

CAMBRIDGE NATIONALS

Examiners' report



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

J808

**R013 (moderated)
Summer 2018 series**

Version 1

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview	4
Comments by LO	5
LO2: To be able to initiate and plan a solution to meet an identified need.....	5
LO5: To be able to import and manipulate data to develop a solution to meet an identified need.....	5
LO7: To be able to select and present information in the development of the solution to meet an identified need	7
LO8: To be able to iteratively review and evaluatue the development of the solution.	7

Introduction

Our Lead Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by the moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements; identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation and comments on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. This report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost to other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.

General overview

For the first session of a new qualification the administration by centres should be commended as on a whole URSs have been completed correctly, whilst there have been some issues these are not unexpected in the first session of a new qualification. There were clerical issues seen and centres should ensure that they guard against this in future.

Work could only be submitted using the Postal or Repository options and in both cases the work submitted should only be the initiation/planning documents, systems produced by the candidates and evaluation documents. There is no requirement in this qualification for work to include screenshots and descriptions of the development process. The process of development is assessed through the production of different versions of the system components by the candidates. This is evidenced by the different electronic versions in the candidates work.

Work should only be submitted electronically, on memory stick, disc, secure cloud accounts or through the Repository with no printed copies of the candidates' work sent to the moderator. Printed copies of candidates' work do not allow integration to be shown and as such, in future sessions when paper-based candidate work is sent, it will be assessed as thus, leading to the integration marks not being credited.

Where centres had carried out effective administration of the course, electronic copies of the work have been provided in clearly labelled folders with different versions of the documents seen. These were then supported by URS forms, which can be sent on paper or electronically, that clearly indicated why decisions were made not just repeating the criteria from the grid. The explanation of why decisions were made regarding candidates' work are helpful in that the moderator can understand the thinking of the centre and allow the moderator to provide a more targeted report, either praising the centre for a clear application of the marking criteria or helping to clear up a misinterpretation by the centre. If there is no explanation on the URS forms, then the moderator cannot help centres to improve effectively.

One issue that was seen this session was that within some centres there seemed to be clear routes of development for a solution that was seen by all candidates in that centre. This is noticeable when centres across the country are seen, where different routes are taken. Whilst there is an acceptance that a teacher or centre will teach their candidates in a certain style or method, it would still be expected that there would be variance in the final project produced. In a number of cases this variation was not seen in the production of the summative evidence, there was a feel of teaching to the assessment and producing the work to meet that.

Comments by LO

LO2: To be able to initiate and plan a solution to meet an identified need

1a

This section of the project is concerned only with the production of the initiation and planning documentation. Hence any reference to the documents produced in execution phase(s) is not relevant to the marks credited here. This was a misconception seen from several centres. Marks beyond mark band one cannot be credited if there is not integration (direct link) between two initiation/ planning documents. Centres who produce a project covering document (index) that hyperlinks to all documents produced in all phases do not meet all of the marking criteria.

To access the higher marking bands, it is expected that a report style document is produced that is styled effectively using technological tools such as tables of contents, header/footers, page numbers etc. Within this document there should then be working hyperlinks to other initiation/planning documents. At the top end these other documents such as a Gantt chart or digitally produced wireframes/ screen layouts should be embedded within the main document. On paper-based submissions this integration cannot be seen. The exemplar coursework for Progress Housing shows this and can be downloaded from Interchange via a link on OCR website

The use of specialist project management software is commended however, in the work seen this has only been used to produce a Gantt chart, which could be produced using other software. To access the full range of marks other aspects of the project management software should be used.

2a

This section is concerned with how the scenario context has been answered. There was a great variation in the quality of the work produced regarding the explanation of the success criteria for the project. Some work was seen where the OCR assignment wording was typed with a few amendments by the candidates. This only identified the client requirements and did not produce success criteria as stated in the marking grid.

An over reliance on producing only an analysis report together with a timeline of activities in a Gantt chart was seen. In a number centres the activities in the Gantt chart were phases from the set assignment which did not make them appropriate. It is expected that clear tasks required to complete the project, such as in this scenario, design database, create and import data into database, design receipt layout would be seen in the Gantt chart

Centres who did well within this section produced an array of documents including the analysis report and task timelines such as data dictionaries, user interface designs (one of the client requirements), data flow illustrations from worksheet to worksheet, slide designs.

