

# Applied GCE

Edexcel GCE

Information and Communication  
Technology (8751)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication code: UA017610

January 2006

advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report

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

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

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

January 2006

Publications Code UA017610

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

## Contents Page

Page	
1	Chief Examiner General Comments
3	6951 - The Information Age
6	6952 - The Digital Economy
9	6953 - The Knowledge Worker
12	6954 - System Design and Installation
14	6955 - Web Development
17	Grade Boundaries

## Chief Examiner General Comments

### Entry

This report provides detailed individual feedback for all the units examined or moderated in the January 2006 series. Moderation was available for all the AS units and an examination was set for Unit 3 (6953 - The Knowledge Worker). There were substantial entries for the examined unit and for Unit 1 (6951 - The Information Age). A few centres made entries for Unit 2 (6952 - The Digital Economy), Unit 4 (6954 - System Design and Installation) and Unit 5 (6955 - Web Development). There were no entries for Unit 6 (6956 - Technical Support).

### Standard of Entry

In all units there were many candidates who seemed ill-prepared for entry at this time. This may have been because centres were 'testing the water' but many candidates seemed to be unsure about what evidence they were supposed to be supplying. I would refer centres to the increasing amount of exemplar materials appearing on the micro site (<http://ict.edexcel.org.uk/home/>) and also the INSET courses being scheduled. The general standard of ability appeared satisfactory although the occasional candidate appeared out of his or her depth. It should be noted that this qualification is designed for parity of esteem with an academic AS level and the entry requirements should therefore be similar.

### Examined Unit

As there was only one examined unit assessed in this series all general comments are included in the report on individual units later in this document.

### Moderated Units

#### Assessment Issues

Across all the moderated units candidates were failing to supply explicit evidence to support their achievement of the criteria in the marking grids. Although assessors and moderators will accept implicit evidence of testing this can only be the case if the final product works. Many of the links in the e-portfolio received by the edexcel moderator had not been tested as they did not work, meaning the moderator had to search through the folder for relevant information. Often the files had unhelpful names which made the search difficult, especially if no guidance is given by the centre's assessor (see Administration).

In many of the moderated units the assessment grids and guidance required the candidates to include in their portfolios a set number of items. For example Unit 1 requires a description of 5 Internet Services. The inference of the marking grid is that if the candidate produced less than this number then they would fail to enter any mark band and the candidate should be awarded no marks. The senior assessment team felt that this was an incorrect interpretation of the marking grid and that there may be genuine reasons why the candidate was unable to cover the range as identified within the marking grid. In these circumstances the candidate should be given credit for the work they have completed, not penalised for work they have not completed and therefore be awarded a proportion of the marks. It would be helpful if the reason is noted on the teacher assessor mark record sheet.

A number of centres submitted marks where in these minimum requirements had not been reached and had, on the face of it correctly, awarded zero marks for that particular mark band. In these circumstances centres may find their marks adjusted upwards.

### **Administration Issues**

Most centres provided disks that worked and the e-portfolios were clearly labelled as were the Candidate Mark Record Sheets (e-sheet). Some centres had not used these and had not supplied a breakdown of marks, however these were in the minority. Centres need to check that the disks containing the e-portfolios can be read and accessed on another system. Discs should be burned to ISO 9660 standard enabling them to be read in any system.

The Candidate Mark Record Sheet (e-sheet) provided by centres with their candidates' work varied in quality. Very few centres provided enough information to enable the moderator to track and trace where marks had been awarded. Many centres provided no comments at all. An exemplar Candidate Mark Record Sheet (e-sheet) has been included on the Applied ICT Micro site (<http://ict.edexcel.org.uk/home/>).

There were one or two centres where the centre had not marked them at all and had simply submitted them to see what marks they would get. It should be pointed out that it is not the moderator's job to mark candidates' work but simply to confirm (or otherwise) the accuracy of the centre's marks.

## Individual Unit Reports

### 6951 - The Information Age (Portfolio)

#### General

Most of work seen was appropriate and gave the candidates good opportunities to meet the requirements of the specification. The candidates that used their own research well and wrote, using clear descriptive language, performed better than candidates who simply pasted large sections of text from internet sources. Candidates are expected to show and acknowledge sources of information clearly. Short extracts with sources acknowledged is permissible and would help to provide examples.

