

Diploma in Digital Applications

AiDA/ CiDA / CiDA+ / DiDA

Summer 2007

Chief Moderator's 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.

Summer 2007
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2007

Contents

1.	Chief Moderator's Report	3
2.	D201 Principal Moderator's Report	7
3.	D101 Principal Moderator's Report	12
4.	D202 Principal Moderator's Report	16
5.	D102 Principal Moderator's Report	20
6.	D203 Principal Moderator's Report	23
7.	D103 Principal Moderator's Report	26
8.	D204 Principal Moderator's Report	29
9.	D104 Principal Moderator's Report	32
10.	Appendix: 2007 SPB Grade Boundaries	35

This is the Chief Moderator's report for the summer 2007 moderation window and relates to the moderators' findings for the 0905 and 0906 SPBs.

General Comments

Entry

The summer 2007 series was the largest DiDA series to date by a significant margin with over 125000 entries across the four units; 25% of these being at level 1. As expected, there was a large entry for D201 (56000) with the next most popular unit being D202 (17000) followed by D203 (13500). This is wholly consistent with most students claiming the Award or Certificate in Digital Applications. More than 63% of the entries for unit 1 were for candidates in year 11, as were 70.5% of the total entry for all units, with the 0906 SPB for unit 1 being the only entry where year 10 candidates exceeded those from year 11. In summer 2006 more than 67% of the unit 1 entry was from year 10, and the majority of entries for all other units were for candidates in year 12, following one year courses.

Standard

The general quality of the work submitted for moderation for this series indicated an overall improvement in standards from the summer 2006 series. The pass rates at both levels were consistent across the units and were higher than the previous series, as were the percentages of candidates achieving the higher grades, although the level and timing of entries were again main issues effecting overall achievement. As in previous reports it is 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 and in all units there were some examples of exceptional work.

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

At level 1, however, the assessment against the lower mark bands tended to be an area of disagreement, where it was found necessary to increase marks in many instances. At this level it was also apparent from the assessment record sheets that many centres are not giving as much guidance to candidates as they require in order to maximise their achievements.

In order to continue these overall improvements centres are asked to note the further assessment guidance to be published for the next series via the DiDA microsite (<http://dida.edexcel.org.uk/home/>) and are referred to the increasing number of exemplar eportfolios available from the OSCA pages of the secure area of 'Edexcel Online' and also to the training on delivery and assessment available via the national INSET programme (http://www.edexcel.org.uk/sfc/training/national_prog/)

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. As a consequence of this grade boundaries are subject to change.

As assessors become more 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 an SPB will remain unchanged throughout its lifetime. For the 0905 SPBs, this series, the grade boundaries for unit 1 set in January 2007 were re-confirmed and for the other units the grade boundaries from summer 2006 were re-applied.

The grade boundaries for the 0906 SPBs determined by the awarding committee for this series, together with a full listing of the unit results is reproduced in an Appendix to this report.

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 courier that required a signature. This is unnecessary and can cause delays when moderators are not available to sign for the sample.

The revised automated sample selection procedure, which did not request the highest and lowest samples, or allow for candidates withdrawing, caused some initial difficulties and needs to be improved. Most centres however overcame these difficulties and submitted correct samples of 10 eportfolios at each level, including their candidates with the highest and lowest marks. Centres are reminded that the highest and lowest candidates must always be provided along with a full sample even when these are not identified online as part of the requested sample. Refer to further guidance here: <http://dida.edexcel.org.uk/home/admin/mod/>

Most centres used marker pens and avoided attaching sticky labels to identify their CDs. A few centres submitted unmarked CDs in labelled boxes. This can cause problems during the moderation process where CDs may be passed between moderators and team leaders for sampling purposes. Some centres sent separate CDs for each candidate rather than burning all ten candidates' work onto one CD as instructed.

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

Some candidates failed to adhere to the technical specifications given in the SPBs and submitted evidence in inappropriate file formats and/or eportfolios which 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 with the centre's assessment.

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 a strand-by-strand breakdown of marks was not always provided. As in previous series 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 ARS proved particularly useful at level 1 in identifying the amount of guidance given to candidates, although 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, where the accuracy of assessment varied 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 marks recorded on the system and those recorded on the assessor record sheets. In these instances the online mark was used for moderation purposes.

Copyright

In this series candidates were not penalised at moderation for non-adherence to legal requirements and moderators were instructed to reinstate marks where centres had obviously penalised their candidates under this heading. Further assessment guidance is to be issued regarding adherence to legal requirements via the DiDA microsite.

D201: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 56124 candidates were entered for this unit, 41115 of these for the 0905 SPB and 15009 for the 0906 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 69.8% and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 8.7% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 71.9% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 3.9% of the total entry as absent. Greater experience and familiarity with the requirements of the SPB resulted in pass rates for 'Make Space' being approximately 13% higher than for 'Check it out'.

