed to use accurate scales and dimensions. Some candidates failed to make the most of the opportunity to use vector-based tools by using only basic shapes or ready made templates for their 2D drawing.

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

Candidates who followed the requirements of the SPB and took their own photographs for the web page were able to demonstrate mastery of a wide range of bitmap-based tools to edit the images and consequently gained higher marks. Some candidates ignored the brief and used images acquired from secondary sources. This tended to limit the creativity of those candidates.

A significant number of candidates failed to use appropriate tools to prepare bitmap images or carried out only very simple editing of the images, which limited the amount of marks they could gain for this strand.

Some candidates had obviously decided that they would gain extra marks by using as many bitmap-based tools as they could which resulted in inappropriate use of tools such as filters and special effects.

### **Strand (d) - Design and create graphic products**

The vast majority of candidates attempted to produce all the graphic products required by the SPB and some excellent products were seen. However, some candidates misinterpreted the SPB and produced work for the 2012 Olympics rather than the 'Get Set!' campaign.

To gain maximum marks in this strand candidates 'must have explained their design decisions for each product and shown clearly what it would look like, taking into account the intended medium'. A number of candidates failed to meet this requirement, for example by not including a 3D representation of the gift bag.

Most candidates obtained critical feedback on their products and recorded the changes they made in response to this feedback, usually resulting in better products. However, some candidates seemed to have only canvassed their peers, who in the main made only positive comments, resulting in no changes being made despite there often being obvious room for improvement.

#### **Medal**

This product was generally well done and many candidates produced an excellent representation of the finished medal with embossing used to good effect. Some candidates did not meet the requirements of the brief by failing to make the medal gold or by omitting some of the required elements, such as the date.

#### **T-shirt**

Candidates used a variety of techniques to produce the T-shirt, for example using a template from the internet, a photograph or a drawing. All these methods are, providing any secondary sources are recorded and are copyright free.

Many candidates showed a strong sense of audience and purpose in their designs for this product. However, some candidates lost marks because they failed to add a visual link between the T-shirt and the gift bag or they attempted to meet this requirement without fully understanding it. Some candidates did not add an image representing the Fun Run or added a ready-made element which meant they lost the opportunity to gain marks in Strands (b) and/or (c).

Most candidates successfully combined a variety of elements such as bitmaps, vector images and text to produce their T-shirt designs and they annotated their designs to make clear how they had done this.

#### **Gift Bag**

The 2D drawing for this product provided the best opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their ability to use vector-based tools and many candidates made the most of this opportunity. Some excellent scaled drawings were produced and annotated to meet the requirements of the SPB. Many candidates showed that their 2D drawing would make up into a bag by producing either a photograph of the assembled bag or an accurate representation. However, a significant number of candidates failed to produce a plan that could be used to produce a bag or did not add enough information to meet the requirements of the SPB.

### **Web Page**

The majority of candidates edited their own photographs for this product and some very professional evidence was submitted.

The majority of candidates provided annotated 'before and after' versions of their photographs giving clear explanations of how they had achieved the final images.

The banner was often well done and some candidates had clearly spent time on their designs. However, some candidates had put the minimum amount of effort into designing and producing the banner.

Most candidates successfully combined elements to produce the web page although some had obviously spent a lot of time creating three images and the banner, but very little time considering the layout of elements on the page, missing an opportunity to demonstrate their skills in combining images.

### **Strand (e) - Exhibit work in an eportfolio**

Most candidates produced functional and attractive eportfolios, which enabled the moderator to locate and view their evidence reasonably well. However, in some cases finding the way in to the eportfolio was anything but straight forward. Some candidates included unnecessary files in their eportfolios, e.g. Word documents as well as the PDFs. It is good practice remove any unnecessary files from an eportfolio before submission.

Although some candidates did make excellent use of graphics to present their achievements and 'showcase' their products, many seemed unaware that the eportfolio for this unit is a graphic product in its own right and should be designed and tested in the same way as any other graphic product.

Most eportfolios contained working links to all the required evidence which indicates that some effective functional testing had taken place.

Candidates are expected to provide comments to introduce and contextualise their evidence and, although most candidates made some comments, most were brief. These comments should 'fill in the gaps' for the moderator; a considerable number of candidates just listed what evidence was required by the SPB, rather than explaining their design decisions or giving some idea of the progress from initial idea to final product.

### **Strand (f) - Review the project**

Candidates are expected to produce a realistic end-of-project review, in which they consider the extent to which the final products meet the project objectives, the contribution of the underlying processes and the effectiveness of their own performance. The review should include some valid suggestions for improvements.