The quality of e-books varied from centre to centre. Some were very professional and clearly some thought had gone into their design. Others were a collection of web pages with many links not working and images not appearing. Often this was due to the fact that absolute references were used in the building of the e-book, and when removed from the centres' computer system, or placed in a different file structure, the links could not be resolved. This was often overlooked by centre assessors when awarding marks for strand(e), as thorough testing had not taken place. Candidates need the opportunity to copy the e-book to CD and test the links before it is sent for assessment.

Centres tended to be generous and did not always take account of the marking guidance and often the statement on what was needed for full marks in a mark band was ignored.

#### Strand (a) On-line services

There was generally a broad coverage of online services by most candidates. However, some candidates did not go into depth with the coverage of each of the services. In some cases five different types of online services were not present. This prevented candidates accessing the full range of marks for this strand, although it is possible to access some marks if fewer than five are covered.

In some cases the information presented was merely copied from sources, with no evidence that candidates understood what they were writing about. Candidates who achieved in the higher mark bands presented their own explanations of the services and supported this with a range of examples. Many candidates looked at the advantages and disadvantages of individual services, but often failed to discuss the overall impact of the internet as a whole. This is essential to access the higher mark bands.

#### Strand (b) Life in the information age

There was generally a broad coverage of the way ICT has impacted on people lives. Unfortunately there was often a lack of depth to the work with candidates only using the internet as a source of information. Candidates who achieved in the higher mark bands used a range of sources and clearly identified both in the work and in the bibliography.

In some cases the five different aspects identified in the marking grid were not present. This prevented candidates accessing the full range of marks for this strand. Although it is possible to access a proportion of the marks if fewer than five are covered.

The overall impact was often not discussed by many candidates. Candidates should be encouraged to summarise and comment on the overall impact of ICT on life in the Information Age. This is essential to access the higher mark ranges.

### **Strand (c) Digital Divide**

The evidence for this strand was often weaker than that for previous sections. Candidates recognised that there were factors of wealth and environment, but did little to evaluate the impact or the extent. Government measures to bridge the gap were rarely mentioned. To gain marks in the higher ranges the candidates must cover the divide at all levels, local, national and international. Many candidates only covered the obvious international divide.

### **Strand (d) The e-book**

There were some very good examples of e-books produced using Dreamweaver, or FrontPage. It was clear that many candidates had enjoyed this aspect of the unit. The selection of appropriate software is crucial to the success of the e-book. There were examples of candidates providing PowerPoint presentations and simple linear PDF files. These candidates could address many aspects of the criteria for this strand and so could not access the higher marks.

Very few candidates addressed the awareness of audience and purpose. Some wrote the e-book as if it was an ordinary assignment to be given in to the teacher. Many e-books used external links with no thought that they may not be available in 100 years time, better candidates used extracts from websites that were contained within the candidates e-book, so no external access was required.

Standard ways of working were not always observed in that filenames were not meaningful and moderators had difficulty in finding the start of the e-book. Many centres had used the cover sheets successfully and others clearly had an index or link to the e-book. Standard ways of working would be shown in candidates' work where the portfolio was organised into clearly named folders, with access to the e-book provided by a clearly named page in the root folder of the candidates work.

### **Strand (e) Components and structure**

Candidates clearly enjoyed the construction aspects of this unit and many good examples of well constructed e-books were seen. However in some cases the features were inappropriate, with examples of images and clips which had no relation to the topic on the page. Candidates also need original multimedia components, as well as ready made ones, across all mark bands.

Candidates need to demonstrate that they know about copyright issues and this is one area where they can easily demonstrate this, for example sound recordings of pop songs were used, and were not always accredited.

Evidence of testing was often demonstrated by the fact that a fully functioning e-book had been produced, some candidates included test plans and feedback from

others as further evidence. Explicit testing is not required. As mentioned previously to access the higher mark ranges candidate need the opportunity to test the e-book on a CD away from the centres' system to test that links and images still function as intended. If some components (pictures etc.) are missing then it is evident that the e-book has not been fully tested.

### **Strand (f) Evaluation**

Most candidates managed to make some evaluative comment about their e-book but struggled to evaluate their own performance. A few incorporated feedback from others. To access the top mark band candidates must also suggest an improvement to their e-book

Many candidates confused the e-portfolio with the e-book at this stage. The evaluation is not part of the e-book and should be a separate document within the e-portfolio.

### **Standard Ways of Working**

In most cases the only evidence the moderators had for this aspect was the bibliography and the file structures and names used by the candidates. In some cases it was difficult to locate the e-book or e-portfolios of candidates as these were often not well named.