Candidates appear to have found both the 0905 'Make Space' SPB and the 0906 'Check it out' SPB to be accessible and relevant. The requirements of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by the majority of candidates and some very effective publications were seen. The more successful eportfolios included clearly presented evidence of background research and analysis that had been used to inform the content of the final publications.

In many cases, candidates obtained feedback only on their final publications and therefore they were not able to take advantage of any suggestions for improvements from test users. In future some greater emphasis on prototyping and testing should lead to improvement of the final outcomes and therefore help to raise levels of achievement.

Most candidates submitted functional eportfolios, although the potential of the context pages, to provide commentary relating the outcomes to their intended audience and purpose, was not always realised.

In general 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

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 often seen which did not add to the usefulness of the plans.

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

Plans in simple table formats were the most successful, although, as in previous series, several candidates opted to produce their plans as Gantt charts. These were not always easy to view on screen and in some cases, where it was difficult to relate the timelines to the tasks, appear to have discouraged use of the plan to track and communicate progress. Several candidates failed to provide a key to the colour coding they had used on their plans.

Some candidates, however, did achieve full marks for this strand. These 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 (b) - Select and capture information from a variety of sources

The data collection tasks of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by most candidates, with many examples of well designed and tested questionnaires for 0905 and many well formatted data sheets for 0906.

The use and recording of other primary sources was more variable, with some candidates, particularly for 0905, using a wide range of primary sources, including interviews, photographs and drawings. There were also several examples for 0906 where primary images had been obtained for use on the digital posters and makeover cards. Where candidates had gathered a range of primary information this tended to be relevant and fully acknowledged, however other candidates omitted to acknowledge any primary sources, even when some had been selected for the final publications.

The clear opportunities for secondary research provided by the 0905 SPB allowed many candidates to gain high marks in this strand, particularly where a range of sources had been acknowledged and used to inform 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.

Very 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. 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 moderators' toolkit.

Spreadsheet. The nature of the spreadsheet work required by the two SPBs was very different, with the 0906 brief requiring some modelling, as opposed to the statistical analysis required by the 0905 survey. The comments made by the Principal Moderator

in June 2006 regarding the spreadsheet for the 0905 SPB remain relevant and are summarised below.

Candidates were often limited in the scope of their data analysis by the questionnaire they had created. Some of the questions they asked elicited open answers which could not be properly analysed in a spreadsheet. Analysis tended to be simple, eg what activity was the most popular, what day was preferred etc, although some candidates did compare the responses of girls and boys, they rarely 'drilled down' any further, for example to explore the responses of difference age groups. In many cases, the charts produced to communicate findings from the survey were poor with vital elements such as axes labels or titles often omitted.

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 addition of a spreadsheet viewer to the moderators' toolkit enabled assessors and moderators to use the models created by the candidates. This allowed the functionality of the model to be readily appreciated and was a considerable improvement over viewing static screen shots.

Databases. Most candidates made good use of screen shots to evidence their database work and in some cases these had been concisely annotated to highlight the more important features of the work. Many candidates provided all the information required by the SPBs, although there were several instances where important evidence, such as queries in design view, had been omitted or was not clear. Data entry forms, where required, tended to be customised, with some good examples incorporating user instructions, control buttons and combo boxes.

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

The comments made by the Principal Moderator for this unit in June 2006 regarding the publications for the 0905 SPB remain relevant and are summarised below.

The information point was generally tackled well, with most candidates demonstrating, at least, some awareness of audience and purpose. In some instances, the quality of the final publications were let down by poor proofreading, omission of important information and/or inclusion of unnecessary and inappropriate animations. A significant number of candidates used presentation software to create their information point. Many of these candidates used features of the software such as timed animation that would have been suitable for a scrolling presentation but were inappropriate for a navigable information point.

Many candidates produced good newsletters. However, some would have benefited from looking at existing newsletters first to get an idea of the type of format/layout that is appropriate before attempting to produce one of their own. Some newsletters were full of information about Make Space, but hardly mentioned the chosen activity or the new club.

Some candidates failed to realise that the database reports were publications in their own right and omitted them altogether or included only screenshots, some of which were so poor that the contents could not be read at all. Many candidates did not appear to have understood the purpose of the reports i.e. to demonstrate the

potential of the database. Use of inappropriate titles and column headings, truncated data and the inclusion of unnecessary or repeated fields was common.

With regards to the 0906 SPB the increased range of publications did not appear to cause candidates any difficulty, with nearly all candidates submitting a complete set of publications and the majority including at least some publications completed to a good standard.

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, but in many instances the layout and content problems noted above for the 0905 SPB reports were repeated.

Food makeover cards. Most candidates complied with the requirements for size and content for the makeover cards and some very good examples were presented, particularly where some consistency in design had been incorporated. 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, although many were more colourful than suggested. 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. A few candidates presented their sequence of posters successfully as masked animated movies.

