

Diploma in Digital Applications

AiDA/ CiDA/ DiDA

Summer 2008

Moderators' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners. For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

January 2008
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

1.	Chief Moderator's Report	4
2.	D101 Moderators' Report	9
3.	D201 Moderators' Report	12
4.	D202 Moderators' Report	15
5.	D203 Moderators' Report	18
6.	D204 Moderators' Report	21
7.	January 2008 SPB Grade Boundaries	24

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication.

This is the Chief Moderator's report for the January 2008 moderation window and relates to the moderators' findings for the 0905 and 0906 SPBs. This window was the final opportunity to submit work for the 0905 SPB.

General Comments

Entry

The January 2008 series followed the cycle of previous years and attracted an entry approximately 30 % of the Summer 2007 series. There were over 39000 entries across the four units; 18 % of these being at level 1. As expected, there was a relatively large entry for D201 (25500) with the next most popular unit being D101 (6000), followed by D203 (3200) and D202 (3100). The entries are indicative of candidates following a one year course and submitting their first unit and of candidates following a two year CiDA course having delayed the submission of their first unit until their second year.

Apart from D101 the entry for the level 1 units was relatively small, being only 2 % of the overall total. Given the low numbers involved it has not been possible to draw any generalised points for D102, D103 AND D104 from the moderation of this work, although the comments made by the Principal Moderators in the June 2007 report regarding these units remain relevant.

Standard

The general quality of the work submitted for moderation for this series was consistent with the overall improvement achieved in the summer 2007 series. The pass rates were relatively consistent across the units, as were the percentages of candidates achieving the higher grades. At both levels and in all units there were some examples of exceptional work.

The level of agreement between centre assessors and Edexcel moderators was also in line with the Summer 2007 series, with the assessment guidance, use of walkthrough documents and general level of experience with the qualification all contributing to improved accuracy of assessment.

In order to continue these improvements centres are referred to the 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.

Awarding

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

As assessors become more familiar with the standard and with the holistic approach to assessment and as centres' internal moderation processes 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 and for the other units the grade boundaries from summer 2006 were re-confirmed.

The grade boundaries for the 0906 SPBs determined by the awarding committee for the Summer 2007 series were also re-confirmed

Administration

Submission of eportfolio samples

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

The automated sample selection procedure, which does not specifically request the highest and lowest examples, or allow for candidates withdrawing, again caused some difficulties, although the vast majority of centres did submit correct samples of at least 10 eportfolios at each level, by adding their candidates with the highest and lowest marks and making substitutions for absentees where necessary

In most cases candidates' work was easily accessible from the CD and most eportfolios had a clearly named index or home page, although in some cases the 'way in' was more difficult to find. As in previous series some eportfolios retained 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 again reminded that eportfolios are viewed using the Moderator's Toolkit, details and links to downloads for 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.

It is essential at level 1 to use the ARS to identify the amount of guidance given to candidates. Some centres indicated the level of guidance as required, but disregarded this when allocating marks.

Internal moderation

It was more evident this series that some centres had not carried out an effective internal moderation before submitting marks to Edexcel. In instances where the accuracy of assessment varied significantly between assessors the overall moderation outcome was adversely affected by the inaccurate examples.

Submission of marks on Edexcel Online

Some 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 has been issued regarding adherence to legal requirements via the DiDA microsite. **This guidance will be applied to all work submitted for moderation in the Summer 2008 series and thereafter** and centres are strongly advised to take note of this guidance and to advise their candidates accordingly.

Generic Strands

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. 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.

Level 1

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 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.

Level 2

Most candidates were able to produce an initial plan that listed main tasks in a logical order and allocated time to each task. In some instances there was no evidence that the line managers had agreed the plans and some candidates started the project with plans that were not workable, thereby making the process of tracking and monitoring very difficult.

The majority of candidates did however provide 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. As in previous series several candidates failed to provide a key to the colour coding they had used on their plans.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Level 1

The eportfolios submitted for this series were generally functional and provided access to most of the required evidence using the Moderator's Toolkit. In general any adjustments made in this strand at moderation tended to result in marks being increased rather than reduced. 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.

Level 2

Most candidates produced functional eportfolios that 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 products 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.

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

Strand (f) - Review the project

Level 1

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.

Level 2

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 some candidates provided a detailed and often lengthy narrative of what they had done, rather than evaluative comments. Feedback from reviewers was often limited to positive comments that would not 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 6173 candidates were entered for this unit, 2020 of these for the 0905 SPB and 3965 for the 0906 SPB. The overall pass rate of 81.3% is higher than that achieved in the previous series. There was also improvement in the rates for the higher grades, with 22.1% of the candidates achieving the equivalent of a pass grade at level 2. 71.7% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 6.7% of the total entry as absent.