Bibliographies are the main source of evidence to support the range of sources of information used by the candidate, too many candidates still give "Google", "Yahoo" and other search engines as the source of the information when clearly the source was a website found using them. Many candidates only quoted web sites, the specification requires a wide range of different sources to be used for strands (b) and (c).

## 6952 - The Digital Economy (Portfolio)

### General

It is difficult to give a full report on this unit as there was a very small number of e-portfolios submitted for this window.

It was pleasing to see that the main aspects of this unit had been understood and some of the evidence seen was of a good standard.

Centres are reminded that the e-portfolios should be a format that can be read in a browser and the files should link together. There were instances of links not working and files being in Word documents. Centres are referred to the e-portfolio section in standard ways of working and also the Guidance to Centres which is on the Edexcel website.

From the evidence seen during this moderation window it would appear that candidates could access higher marks if they had developed better evaluating skills. Candidates tend to say what they see or what they did, rather than think about the strengths and weaknesses and then form some conclusion which would enable a recommendation to be made.

Not all candidates had addressed standard ways of working in the approach to their work. Overall most candidates had provided an e-portfolio where the files had sensible folders and file names and the index or home page file was easy to find. There was no evidence of 'readme' files in the sample moderated which could help the moderator access the e-portfolio work more readily.

Few candidates appeared to have proof read their work thoroughly with the result that most e-portfolios contained a good number of uncorrected errors. Candidates should be encouraged to address the quality assurance section of 2.10.

There were few instances of plagiarism observed for this unit in this window.

It was good to see that some assessors are using the Candidate Mark Record Sheet (e-sheet) to indicate whether deadlines were met, independent working was carried out and how the marks were awarded.

### Strand (a) The transactional website

There are a lot of marks (18) allocated to this strand and candidates need to look at a range of aspects in order to be able to access them all. It was good to see that all the candidates moderated had chosen their own transactional website to evaluate. All the candidates explored the navigation of the sites and explained the process to purchase on line. Some of them evaluated the appearance of the site and looked at ways the site tried to entice customers.

Some candidates did explore how the site evaluated gathered information from site visitors (2.5) but these were in the minority.

Candidates could access the higher mark bands more easily if they looked at some of the suggestions made in the Assessment Guidance for this strand and also looked more widely at the unit specification, i.e. (2.3) and (2.5).

### **Strand (b) Back-office processes**

10 marks are allocated to this strand which requires a set of diagrams explaining the back office processes. All the candidates seen had made a good attempt to relate their evidence to the transactional website they had evaluated. Candidates are not required to find out at first hand from organisations how their back offices work, as it is unlikely that many candidates would be able to do so. This does mean that the theory of 2.4 needs to be taught. Candidates who make a good attempt to relate their evidence to their sites do demonstrate understanding.

Candidates are required to produce their own diagrams, which can be in a variety of formats. Information flow diagrams are the requirement of the unit but DFDs and Flow Charts are acceptable too. A variety of different charts and diagrams were seen.

Centres do need to ensure that candidates do produce their own diagrams and do not just copy exact examples from the Edexcel website or from textbooks, as was found in some cases. There were also instances of candidates having exactly the same diagrams.

It is acceptable for candidates to annotate and explain their diagrams which does demonstrate understanding, however, explanations on their own without diagrams do not address this assessment strand.

### **Strand (c) Threats to data**

It was good to see that most candidates addressed this strand well. It should be noted that there is a wealth of information relating to security that can be easily accessed and this is reflected in the number of marks allocated to the strand (6). It was also good to see that most candidates had explained the legislation they had chosen to look at and had not just copied the wording of the various acts into their e-portfolios. There was also evidence of candidates examining the transactional website they had evaluated for strand (a) and making some very good observations of security issues relating to the site.

A weakness that was observed is that some candidates had not appreciated the need to evaluate their findings and draw conclusions to access full marks. Again the Assessment Guidance provides some assistance with this aspect.

### **Strand (d) Database**

It should be noted that 20 marks are allocated to this strand. The majority of evidence seen was in the lower mark bands. Candidates could gain higher marks by looking at the requirements in the mark bands and thinking about the order they undertake their work. Candidates need to examine the data files and then create a structure for the data. The structure needs to be tested with some test data to see if it works. More thought given to the structure can also help candidates access the higher mark bands. It was good to see input masks being used, but few validation rules were observed.