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, frequently containing spelling errors, which detracted from the overall quality of the work when left uncorrected.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Candidates are expected to carry out a comprehensive review of the project, considering the 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.

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

D101: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 24230 candidates were entered for this unit, 17424 of these for the 0905 SPB and 6806 for the 0906 SPB. The overall pass rate of 66.4% is higher than that achieved in the previous series, although there remains scope for further improvement. There was also some improvement in the rates for the higher grades, with 11.5% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 70.7% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 6% of the total entry as absent.

Most candidates had therefore taken some 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 are relying on peers for feedback on publications which tends not to contain constructive advice but general comments that are unlikely to move the work on.

Most of the 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 justifying the equivalence with the level 2 pass grade.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Despite extensive use of the scaffolding documents provided via the SPBs many candidates would have benefited from greater guidance with planning to ensure that they had 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, and communicate progress.

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

As for level 2 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 examples of well designed questionnaires incorporating the given questions for 0905 and many well formatted data sheets, based on the template provided, for 0906.

The use and recording of other primary sources was generally missing, with most 0905 candidates omitting to acknowledge the original photographs used in their presentation and most 0906 candidates overlooking the requirement to include a primary image on the recipe card holder.

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 moderators' toolkit.

Spreadsheet. The nature of the spreadsheet work required by the two SPBs was very different, with the 0906 brief requiring some modelling, as opposed to the simple analysis required by the 0905 survey. The comments made by the Principal Moderator in June 2006 regarding the spreadsheet for the 0905 SPB remain relevant and are summarised below.

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. 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.

With regards to the 0906 spreadsheet work, again most candidates repeated the design of the model provided in the brief, with very few extending this design to include any additional features or functions. Some of the models had been well formatted, although there remained general scope for improvement in the presentation of the spreadsheets. The addition of the spreadsheet viewer to the moderators' toolkit enabled the functionality of the models to be more readily assessed than the previous static screen shots.

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

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

The comments made by the Principal Moderator for this unit in June 2006, regarding the publications for the 0905 SPB remain relevant and are summarised below.

Leaflet. Many candidates produced colourful leaflets that contained most of the required information. 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. 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

called into question the candidates' sense of purpose for the publication.

Database reports. As for level 2 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 with truncated fieldnames and/or data.

With regards to the 0906 SPB the increase in the range of publications did not appear to cause candidates any difficulty, with most candidates submitting a complete set of publications and the majority including at least some publications completed to a good standard.

Fruity recipe cards. The majority of candidates complied with the requirements for size and content for the recipe cards, although many A4 cards were submitted. 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. In general, however, the holders were not well done, with very few candidates including the required primary image and many apparently misunderstanding what was required. These candidates may have benefited from seeing similar, completed, holders prior to undertaking this task.

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

Fruit fact results. Many candidates presented the four database reports specified in the SPB and this task generally produced better outcomes than the corresponding task at level 2, where the search conditions were unspecified. Several candidates did, however, have difficulty relating the search criteria to the correct students from the survey and in some instances the layout and content problems noted above for the 0905 SPB reports were repeated.

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. In many cases the charts had not been checked prior to publication, with examples of unnecessary legends and errors in titles and axes labels

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. Fewer candidates submitted evidence in unsuitable file formats and fewer oversized eportfolios were seen. 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 and colour and some of images to introduce their evidence, with most including some introductory comments on their context pages, although some simply linked evidence to buttons on a navigation bar without any introduction.

The majority of the candidates demonstrated at least some awareness of audience and purpose in their eportfolios, although examples of weak page designs with extreme colour schemes and difficult to view text were submitted.

In general any adjustments made in this strand at moderation tended to result in marks being increased rather than reduced.

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

D202: Multimedia

Overall

A total of 16974 candidates were entered for this unit, 10954 of these for the 0905 SPB and 6020 for the 0906 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 70.2% and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 14.8% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 63.4% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 2.5% of the total entry as absent.

Some very good multimedia products were seen for both SPBs. In particular those candidates who opted for the 0906 SPB 'Crack the Code' appeared to enjoy producing the game and its component parts and some excellent games were presented for moderation.

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.

In general plans had improved in this moderation window compared to those seen in the past. Plans submitted by candidates often 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 where appropriate. In many candidates' work, these tasks and sub-tasks were in a logical order, for example including "designing" and "storyboarding" before the creation of the products. Often, however, gathering assets was seen very early in the plan and some candidates failed to allow for design work, or testing and refinement.

A large proportion of candidates are now allocating sensible timings to the tasks and sub-tasks within their plans and some candidates are using their plans effectively to track their progress. In many cases comments on progress had been added to the plans and there was some good use of diaries or project logs to provide more detailed commentary, although few candidates presented clear evidence of efficient time management.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

It was disappointing that the designs for both the 0905 and the 0906 SPBs demonstrated very little improvement overall in this moderation window to those seen previously.