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

Most of the candidates not achieving a pass grade at this level submitted incomplete eportfolios, with incomplete sets of publications 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

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

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

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

The primary data collection tasks of both SPBs were reasonably well addressed by most candidates, with many well formatted data sheets, based on the template provided, for the 0906 SPB. 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 many 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 further research opportunities, such as recipes and 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. To concentrate on the 0906 work, 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. Most centres had noted the addition of the spreadsheet viewer to the moderators' toolkit and the majority of candidates provided direct links to their spreadsheets. This approach enabled the functionality of the models to be more readily assessed than static screen shots.

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

Strand (d) - Present and communicate information

With regards to the 0906 SPB most candidates submitted a complete set of publications with 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: Most candidates based their designs for the holder on the template provided and included some visual link to their recipe cards. However, as in the previous series, many candidates omitted to include the required primary image and therefore failed to cover all of the requirements for this publication.

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 again the most successful publication of the series with many excellent outcomes seen.

Fruit fact results: Most candidates presented the four database reports specified in the SPB. Several candidates did, however, have difficulty relating the search criteria to the correct students from the survey and in some instances the use of inappropriate titles and column headings and the inclusion of unnecessary or repeated fields detracted from the final outcomes.

Fruit check findings: The majority of candidates included the fruit check findings document of the SPB, with the required charts added. Some candidates annotated

their charts to explain their findings. As in the previous series many of the charts had not been checked prior to publication, with many examples of unnecessary legends and errors in titles and axes labels.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D201: Using ICT

Overall

A total of 25656 candidates were entered for this unit, 10129 of these for the 0905 SPB and 15527 for the 0906 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 69.8% and an improvement in the achievement of higher grades, with 12.7% of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 68.2 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 3.4% of the total entry as absent. In the previous series the pass rate for the 0905 SPB was significantly higher (13 %) than that of the 0906 SPB. In this series the difference narrowed to 4 %.

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.

Some greater emphasis on prototyping and testing leading to improvement of the final outcomes was evident and this process contributed to the overall improvement in the 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 again an area that was not fully exploited. The end of project review remains an area for further improvement. Most candidates provided an account of work done, although this often lacked evaluative content and very rarely included suggestions for further improvement based on reviewers' comments.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

Several candidates achieved full marks in 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.

As in previous series, however, 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.

For 0906 many candidates researched alternative recipes for their makeover cards and acknowledged secondary sources relevant to the content of their snack attack posters. Very few candidates included evidence of their consideration of the reliability of the selected sources.

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

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

Spreadsheet: 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. 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. Most centres had noted the addition of the spreadsheet viewer to the moderators' toolkit and the majority of candidates provided direct links to their spreadsheets. This approach enabled the functionality of the models to be more readily assessed than 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

Most candidates submitted a complete set of publications with the majority including at least some publications completed to a good standard. The following comments refer to the publications of the 0906 SPB.

Reality check results: Few 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. Many 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. For consistency this approach was again 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. In some instances the reports were very well formatted and most included the required images. In other examples the use of inappropriate titles and column headings and the inclusion of unnecessary or repeated fields detracted from the final outcomes.

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. The more successful examples were customised for the test buddy. 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 consistent features.

Snack Attack Posters: The majority of candidates included most of 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 again 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

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D202 Multimedia

Overall

A total of 3077 candidates were entered for this unit, 1304 of these for the 0905 SPB and 1773 for the 0906 SPB. The unit achieved an overall pass rate of 68.3 %, which is a marginal fall in comparison with the summer 2007 results, due in part to the relatively low entry for this series. There remains, over several series, however, a consistent raise in the overall level of achievement. 11.3 % of the candidates achieved the merit or distinction grades.

Some 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 good games were presented for moderation.

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please also see general comments on generic strands.

Plans submitted by candidates tended to demonstrate 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. There were still however, a number of candidates, who were not identifying tasks and sub-tasks within their plan in a logical order. For example asset gathering was often indicated on the plan before product design, whereas the design should inform the gathering of assets. During this series it was also noted that a significant number of candidates were missing out whole tasks from their project plans, in particular designing products and the review.

The use of the project log in the Crack the Code SPB seemed to encourage candidates to track and monitor their project more effectively by making it an explicit part of the SPB than was the case with the Energise Your Life brief.

Strand (b) - Design multimedia products

There were, as in previous series, a minority of candidates who did produce very good up-front designs that were detailed enough to allow visualisation of the finished product and also contained explanations of design decisions. Whilst many candidates were able to produce outline designs, few produced detailed designs that would facilitate implementation or enable someone else to visualise the final product.

It was evident again 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, or timings accurate to a tenth of a second) in their apparently initial design work. As such these contribute very little to the process of developing and producing a multimedia product.