As the candidates are required to produce two relational tables, they should try to ensure they evidence manipulation of their databases using the relational aspects. Much of the evidence was based on one entity only. Some candidates used design screen shots to show how they had manipulated their database. Such shots can show, the entities used, search criteria, grouping, sorting, calculations, etc, thereby evidencing how the final results were implemented. However, candidates are not expected to show every step along the way. The emphasis should be on relevant screen prints and annotation.

Candidates should be encouraged to work out for themselves what queries they will use by examining the data used. Such queries should enable them to produce trends. It was good to see that most candidates had used graphical format to portray their trends clearly and most had made an attempt to analyse and explain the trends. To achieve full marks the candidates need to make sensible recommendations based on the trends identified. A major part of this strand is the ability to use a database as a tool to help in the decision making process.

### **Strand (e) Evaluation**

Not all candidates produced an evaluation. 6 marks are allocated to this strand and the evaluations seen were mainly in mark band 1. Few candidates really addressed the evaluation of the performance of their database. Most spoke about what they did when they put their e-portfolio together. A few described problems encountered and how they overcame them.

The evidence of incorporating feedback from others was usually very superficial and it was difficult to see who the others were and what they really had said. This feedback needs to be incorporated into the recommendations for improvements to enable all the marks allocated to this strand to be accessed.

## 6953 - The Knowledge Worker (Examination)

### General

The major issue with most candidates was the matter of time. The vast majority of candidates failed to finish in the allotted time. There were a number of reasons for this. Many candidates seemed unprepared for the tasks. Despite the model and scenario being available three working weeks in advance of the examination there was evidence that a number of candidates were unfamiliar with the model and consequently spent time finding out what it did. They should have been familiar with the model before the examination started. Suggested times for each activity were printed on the question paper and the sample assessment material supplied on had similar timings. Centres could have used this to prepare their candidates. Apart from activity 5 (the report) all other questions could have been answered in note form. This would have saved candidates time, especially on the first two activities. There is, however, no doubt that a lot was being asked of candidates within the time frame and this was taken into account when awarding the grade boundary.

### Activity 1 Identify the problem

Activity 1 tested the candidates' understanding of the scenario and required them to identify the 'problem', their data sources and recognise their objectives. Most candidates scored reasonably well in this activity recognising the important background information and, to a large extent, recognising what they had to achieve. Most realised that the fewer electricians they had to employ the better off they were, however only a few could, at this point, recognise that they needed a more even distribution. Although most candidates scored well there were a considerable number who misunderstood the role of the three main data sources. Many felt that the sources were in competition for a contract to supply roadies. This lost few marks in this section, but tended to have a knock-on effect throughout the rest of the activities.

### Activity 2 Analyse the data sources

Activity 2 asked, in essence, for a comparison between the three major data sources for setup and dismantling times and some evaluation of each. The sources were chosen so that there was little to choose between them and candidates were expected to make a choice based on more than one source. To some of those candidates who had mistaken the sources to be in competition this proved problematic as they no longer appeared to be data sources. Many others, however, were able to make valid evaluative points even though they had mistaken the role. On the whole some good marks were scored in this part of the activity. The second part of the activity required the candidates to decide upon a strategy for using these sources. A significant number of candidates either omitted this or simply avoided a decision with comments like, "I will use the source I consider to be the most suitable", which rather defeated the object. This not only lost marks here, but failure to make a decision would lose two marks in Activity 3.

### **Activity 3 Create the data model**

This activity was done well almost universally with the majority of candidates scoring 10 or more marks. If candidates lost marks it was generally because they had failed to make a decision in activity 2. The evidence seems to point to the conclusion that a significant number of centres had taught the unit as a spreadsheet unit and not as a decision making process as it was intended.

### **Activity 4 Use the data model**

The purpose of this activity was to use the model to help make the two key decisions of the running order and the number of electrician teams required. Only the higher scoring candidates tried to use a strategy, most simply used trial and error. This had two effects, firstly they did not necessarily find a better running order and secondly they were tempted to spend too long on the activity. Many even suggested more time for this activity in their evaluations, but more time would not necessarily have got a better solution and would only have picked up one or two extra marks. The high marks in this activity were to be gained by explaining their strategy, which few were able to do.