Many candidates produced outline designs and there was a minority of candidates who produced very good up-front designs that were detailed enough to allow the final product to be visualised and included detailed comments about the design decisions. It was clear that these candidates had spent time, thinking through their ideas, getting feedback from others and refining their proposals. However, many designs were simplistic representations of layout with little or no indication of fonts, colours or navigation and no explanation of their design decisions.

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 images of the finished product or timings accurate to a tenth of a second or less. In these cases the design appeared to be an afterthought rather than integral part of the project 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. In some instances, however, assets from secondary sources had been used in their entirety, with only basic cropping and resizing having taken place. Some candidates simply gathered assets and made no attempt at preparing or repurposing them for their final products. Editing in many cases was inferred rather than explicitly evidenced. Candidates should be encouraged to note what editing they have done and why.

Whilst most candidates attempted to acknowledge their sources many failed to provide the full URL of websites used and many attributed assets to search engines such as Google. 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.

Many candidates ignored copyright issues or assumed that permission was not needed. Candidates occasionally provided evidence that they had asked for permission, but relatively few actually obtained permission to use a protected asset. Candidates should be encouraged to use copyright free sources.

Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products

0905 SPB

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

Many candidates aimed all 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 were consistent with 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 contain sound or loop.

Movie. Many of the movies submitted had not been designed to promote the E-Learning package and had been aimed at their peers, rather than teachers and were therefore lacking a clear audience and purpose. The quality of sound was also poor in many movies.

E-Learning package. Most candidates completed the E-Learning Package as a website, although a number were completed, often less successfully, as slideshow presentations. Many candidates produced a product that was an information source

rather than a teaching aid. Very few encompassed the multimedia theme of the unit. Many packages tended to be functional, consisting of a few linked web pages with limited use of multimedia or interactivity.

Presentation. Many good presentations were seen, although some candidates produced presentations that were not suitable for the intended audience of primary school pupils. Often there was too much text to be read as a scrolling presentation.

Although most candidates did appear to have asked test users for feedback on their products during the development process, frequently the comments they received, mainly from peers, were superficial and had little or no impact on product development. Where useful feedback had been obtained, it often had not been used to enhance the quality of the products.

0906 SPB

Moderators saw some outstanding examples of work for this brief, with some superb use of animation software. Some very good games, which used web pages and embedded movies, were presented. Many candidates showed a better awareness of audience and purpose for this brief and there was more creativity and use of multimedia. Some candidates, in their talking heads movie, dressed up, used props and appropriate backgrounds. There were some delightful games and candidates had obviously enjoyed working on them and developing their skills. Centres should not award marks for the candidates being able to demonstrate their skill in a complex software package rather than meeting the requirements of the SPB.

Some candidates had chosen a presentation package as their preferred software for producing some or all of the required content. Some of this work was poorly organised, consisting of very many linked files and often containing only one slide.

Some candidates, whilst able to produce the game in part or its entirety, did not address the correct audience, particularly at level 2 where the target audience was that of young children.

Splash screen. A number 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 sections of the game. A number of candidates omitted to include a code sheet that could be printed by the player, for use whilst playing the game.

Level 1. Most candidates produced good outcomes for this level. However, some candidates did not restrict themselves to the use of still images only and the sound quality of some of the movies was poor.

Level 2. Candidates produced talking heads videos with a range of outcomes, some excellent. Some however, 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 was the weakest of the levels produced by the candidates. Many seemed to have run out of time and/or inspiration and produced puzzles that were technically competent, but did allow the user to collect the code.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

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. However, 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 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.

Some candidates used presentation software to produce their eportfolios with variable success. Whilst any suitable software can be used to create the eportfolio, presentation software is not ideal.

Strand (f) - Review the project

The ability of candidates to produce a comprehensive review, covering all of the required areas, has improved in this series. Many of the reviews are now more complete in their scope and more evaluative in their content, although valid suggestions for improvement were again missing from the majority of the reviews submitted for moderation.

D102: Multimedia

Overall

A total of 3084 candidates were entered for this unit, 1789 for the 0905 SPB and 1295 for the 0906 SPB. The overall pass rate of 65.4% 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 11.6% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 59.4% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 10.9% of the total entry as absent.

As for level 2 candidates appear to have found the 'Energise Your Life!' SPB interesting and relevant. Some very good multimedia products were seen. Those candidates who opted for the 0906 SPB 'Crack the Code' appeared to enjoy producing the game and its component parts and some excellent games were seen.

A number of level 1 candidates, whilst able to produce the functional components of 'Crack the Code', found some difficulty in putting the levels and the other requirements of the game together to form a complete product.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

In general plans had improved this moderation window compared to those seen in the past. Most candidates achieved some marks in this strand using the template and scaffolding documents provided in the SPB. The submitted plans often demonstrated a realistic understanding of the project objectives.