Some candidates did cover all these points and produced a well thought out, reflective review, but a significant number did not. Too many candidates produced a review which consisted mainly of narrative ...'first I did this and then I did that'... rather than making

evaluative comments. Suggestions for improvement should be specific. It is not sufficient for a candidate to state 'I would improve my medal' without indicating specific ways in which this could be done.

The standard of feedback from reviewers was sometimes good, with some candidates incorporating it into their evaluation.

## **D204 - ICT in Enterprise**

### **Overall**

The vast majority of candidates seemed to have enjoyed the 'Class of 2006' Summative Project Brief (SPB) and understood the objectives of the project.

Most candidates attempted all aspects of the SPB with varying degrees of success. Effective use of feedback was rarely seen. It may well be that teachers are unsure of the difference between feedback and guidance.

Collaborative working is key feature of this unit and it was pleasing to see some good examples of effective teamwork.

It should be noted that the enterprise proposal is the focal point of this unit and should stand out when the moderator accesses the eportfolio for the first time.

### **Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project**

In this unit planning is a team activity. Each team should have an up-front, workable plan that identifies all the main tasks and sub-tasks, breaks them down into a logical order and allocates time to each of them. The plan should differentiate between team and individual tasks and indicate who is responsible for what. It should also differentiate between work to be completed in class and work to be done elsewhere.

Most candidates included a team plan that listed tasks and sub-tasks in a logical order. Some plans differentiated between team and individual tasks, but few actually stated who was responsible for what. Interim review points had been included in some plans, but the outcomes of these reviews were rarely shown. Contingency time had not been built in to many plans and where it had been incorporated it wasn't clear if it had been used and what for

The team plan is designed to work in conjunction with each team member's project diary. Together they should provide a comprehensive project history.

Most teams had used their plan to keep track of progress, although there was very little evidence of monitoring. Most candidates appear to have kept a project diary and the best ones gave a real 'feel' for what was going on and clarified who did what.

### **Strand (b) - Investigate an enterprise opportunity**

Each individual team member was expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea. A range of both primary and secondary sources should have been used to carry out this research. There was little evidence to suggest that candidates had approached potential customers to see what they thought of the potential enterprise idea and what there was was rarely detailed enough to enable the team to make sound decisions based upon it. Secondary sources were usually limited to the internet. In some instances, there was no indication of the sources used. It appeared that some candidates, and their teams, had decided what the final idea was going to be before carrying out any research. This completely defeated the object of the exercise.

Mind maps were produced by almost all candidates and time and effort had clearly gone into some of them. This was an improvement on the summer series.

Spreadsheet modelling was in the main simplistic and did not take into account all the factors that needed to be considered. Each team member was expected to produce a sufficiently complex spreadsheet model to enable the team to explore a range of options

and confidently use output from the model to inform their decision-making. This was rarely the case. Few candidates showed any understanding of the purpose of the model. Little thought had gone into designing the model so that it could be used by other team members by protecting formulae, using formatting features etc. In most cases, there was no evidence to suggest that the spreadsheet was capable of answering 'what if' questions.

With the addition of the Excel reader to the Moderator's Toolkit, most spreadsheet work could be viewed.

It was encouraging to see that team members did 'present' their findings to the team at a meeting designed to enable the team to make an informed decision about which enterprise idea to adopt. This is an improvement on the summer series. However, there were still a few instances where this did not occur and the team decided on the final idea because they liked it without considering whether it would work.

### **Strand (c) - Create a corporate image**

The SPB required the team to agree a set of principles before creating the corporate image. Each team member was expected to design a corporate image (logo, strapline, colour scheme, font style, contact details etc) for the enterprise and demonstrate it on a letterhead based on the agreed principles. However, whilst most candidates produced the letterhead there was no record of agreeing any principles beforehand.

It was encouraging to see that almost all candidates had included the individual letterhead this session although not all were annotated to explain the design.

The team had to agree and final corporate image and explain why it was chosen. Very few candidates included any explanation as to why the chosen image was selected or why the others were rejected.

The team then had to share out the task of producing a complete and consistent set of documents. This should have provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate team working, since each document had to conform to the agreed corporate image irrespective of who created it.

Most candidates produced a complete set of documents although few identified who in the team had created each one. Although it was pleasing to see a slight improvement in some documents, the invoice, receipt and agenda still lacked fitness for purpose. Candidates need to familiarise themselves with the layout and common elements of standard business documents before attempting to create their own. Candidates and teachers should be encouraged to provide feedback on the documents to improve the quality and consistency of the documents presented.

The use of templates was not so evident as in the summer series but where candidates had used them they still did not customise them appropriately to ensure fitness for purpose.

Where teams had spent the time reviewing each others' documents to make sure they were consistent and fit for purpose, the final set of documents produced was usually of a very high standard.