### **Activity 5 Report the findings**

This activity tests the candidates' ability to report their findings in a professional manner and a significant number of marks are available for the findings and the quality of presentation. Many candidates had not left enough time for the final two activities and there were a large number of cases where this activity was either omitted or reduced to one paragraph. Many of those who did attempt this activity had little idea how to lay out such a report and subsequently lost a lot of the presentation marks. Very few had a conclusion and many failed to include a chart which was specifically asked for. Only the highest scoring candidates scored well in this activity.

### **Activity 6 Evaluation**

The answers to this activity were disappointing. Many candidates failed to submit anything under this activity and those who did only made superficial comments. As mentioned before a significant number mentioned that they would have liked more time on activity 4, but there were few comments about the layout, format or ease of use of the model. A number of candidates, however, could suggest sensible things they would like the model to do and most could supply a good reason. There were, however, few comments about how the data to achieve these improvements could be obtained.

## Administration

A large number of candidates failed to supply the activity number and the other required items in the header or footer of their printouts. There were also a large number of cases where the printouts were supplied in the wrong order. In the absence of an activity number the examiner will make a decision about which activity the printout is for. This will usually be based on its position within the pack. It is in the candidate's interest that all printouts are suitably labelled and in the correct order.

All printouts should be attached to the cover sheet via a **single** treasury tag to the hole available in the top left corner of the inside of the cover sheet as shown in the instructions. There should be no need to punch extra holes in the cover sheet and the treasury tag should be passed through the cover sheet and the printouts only **once**. The examiners would be grateful if centres could remind candidates to do this.

## **6954 - System Design and Installation**

### **General**

This report is based on the e-portfolios submitted by a very small number of centres.

The standard of work in the e-portfolios was in general of a good standard. Many candidates presented their work in a structured e-portfolio that allowed navigation between the various sections. Others submitted a collection of files with no means of navigation.

### **Strand (a) Needs analysis**

The degree of help given to candidates in the production of their needs analysis varied from centre to centre. It is appreciated that candidates may find it difficult to find a 'real' client to work with; an acceptable alternative is for the centre to provide scenarios from which candidates choose. The scenario should be written in such a way that the candidate will have to do some further investigation and fact finding. Assessors who give all the answers in the first instance prevent their candidates from entering mark Band 2. Most candidates supplied details of two existing systems, but many failed to describe the system or to have said how well the existing systems would meet their client's requirements. If included, test plans and training schedules were of little benefit to the implementation of the new system.

### **Strand (b) System specification**

Candidates produced reasonable system specifications, although many failed to make any mention of ergonomics thus preventing access to Mark Band 2. Candidates failed to justify their choices in anything other than monetary values and future needs were rarely considered.

### **Strand (c) System build**

Centres must ensure that resources are in place for candidates to undertake the building of a system plus the required configurations. It is not sufficient to explain how to carry out the activities. They must be properly evidenced by the candidate clearly demonstrating that they have taken place. Assessor witness statements/observation sheets can only support candidate evidence and this they do well, however these must be used as additional evidence to support written work that makes use of screen shots, photos and/or videos in order to authenticate the practical work undertaken. In future series witness statements alone will not be seen as adequate evidence of achievement. The fact that a candidate has performed well in practical lessons is not sufficient evidence to enter Mark Band 1 for assessment evidence (c). Many candidates configured basic settings such as screen resolution, language setting, etc, or added icons to toolbars, with no explanation as to how they made the system more appropriate for the specified purpose.

### **Strand (d) Testing**

Testing was not always thorough and once again evidence was often weak, statements from peers that the system worked is not enough. Candidates need to list the tests undertaken and the results with any supporting evidence being included in the form of screen shots and/or photos. The majority of candidates failed to test for usability and accessibility preventing entry to Mark Band 3.

### **Strand (e) Evaluation**

Most candidates managed to evaluate the performance of the system and their own performance, but even those who collected feedback from others failed to use this in their evaluation preventing entry into Mark Band 2.

## **6955 - Web Development**

### **General**

The standard of work for this first series was disappointing. Candidates would probably have benefited with being given more time to complete their eportfolio. This would have enabled a higher standard of work to be produced.

Many candidates were able to create functional websites that met some of the client's needs. There were general weaknesses in the planning, the investigation and analysis and the use of feedback to improve the prototypes. Testing evidence was often superficial or limited to navigational tests.

Evaluations were often very weak, not addressing the original requirement specifications and often discussing the candidate's difficulties in understanding/using the software features, etc.

Many candidates were not comfortable with the requirements of an e-commerce website and so did not provide suitable suggestions with reasons.