Some candidates had used formats for their plans other than the tabular format provided such as Gantt Charts or Project Management software. Whilst using other formats is totally acceptable candidates who used a tabular format seemed better able to use their plan to communicate progress.

Most candidates allocated sensible timings to the tasks and sub-tasks within their plans and some candidates made effective use of their plans to track their progress.

It did appear, for a minority of candidates, that the plan was only considered as an afterthought rather than as an essential part of the project process and there was often no evidence that the plans has been agreed with the line manager. In these instances the candidates would have benefited from greater guidance to ensure that they had a workable plan from the onset that would help them to organise their progress.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

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

It was disappointing that the designs for both SPBs showed very little improvement in this moderation window to those seen previously. Whilst many candidates were able to produce outline designs 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.

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

Many assets tables seen at level 1, 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. Whilst this is not a requirement 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 used 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. The raw video footage shot for level 2 of the game was often missing.

Strand (d) - Develop multimedia products

0905 SPB

Many candidates produced excellent products that were fit for both audience and purpose, although again some products had been produced using inappropriate software and/or without the candidate having the necessary skills.

Movie. 'Movie Maker' had been used by the majority of candidates to good effect. The movies created generally had appropriate styles of presentation and incorporated a range of assets likely to encourage young people to look at the web pages. However, some candidates had produced movies which were very small in screen size and very difficult to see. Some candidates had converted their movie files into 'Flash' files. Whilst this is admirable as the resultant file size is much smaller the final movies were often very pixelated and difficult to see.

E-Learning package. Most candidates created their web pages with web authoring software; however it was disappointing to see that some candidates were still using presentation software, with varying degrees of success. Some candidates merely copied and pasted large chunks of inappropriate text and images from external websites and some did not include clickable thumbnail images as required by the SPB, but provided text hyperlinks or buttons instead.

Presentation. Many good slideshow presentations were seen, although some candidates produced presentations that were very text heavy.

0906 SPB

Moderators saw some very good examples of work for this brief at this level, with some very good use of animation software. Many candidates showed a better awareness of audience and purpose for this brief and there was more creativity and use of multimedia. Again centres must be careful not to award marks for the candidates being able to demonstrate skill in a complex software package rather than meeting the requirements of the SPB.

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, 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 weakest of the levels, with many candidates apparently running out of time and/or inspiration for the production of their guessing games.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

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

Some candidates used presentation software to produce their eportfolios with variable success. Whilst any suitable software can be used to create the eportfolio, presentation software is not ideal.

Strand (f) - Review the project

The standard of the candidates' end of project reviews was improved this series, with most making use of the scaffolding documents available via the SPB, although with varying degrees of success, some only ticking boxes without adding any further comment.

D203: Graphics

Overall

A total of 13672 candidates were entered for this unit, 8052 for the 0905 SPB 'Get Set for 2012' and 5620 for the 0906 SPB 'Come to the Fair!'. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 69.7%, with 11.7% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 64.9% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 4.2% of the total entry as absent.

It is clear from the number of centres that were in tolerance 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.

Completion of the elements table remains an issue as some candidates do not appear to understand the difference between a primary and secondary source and how to acknowledge the latter. Candidates should be encouraged to use their skills to produce original graphical elements unless the SPB specifically states that secondary sources should be used, this will normally result in higher marks for stands (b) and (c).

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

There was some general improvement in the content and layout of the candidates' plans. However some candidates had clearly produced a plan that was rarely revisited and which had apparently been completed at the end of the project. Centres are reminded that to gain full marks in this strand candidates should have used and updated their plan throughout the project. Any changes to estimated times, or of the order in which tasks are completed should be recorded, together with information on how the changes will be managed.

Some centres are still using Gantt charts which, although not specifically incorrect, are difficult to read and interpret on screen and often do not contain sufficient information to access the higher mark bands.

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

Both SPBs required the candidates to produce a logo and some imaginative and well designed logos were produced, however there was still a significant number of candidates who produced logos using bitmap software or a combination of bitmap and vector software when the requirements of the SPB mean that only vector tools should be used, as the logo must be scaleable. 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.

Other than the logo, the main opportunity for the use of vector tools in the 0905 SPB was the 2D drawing of the gift bag net, this was often well done and photographs of the assembled bag were often included that proved that the net would actually work.

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 the marks they gained in this strand.

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

In the 0905 SPB the main opportunity for demonstrating the use of bitmap-based tools to develop images is the web page and some excellent work was seen although there are still some centres where candidates are not using primary sources for this product.

In the 0906 SPB the representations of the banner, wristband and the CD case afforded candidates excellent opportunities to demonstrate their use of bitmap tools to edit images from secondary and primary sources and many candidates took full advantage of these opportunities and produced some very good images.