### **Strand (d) - Promote a product or service**

Each team member was expected to produce a three item promotional pack and contribute to the creation of the team's website to advertise their chosen product. Ideally, the team should have agreed a marketing strategy at the outset, so as to ensure that items produced by individual team members worked together as part of a

coordinated, targeted promotional campaign. In some instances the team produced a set of three items between them and this was not what was required.

The 'Class of 2006' was more evident for this session and this was pleasing to see. Most candidates had remembered what they were promoting but omitted important information, such as where and when the product would be on sale and how much it would cost. To enable candidates to produce quality promotional items they should be given to opportunity to study promotional materials produced by others to get ideas of their own.

The use of feedback, both by team members and the teacher is vital to allow the best products to be produced by the candidates. Evidence of testing or use of feedback was limited.

Candidates who performed best in this strand produced an effective set of promotional materials that made the audience keen to purchase the product advertised and aware of where to purchase it.

Where the team had worked collaboratively the promotional materials all followed the corporate look and had a very professional look to them.

The website was produced by all candidates but it was sometimes difficult to see what the contribution of each candidate was as there was no evidence to indicate who had done what. Some websites did not promote the product, as was required in the SPB, but the company as a whole.

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

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios which were easy to navigate but did not acknowledge that the focal point of the eportfolio for this unit was the Enterprise Proposal.

In most instances the proposal was poorly prepared and presented. The proposal was meant to introduce the team and provide details of the chosen product, the corporate image and promotional materials. It was also supposed to include the financial model for the chosen product. Very few candidates grasped the idea that the proposal had to sell the product to a potential sponsor and convince them that their product would be successful.

Some candidates submitted eportfolios with links that did not work and the moderator had to locate the evidence through the folder structure. In other instances it was evident that the CD that was submitted for moderation had not been tested on a standalone computer before posting as the majority of links were trying to find files on the candidates' school/college network and were therefore not visible to the moderator. In these cases it was inevitable that there was a large discrepancy between the centre and final moderator marks.

It was noticeable that centres had taken notice of the previous moderator's report as there were less files submitted in unacceptable file formats.

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

Candidates are expected to evaluate the enterprise proposal, the project process and their own performance, including their contribution to collaborative working, drawing on feedback they receive from others. They should also include sensible suggestions for improvement.

Most reviews sampled did not include any comments, evaluative or otherwise, on the enterprise proposal as most candidates had forgotten that this was in fact the focal point of their project.

The reviews in general appeared as an afterthought and did not show any evidence that a lot of thought had gone into them. Suggestions for improvements were either vague or non-existent. If a candidate is using a level 1 template they should adapt it accordingly to suit level 2.

Where candidates had kept a detailed diary throughout the project their reviews tended to be of a much higher quality.

Very few candidates remembered to include a review on the team's performance and their contribution to it. As this is a team unit, the ability to sensibly review the team's performance is vital.

For this SPB, the review is an individual document and not a team effort.

## DiDA Grade Boundaries for SPBs issued in September 2005(0905)

**(0905 SPBs: Unit 1 Make Space, Unit 2 Energise Your Life!,  
Unit 3 Get Set!, Unit 4 Celebrating the Class of 2006)**

### Unit 1

#### D101

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	31	25	19	13
Uniform boundary mark	42	36	30	24	18

#### D201

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	36	29	22	15
Uniform boundary mark	84	72	60	48	36

### Unit 2

#### D102

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	30	24	19	14
Uniform boundary mark	42	36	30	24	18

#### D202

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	31	26	21	16
Uniform boundary mark	84	72	60	48	36

### Unit 3

#### D103

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	30	24	18	13
Uniform boundary mark	42	36	30	24	18

#### D203

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	34	28	22	16
Uniform boundary mark	84	72	60	48	36

### Unit 4

#### D104

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	30	25	20	16
Uniform boundary mark	42	36	30	24	18

#### D204

Grade	Max. Mark	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass
Raw boundary mark	42	33	27	21	15
Uniform boundary mark	84	72	60	48	36

## 0905 SPB Grade Boundaries

### Level 1 Qualification Awards

Grade	Uniform mark total		
	AiDA Award	CiDA Award	DiDA Award
Pass	18	36	72
Credit	24	48	96
Merit	30	60	120
Distinction	36	72	144
Maximum	42	84	168

### Level 2 Qualification Awards

Grade	Uniform mark total		
	AiDA Award	CiDA Award	DiDA Award
Pass	36	72	144
Credit	48	96	192
Merit	60	120	240
Distinction	72	144	288
Maximum	84	168	336

## Notes

**Maximum Mark (Raw):** the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

**Boundary mark:** the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our  
Customer Services on 0870 240 9800  
or email: <http://enquiries.edexcel.org.uk>  
or visit our website: [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

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

**A PEARSON COMPANY**