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 to produce better multimedia products.

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. However this often excluded sound, even when this is an explicit requirement of the SPB. Candidates were better at collecting, producing and editing assets for their products than they were at evidencing the process. In many instances assets from secondary sources seemed to have 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.

Candidates are improving in their capability to correctly acknowledge the sources of their assets. Whilst some attempt was made by most candidates to acknowledge the source of secondary assets, a large number still failed to provide the full URL of Internet sources. Many still attribute 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 ignored.

There still seems to be confusion, with some candidates, as to what constitutes a primary and secondary asset. A number of candidates are of the opinion that a secondary asset once it has been edited in some way becomes a primary asset. This of course, is not the case. There also seems to be a trend developing where candidates are submitting falsified emails as evidence for gaining permission to use an asset. Centres should discourage this practice. Centres should make reference to the statement about copyright on the DiDA microsite.

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.

Evidence of reviewing, and the impact of this process on the development of the products was weak. Although candidates did ask for feedback on their products from test users, in many instances the comments they received - mainly from peers - were not particularly useful, or positive rather than offering constructive criticism.

With specific regards to the 09/06 Brief. Many candidates selected PowerPoint as their preferred software for producing some or all of the content for the game and some of the work submitted for moderation consisted of very many PowerPoint files, often containing only one slide, with links going back and forth between the files. Embedded movies were often not in the same folder as the PowerPoint file and therefore would not work as a part of the game once taken off the school/college network. The games seen in the summer series fully embraced the multimedia nature of the unit. This session's submissions often lacked the creativity it should be possible to show in this unit.

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

There were games that would not allow you to crack the code no matter how patient you were in trying to find the work in folders because links did not work within the game itself. This highlights the need for centres to get candidates to check their work on a stand alone machine once on the CD.

Splash screen: A number of candidates produced very effective splash screens, introducing the game and leading players to the game map, whilst others failed to use this component to introduce the game.

Map: Most candidates were able to produce a functional and often well themed map containing links to all components of the game. A number of candidates failed to include a code sheet that could be printed by the player, for use whilst playing the game.

Level 1. The majority of candidates were able to produce the movie using still images, but for many the questions were not found as part of the movie but either on a PowerPoint slide or the web pages that had the movie embedded. A number of candidates produced this product using presentation software, most with limited success.

Level 2. Candidates produced talking head videos with a range of outcomes. Many 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. Apparently the most successful component as far as the candidates were concerned, with the vast majority of candidates being able to produce this with at least some awareness of both audience and purpose.

Strand (e) - Present evidence in an eportfolio

Please also refer to general comments on generic strands.

Some centres had succeeded in encouraging candidates to include multimedia in their eportfolios. Most candidates however made minimal use of multimedia, such as a single repeating marquee or rollover image and there were very few instances where candidates had endeavoured to showcase their products within a multimedia eportfolio.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D203: Graphics

Overall

A total of 3250 candidates were entered for this unit, 977 for the 0905 SPB and 2273 for the 0906 SPB. This unit produced an overall pass rate of 73.2%, with 10.3 % of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 58.8% of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 7.4% 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.

Although the completion of the elements table improved 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. Where secondary sources are required candidates must follow the copyright guidelines given on the microsite.

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

Strand (a) - Plan and manage the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

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

Both SPBs required the candidates to produce a logo and some professional looking 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. Centres are reminded that, 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, a significant number of candidates did not meet the requirements of the SPB for this task although photographs of the assembled bag were often included which 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 accompanied by some imaginative representations.

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 were not using primary sources for this product.

In the 0906 SPB the CD cover and the representations of the banner and wristband afforded candidates excellent opportunities to demonstrate their use of bitmap tools to edit images from secondary and primary sources. Many candidates took full advantage of these opportunities and produced work of excellent quality.

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. This is 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.

Strand (d) - Design and create graphic products

The vast 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 the wrong kind of Fair.

With regards to the products required by 0906 SPB;

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

Banner: Most candidates met the requirements of the SPB by producing two banners that worked as a pair although some candidates added images that did not reflect the purpose of the fair. Almost all 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, although 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. A significant number of candidates did not produce a drawing showing the open case as required by the SPB. 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', which was sometimes the case. Some

candidates failed to include the required images from primary sources and/or did not include annotated thumbnails to show how these had been developed.

Strand (e) - Exhibit work in an eportfolio

Please also refer to general comments on generic strands.

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. There was an increase in the number of candidates who included useful comments to introduce their work.

Strand (f) - Review the project

Please refer to general comments for generic strands.

D204 - ICT in Enterprise

Overall

A total of only 635 candidates were entered for this unit this series. Most of the entries were for the 0906 SPB. The unit produced an overall pass rate of 76.1%, with 13.6 % of the candidates achieving a merit or distinction. 61 % of the centres' assessments of the eportfolios were agreed at moderation, with centres reporting a further 19.5 % of the total entry as absent.