To make sure candidates are awarded good marks for editing an image they need to show the moderator how the original image differs from the edited photograph which is why both SPBs ask for annotated thumbnails. Candidates should show the images before editing and indicate what changes they made using brief annotations.

Centres should check that candidates are following the requirements of the SPBs by using primary sources such as photographs where 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 some very good work was seen for both SPBs. However candidates from some centres failed to recognise that the 0905 SPB is for the Get Set for 2012! campaign not for the actual London Olympics, similarly 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 in both cases.

0905 SPB

The medal was often well done although some candidates did not meet the requirements of the SPB by failing to make the medal gold or missing an element such as the date.

Several candidates did not include a graphic image representing the Fun Run on the T-shirt and /or did not include a visual link between the T-shirt and the gift bag. To gain high marks in strands (b) and/or (c) candidates should be encouraged to add a graphic image which they have created or edited rather than using an unedited existing image such as clipart or an image from the internet.

0906 SPB

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 creation of an original 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 which 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, the representations were particularly impressive. Some candidates failed to realise that the wristband, including the logo, should be one colour.

CD case and cover. 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 produced 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, which was sometimes the case.

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.

Strand (e) - Exhibit work in an eportfolio

A higher number of candidates produced functional and easy to use eportfolios that were within the specified file size and included only acceptable file types than in previous series. Most eportfolios contained working links to the required evidence which indicated that some effective functional testing had taken place.

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

To gain high marks in this strand candidates should consider the extent to which their final products meet the project objectives by making some evaluative comments on them. They should also consider the contribution of the underlying processes and the effectiveness of their own performance. The review should also include some valid suggestions for improvement and feedback on their finished products.

In this series there was an increase in the number of candidates who met these requirements. However some candidates limited their marks by presenting a narrative review which listed actions taken but was not evaluative.

D103: Graphics

Overall

A total of 2008 candidates were entered for this unit, 1136 for the 0905 SPB 'Get Set for 2012' and 872 for the 0906 SPB 'Come to the Fair!'. The overall pass rate of 64% is higher than that achieved in the previous series, with 11.3% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 59% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 11.2% of the total entry as absent.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

In general, compared to previous series, candidates made better use of the scaffolding documents provided, although some centres encouraged their candidates to produce their own individual plans. Many candidates also included an informative project log in their eportfolios which gave additional useful information on progress.

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

Both SPBs required the candidates to produce a logo and some imaginative and well designed logos were produced, however there is still a significant number of students who have 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.

Other than the logo, the main opportunity for the use of vector tools in the 0905 SPB was the 2D drawing of the drawstring bag, this was often well done although a significant number of candidates produced a drawing of the completed bag when the SPB states that the drawing should show the bag design before it is folded and stitched.

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

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

The main opportunity to use bitmap tools to develop images in 0905 SPB was the presentation on the Wheelie Race. The representations of the banner, the web advert and the CD cover in the 0906 SPB also afforded candidates 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. To achieve high marks in this strand candidates must do more than simply crop or resize images.

To make sure candidates are awarded high marks for editing images they need to show the moderator how the original image differs from the edited photograph. Candidates should show the images before editing and indicate what changes they made using brief annotations.

Centres should check that candidates are following the requirements of the SPBs by using primary sources such as photographs where 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 some very good work was seen for both SPBs. However candidates from some centres failed to recognise that the 0905 SPB is for the Get Set for 2012! campaign not for the actual London Olympics. The products and logo for the 0906 SPB should be for the Welcome Fair and not for the school or college generally.

0905 SPB

The medal and presentation were often well done although some candidates produced medals which resembled badges as there was no depth to the image or no embossing effect used. Candidates who produced good presentations had met the requirements of the SPB by using and editing images from primary sources rather than using secondary sources. The net for the drawstring bag was often the weakest product as candidates had drawn the finished bag rather than a net with a scale and dimensions.

0906 SPB

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 and some were excellent. 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 which met the requirements of the SPB. Some candidates failed to use photos which 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 photo on both products.

Strand (e) Exhibit work in an eportfolio

A higher number of candidates produced functional and easy to use eportfolios which were within the specified file size and included only acceptable file types than in previous series.

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

Most candidates made good use of the scaffolding template provided via the SPBs, although candidates should be encouraged to add their own comments to the review rather than just 'ticking boxes'.

D204: ICT in Enterprise

Overall

A total of 8481 candidates were entered for this unit, 4634 for the 0905 SPB (Class of 2006/7) and 3847 for the 0906 SPB (Cash 4 Kids). This unit produced an overall pass rate of 72.1% and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 15.9% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 72.6% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 7.6% of the total entry as absent.

The quality of the work produced was generally better than previous series and it was encouraging to see some good examples of collaborative working. 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.

It was very pleasing to note many examples where 'the proposal' had been made the focal point of the eportfolio.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

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.