### **Strand (a) Outline project plan**

Most plans produced were retrospective. Candidates are expected to produce a plan up front that identifies the main tasks to be carried out, the order in which they will be tackled and the time allocated to each task. As the project progresses the candidate should then use the plan to monitor progress and then make changes. Some centres used Gantt Charts for the plan and then a project log, which was then annotated and commented to indicate how well the plan was being followed and where adjustments were made. An ideal solution would be to provide an initial plan up front and then have a working version on which progress and adjustments are made and annotated.

Many of the plans produced were rather poor with some of the most important tasks not included (e.g. Investigation, Analysis, Requirements specification) or with the wrong order of tasks (e.g. Detailed design before Design).

There was generally very little evidence of using the plan to monitor progress.

### **Strand (b) Customer requirements**

This was a challenging strand for some candidates. Candidates that did well in this strand included interviews or questionnaires, evaluation of similar websites, sitemaps, flowcharts and structure diagrams or story boards, to evidence investigation, analysis and design.

Some candidates performed very limited investigation of the client's requirements but produced good designs.

The poorer candidates did not show any evidence of investigation or analysis of client needs. This may have only been implicit in the designs, which is not really enough.

Candidates that included the following subheadings in the requirements analysis often scored better marks.

Requirements Analysis (as in the specifications)

- Purpose of site
- The target audience
- How users will access the site (hardware, software, connection)
- The information that must be provided
- Features that must be included (e.g. logo, counter)
- The user interaction that is required
- Visitor information to be collected
- Plans for maintaining/updating the site once it is up and running
- Security requirements
- Legal requirements

Information relating to the above could be obtained by interviewing the client, summarising the results of the interview and then writing out the system requirements which the client then signs off. Only after this should the design then be begun.

Centres that did well in the design included discussions on

- Layout and structure
- Style and format
- Navigation routes, action controls and navigation aids
- Page content and layout
- Interactive features
- Accessibility options for the disabled visitors (e.g. visually impaired)

as well as providing diagrammatic evidence in the form of

- Storyboards to map out the layout and content of each screen
- Structure charts to show how content is organised
- Flowcharts to describe the user interaction and pathways through the website (a screen connectivity diagram could also be used).

### **Strand (c) Development**

This strand was relatively well attempted and assessment was generally accurate and consistent. Most candidates produced very functional websites, which met some of the client's requirements. The only weaknesses were limited evidence of testing and there were only few candidates who discussed refinements of prototypes based on feedback from the client or users. Both testing and the use of feedback to refine the initial design are crucial components of this criterion and candidates should be encouraged strongly to evidence these. Candidates must state what the feedback was and how it was used to refine the design.

Those candidates who tackled testing well would have considered tests in the following aspects

- The layout and presentation of each page is appropriate
- Hyperlinks work and go where expected (the most overused aspect)
- There are no dead ends
- Any interactive actions work as intended
- It is displayed properly by all common browsers (at least two)
- It renders properly at different screen resolutions
- It is accessible to disabled users.

Many candidates used questionnaires to elicit feedback from others. The areas of feedback included: usefulness, effectiveness, content, presentation, navigation, usability, accessibility, etc. Unfortunately they then failed to discuss the feedback or show how it was used to modify the website. The candidate should provide a copy of the questionnaire, a summary of the findings (responses) and describe the features that have been modified based on the feedback so obtained.

#### **Strand (d) Evaluation**

This strand was relatively well attempted and assessment was generally accurate and consistent. Many candidates made good suggestions for improvement, but were again limited by not using/evidencing feedback from clients or users. Evaluations, however, were generally very weak. The evaluation should be based on the solution of the original problem and not the candidate's use of the software or the difficulties encountered with the software. It should include

- Evaluation of objectives as specified in the requirements specification
- User comments
- Further improvements (especially where original objectives have not been met and enhancements).

#### **Strand (e) Outline proposal**

This was also a challenging strand for some candidates. Some simply made an attempt at defining a transactional website and then went on to suggest that the client upgrades to one. This is not enough. The candidate must suggest something like "add an on-line payment facility". Give reasons why it is a good idea and if possible, describe what would be needed to effect that change.

## Grade Boundaries - January 2006

### 6951

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

### 6952

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	41	35	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

### 6953

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	58	50	42	35	28
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

### 6954

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	42	36	30	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

### 6955

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	49	43	37	31	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

### Notes

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

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

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA017610 January 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

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