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

Strand a - Plan and manage the project

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

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

Strand b - Investigate an enterprise opportunity

For both SPBs each individual candidate is expected to investigate a potential enterprise idea. A range of primary and secondary sources should be used to carry out this research. The sources used should be acknowledged in enough detail to allow someone to find the information at a later date.

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

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

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

Most candidates produced useful mind maps.

Modelling was an area of general improvement, where purposeful models allowed the team to explore a range of options and carry out what if scenarios to inform the decision making process. Most models were presented as working spreadsheets and this allowed the moderator to use them and judge their effectiveness. The presentation of individual findings to the team members was also an area of improvement and in most cases appeared to enable the teams to make informed decisions on which enterprise ideas to adopt.

Strand c - Create a corporate identity

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

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

Where existing templates are used for the documents they must be customised appropriately. Lack of appropriate customisation was most evident in the production of invoices. Contact details, together with the logo and strapline, should be included on all documents and should be consistent throughout.

Strand d - Promote a product or service

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

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 campaign. In a few instances teams had produced a set of three items between them, which is not what was required.

Most candidates had remembered what they were promoting - Class of 2006/7 or Cash 4 Kids but many items did not promote the product/event but just contained the name of the enterprise along with the logo.

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

For the 0906 SPB the candidates' own items along with the complete set from the team should have been evidenced in addition to the team's website. This was not always the case, with many candidates not including the items that other team members had produced. Where the complete set was included some candidates had not indicated which team member had produced which three items.

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

Strand e - Use an eportfolio to present an enterprise proposal

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

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

Strand f - Carry out an end of project review

Please also refer to general comments for generic strands.

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. The addition of both individual review notes and team review notes for the 0906 SPB appears to have helped candidates to address these elements in a more comprehensive manner.

March 2008

DiDA Grade boundaries - January 2008 results

For the January 2008 exam series grade boundaries for both SPB05 and SPB06 were confirmed from the Summer 2007 series. No boundaries have altered from the previous series.

Note that the data in this document is relevant to the January 2008 results only; on some units candidate entry level is low, in which case statistical data should be treated with caution.

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 2208 candidates, SPB0906 3965 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	31	25	19	13	0
Cumulative % of cand	16.7	33.3	54.9	78.4	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	31	25	19	13	0
Cumulative % of cand	24.7	41.4	62.7	82.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	22.1	38.6	60.2	81.3	100.0

D201 – Using ICT [SPB0905 10129 candidates, SPB0906 15527 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	15	0
Cumulative % of cand	1.6	10.3	35.0	83.9	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.8	14.4	41.2	79.6	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	2.3	12.7	38.9	81.1	100.0

D102 – Multimedia [SPB0905 160 candidates, SPB0906 283 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	30	24	19	14	0
Cumulative % of cand	10.0	31.3	56.9	71.3	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	30	24	19	14	0
Cumulative % of cand	45.9	54.8	66.4	76.3	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	33.0	46.3	63.0	74.5	100.0

D202 – Multimedia [SPB0905 1304 candidates, SPB0906 1773 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.8	12.5	35.7	73.5	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.1	9.8	30.5	63.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	2.6	11.3	33.4	68.3	100.0

D103 – Graphics [SPB0905 159 candidates, SPB0906 90 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	30	24	18	13	0
Cumulative % of cand	5.7	16.4	43.4	57.9	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	15	0
Cumulative % of cand	14.4	30.0	47.8	65.6	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	8.8	21.3	45.0	60.6	100.0

D203 – Graphics [SPB0905 977 candidates, SPB0906 2273 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	34	28	22	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	3.4	16.2	42.9	76.8	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	36	29	22	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.1	8.0	31.5	73.2	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	2.4	10.3	34.4	73.2	100.0

D104 – ICT in Enterprise [SPB0905 91 candidates, SPB0906 142 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	36	30	24	18	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	30	25	20	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	16.5	31.9	50.5	65.9	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	31	26	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	41.5	51.4	62.7	75.4	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	31.8	43.8	57.9	71.7	100.0

D204 – ICT in Enterprise [SPB0905 227 candidates, SPB0906 418 candidates]

SPB	Distinction	Merit	Credit	Pass	U
UMS mark boundary	72	60	48	36	0
0905					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	15	0
Cumulative % of cand	6.6	22.5	50.7	85.0	100.0
0906					
Raw mark boundary	33	27	21	16	0
Cumulative % of cand	2.4	12.0	37.1	67.5	100.0
Overall					
Cumulative % of cand	3.4	13.6	42.7	76.1	100.0

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