Most candidates included good plans with detailed lists of main tasks and sub tasks and designated responsibilities for each team member. Most candidates had included some comments on progress on the plans and many had used the project diary to record further details. In some good examples the diaries included explanations for changes in timings, cross referenced to an updated version of the plan.

As in previous series a detailed diary tended to support a comprehensive final review.

Strand (b) - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For both SPBs each candidate was expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea for a product or an event, using a range of both primary and secondary sources. In general there was little evidence that candidates had tested their ideas on potential customers and therefore findings were rarely detailed enough to enable the team to make sound decisions, based on the research.

Secondary sources were usually limited to the internet. Some candidates provided a list of web addresses, without indicating what information was found and where this was used in the project. It was also apparent that some teams had decided on their final idea before carrying out any investigation.

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

Spreadsheet modelling 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. Unfortunately the candidates that demonstrated this level of understanding of modelling were in the minority.

Many candidates had taken the opportunity to include their spreadsheets so they could be viewed by the assessor and moderator in the viewer rather than in .pdf format. This enabled the standard of the work to be more readily assessed.

Strand (c) - Create a corporate identity

The SPB 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. However, whilst most candidates produced an individual design there was often no record of the team's agreement of any principles. Candidates should evidence their own design in the eportfolio and identify this for the moderator.

Most teams agreed the final identity but few provided any justification of their selection or explanation as to why other proposals had been rejected.

The teams also 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 did not identify who in the team had created each one.

The documents for the 0906 SPB tended to be fit for purpose and of a better standard than the documents produced for the 0905 SPB. 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.

It was evident in this series that where templates had been used these tended to be customised appropriately to be fit for purpose and consistent with the other documents.

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.

Ideally the team should have agreed a marketing strategy from the outset, so as to ensure that items produced by individual team members worked together as part of a co-ordinated, targeted promotional campaign. In some instances the team incorrectly produced a set of three items between them.

Most candidates were aware that they were promoting - Class of 2006/7 or Cash 4 Kids - but many items did not promote the product/event but just included the name of the enterprise and the logo.

Some items did not lend themselves to presenting detail about the product/event e.g. key-rings, pens, pencils etc. although these smaller items were often well used to promote the website address and thereby provide access to more details.

Where posters had been used they were an improvement on previous series and tended to contain necessary details such as where the product could be bought/where the event was taking place, how much the product cost/how much tickets cost, where the product could be purchased/where the tickets could be bought and when the event was taking place.

For the 0905 SPB the candidates' individual set of three items should have been evidenced along with the team's website.

For the 0906 SPB the candidates' own items along with the complete set from the whole team should have been evidenced in addition to the team's website. This was not always the case with many candidates not including the items that other team members had produced. Where the complete set was included 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, although few candidates indicated the contribution of each individual team member and some teams did not include enough information to enable someone to buy the product or attend the event. The focus of some of the websites was the promotion of the team and not of the actual product/event. This is not what was required.

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

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios which were easy to navigate and 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. However, the required introduction to the team and the justification of the selected product/event were often omitted.

Many candidates did not demonstrate an understanding that the purpose of the proposal was to sell the idea to a potential sponsor and convince them that the product/event would be a success.

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.

In general reviews appeared to have been rushed at the end of the project and many lacked evaluative content, although where candidates had completed a detailed diary throughout the project their reviews tended to be of a higher quality.

D104: ICT in Enterprise

Overall

A total of 1019 candidates were entered for this unit, 319 for the 0905 SPB and 700 for the 0906 SPB. The overall pass rate of 62.8% is higher than that achieved in the previous series and 11.3% of the candidates achieved the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 61.7% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 12.7% of the total entry as absent.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Most candidates achieved marks in this strand. Using the scaffolding document provided in the SPB, they produced an initial team plan that listed the main tasks and some sub tasks in a reasonably logical order. Timings were not always sensible. Some candidates had included progress comments on the plans and had indicated which tasks had been completed.

Diaries were completed by some candidates, with most using the scaffolding document provided.

It is acceptable for teachers to help teams with the creation of the plan and where this was evident the teams tended to be more successful in their use of the plan to track progress.

Strand b - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For both SPBs each candidate was expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea for a product or an event, using a range of both primary and secondary sources. In general there was little evidence that candidates had tested their ideas on potential customers and therefore findings were rarely detailed enough to enable the team to make sound decisions, based on the research.

Secondary sources were usually limited to the internet. Some candidates provided a list of web addresses, without indicating what information was found and where this was used in the project. It was also apparent that some teams had decided on their final idea before carrying out any investigation.

Mind maps were produced by most candidates and these tended 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, without any attempt at customisation or improvement. However some candidates did use formatting tools to improve the presentation of the model.

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 about which enterprise idea to adopt. However, there were some instances where this did not occur and the team decided on the final idea because they liked it without any consideration of viability.