This section is also only concerned with the information necessary to answer the scenario task. There should be no general theory work on for example project management or cyber security issues submitted as these are not part of the project.

LO5: To be able to import and manipulate data to develop a solution to meet an identified need.

1b

This section refers to the use of technology in the data manipulation phase only. There was a wide range of choices seen within in this section between data being manipulated in only a spreadsheet or database as well as centres choosing and using effectively both types of software.

Within centres the same choices and tools/techniques within the software tended to be used, with some centres almost being formulaic in the choice and approach taken by the candidates. In centres where the course has been embraced fully the choice of the tools/techniques used by individual candidates varied and has been supported in the moderation process as a result.

The integration of data in this phase can be clearly seen where data has been moved across different worksheets is a spreadsheet or a relational database has produced effective query results from multiple tables. In some cases, the highest marks have been supported where data has been effectively moved from one type of software to the other.

However, what has been seen is that marks have been credited where the tools used such as queries and filters do not actually produce accurate results. Centres need to ensure that marks can be credited in this section with accurate data being produced.

2b

The scenario required candidates to produce a range of documents to answer a number of questions. Whilst there was concern expressed through various forums this year regarding this section the actual responses submitted by candidates were overall positive.

Candidates tended to produce a relational database for the bookings aspect with good examples of the queries and switchboards to aid the user being seen. Very few candidates took the approach of using calculated fields in the database. As mentioned there were examples of candidates from some centres all producing the same queries and reports with very little variation and this should be guarded against in future sessions, where over direction could be applied to the marking.

With the spreadsheet aspect the use of a various formula and functions was seen although there were several spreadsheets seen where the marks were credited despite the calculations not producing the necessary results. Centres should take note of this in future sessions.

Security aspects were generally well applied in this section, although centres should ensure in future sessions that the passwords supplied work on the sample provided. The requesting of correct passwords from centres caused issues with moderation process.

LO7: To be able to select and present information in the development of the solution to meet an identified need

1c

This section was concerned only with the use of technologies to output data and was not concerned with any manipulation. The main uses seen were the use of mail merge technologies and the development of presentations that automatically looped and moved from slide to slide. These were generally used well although there was great variation in the amount of time that slides were displayed on screen for before they were changed. Centres should also be aware of ensuring that certain aspects of presentation software should be disabled to make these presentations more effective.

If a mail merged document is required in future sessions centres are advised to ensure that they submit both the template used by the candidates and the completed merged documents. This ensures that marks can be supported as some candidates only submitted the template with merge fields included and when the process was run the data would not link to complete the mail merge fully.

2c

The scenario required the production of three main outputs, a receipt for customers, a real-time feed for the Directors regarding revenue and presentation for the use in the hotel to advertise the events and booking offers.

Where the real-time feed for the Directors was produced in Section 2b, there was a perception with the majority of candidates that the Directors would access this data through the database or spreadsheet. This is not a correct perception and only a small number of the candidates seen actually presented this aspect in user friendly way for the Directors. There was also a large group of candidates seen who did not actually present this data at all. This then restricts that marks that can be credited as not 'all requirements' are met.

The projects for RO13 are set within in organisational scenario and it would be expected that all documents produced by that organisation, in this case the Hotel, would look similar in style. This was not seen in a large number of candidates, with the mail merge receipt just consisting of the OCR provided text being used in a word-processed document with no thought to the style and look being given.

LO8: To be able to iteratively review and evaluate the development of the solution.

3a

This section requires two aspects to be carried out. At the end of each phase an iterative review should take place where comments should be made by the candidate about what went well, what did not, what changes were made and other aspects as stated in the specification. In most of the work seen these phase reviews did not take place. This then restricts the marks that can be credited. To access mark band 2, it clearly states that at least one phase is reviewed.

Work was seen where screenshots of the production of the work was produced together with a description of what the candidate has done was submitted for this review and evaluation. This does not meet the requirements of the specification.

The final evaluations seen tended to be descriptive in their tone following the process mentioned in the paragraph above. To access the highest mark bands in this section the candidates need to be reflecting on how their system meets the success criteria that they wrote in Section 2a. This is an aspect where in future sessions candidates can easily pick up marks if they follow the process of reviewing each phase and then reflecting on how the system, not how they worked, meets the success criteria. This can be seen in the exemplar coursework of Progress Housing.

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

active**results**

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:
resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Vocational qualifications

Telephone 02476 851509

Facsimile 02476 851633

Email vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2018** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge
Assessment