Strand (c) - Create a corporate identity

The SPB required the team 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 strap line. Candidates must evidence their own design in the eportfolio and identify this for the moderator.

Most teams agreed the final identity but few provided 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 although many did not identify who in the team had created each one.

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 event/product.

Most candidates demonstrated an awareness of what they were required to promote - Class of 2006/7 or Cash 4 Kids, although many items did not promote the product/event but just included the name of the enterprise and the logo.

Some items did not lend themselves to presenting detail about the product/event e.g. key-rings, pens, pencils etc. although these smaller items were often well used to promote the website address and thereby provide access to more details. Where posters had been used they were an improvement on previous series and tended to contain all necessary information.

For the 0905 SPB the candidates' individual set of three items should have been evidenced along with the team's website.

For the 0906 SPB the candidates' own items along with the complete set from the whole team should have been evidenced in addition to the team's website. This was not always the case with many candidates not including the items that other team members had produced. Where the complete set was included 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, although few candidates indicated the contribution of each individual team member and some teams did not include enough information to enable someone to buy the product or attend the event. Unfortunately the focus of some of the websites was the promotion of the team and not of the actual product/event, as required.

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

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios which were reasonably easy to navigate and acknowledged that the focal point of the eportfolio was the Proposal.

Proposals usually contained the set of business documents, the promotional items and the website along with the financial model for the chosen enterprise event/product. However, the introduction to the team and the justification of the selection of the event/product were often missing.

Strand f - Carry out an end of project review

Most candidates completed the review document provided. For the 0905 SPB they tended to put ticks in the boxes and add only brief comments and for the 0906 SPB candidates tended to complete the comment boxes with a repeat of the question.

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

Appendix: DiDA Grade boundaries - Summer 2007 results

Grade boundaries for SPB 0905 remain as they were for the Winter 2006/7 series. SPB 0906 was Awarded for the first time in Summer 2007 and the results are indicated below. SPB 0905 results have been included in the tables below for reference.

Note that the data in this document is relevant to the Summer 2007 results only.

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 [SPB0905 17424 candidates, SPB0906 6806 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	12	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	31	25	19	13	7	0
Cumulative % of cands	12.3	25.9	46.4	69.1	81.9	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	31	25	19	13	7	0
Cumulative % of cands	9.6	21.5	39.1	59.5	74.9	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cands	11.5	24.7	44.3	66.4	80.0	100.0

D201 - Using ICT [SPB0905 41115 candidates, SPB0906 15009 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	24	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	15	8	0
Cumulative % of cands	1.2	8.4	31.4	73.4	83.5	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	10	0
Cumulative % of cands	1.7	9.3	29.3	60.0	75.0	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cands	1.3	8.7	30.8	69.8	81.3	100.0

D102 - Multimedia [SPB0905 1789 candidates, SPB0906 1295 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	12	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	30	24	19	14	9	0
Cumulative % of cand	11.5	25.5	43.5	62.1	74.4	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	30	24	19	14	9	0
Cumulative % of cand	11.8	31.4	50.5	69.7	81.2	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	11.6	28.0	46.4	65.3	77.2	100.0

D202 - Multimedia [SPB0905 10954 candidates, SPB0906 6020 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	24	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	11	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.6	14.6	36.0	70.2	83.9	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	11	0
Cumulative % of cand	4.4	15.2	34.8	70.1	84.0	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	4.5	14.8	35.6	70.2	83.9	100.0

D103 - Graphics [SPB0905 1136 candidates, SPB0906 872 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	12	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	30	24	18	13	8	0
Cumulative % of cand	10.6	27.6	53.3	69.5	80.9	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	15	10	0
Cumulative % of cand	9.5	21.7	39.2	57.0	70.0	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	10.1	25.0	47.2	64.0	76.1	100.0

D203 - Graphics [SPB0905 8052 candidates, SPB0906 5620 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	24	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	16	10	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.0	13.3	37.2	71.0	82.6	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	10	0
Cumulative % of cand	1.5	9.4	32.4	68.0	79.4	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	2.3	11.7	35.2	69.7	81.3	100.0

D104 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0905 319 candidates, SPB0906 700 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	12	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	16	12	0
Cumulative % of cand	12.2	28.8	47.0	63.9	74.9	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	11	0
Cumulative % of cand	10.9	26.0	43.4	62.3	73.0	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	11.3	26.9	44.6	62.8	73.6	100.0

D204 - ICT in Enterprise [SPB0905 4634 candidates, SPB0906 3847 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	N	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	24	0
0905						
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	15	9	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.9	16.9	41.9	71.5	83.5	100.0
0906						
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	11	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.7	14.6	41.2	73.0	84.0	100.0
Overall						
Cumulative % of cand	3.8	15.9	41.6	72.1	83.7	100.0

* All cumulative % of candidate data as at 31/07/2007.

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

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

A PEARSON COMPANY

