



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

GCE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY AS/Advanced

SUMMER 2017

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
Unit 1	1
Unit 2	4
Unit 3	11
Unit 4	13

WJEC
GCE ICT
Summer 2017
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced
UNIT 1

General

It was disappointing to see so many candidates displaying poor exam technique and again not reading the questions properly and then giving answers which were already precluded or being far too general in their response.

Q1

Fairly well answered by most candidates but marks were lost by:

For knowledge, the rule was missing. 'The swimmer in lane 3 was the fastest' rather than hence won the race.

Weaker candidates only tended to give only one example.

Q2

Many candidates found it difficult to give specific uses of the interfaces. The candidate needs to ask themselves 'To do what?' – 'Calling a person on a mobile phone', 'Navigating between pages on my tablet so I can select an App' would have given them the mark for the touch sensitive interface. Candidates also tended to lose marks when discussing the game playing device by giving a brand name rather than talking about a joystick to control a plane.

Q3

A number of candidates thought that they had to discuss features of good information rather than the way it adds value. Candidates should study the mark scheme for the ways and their extension.

Q4

Candidates lost marks here:

By not giving 3 different examples with different combinations of stage and cost. Examples were also often too general.

Q5 (a)

Candidates dropped marks by

Discussing presentation software and not wordprocessing software.

Describing the use of macros in their spreadsheet.

Being too vague when describing their features.

Most candidates did refer to a hospital use.

Q5 (b)

Very poorly answered with most candidates being unable to give any differences. Better candidates showed thought and produced some good answers.

Q6

A number of candidates were unable to give a reasonable definition of data validation, mark schemes have given a number of appropriate versions and one of these should be learnt. Weaker candidates seemed to confuse range and length checks. Marks were lost by candidates not saying which field the validation method was working on.

Q7

It was surprising to see how many candidates could not describe three acts and even got their names wrong. Weaker candidates should also try and ensure that they do not repeat the same points for every example, i.e. a fine as a consequence for each crime.

Q8a (i)

Again it was surprising to see how many candidates could only name 1 or 2 physical quantities that are measured by sensors.

Q8a (ii)

Again it was disappointing to see how few candidates were able to describe two advantages of using sensors to monitor patients, which over the years has been fairly well answered.

Q8a (iii)

From the responses, one could assume that candidates did not realise what control was in a hospital. Only the best candidates were able to describe more than 1 situation.

Q8b

Unfortunately a significant number of candidates seem very confused between MRI and CAT scanners and were unable to discuss the differences between them.

Q8c

Most candidates were able to give one future development of ICT in medicine but only the best were able to describe 2 or 3 developments.

Q9

Most candidates were able to give an advantage. Marks were lost for vague answers such as stating that 'such forecasts are not accurate' or stating 'that an expensive computer was required'. Candidates also dropped marks by giving the measurements precluded by the question.

Q10

Teachers are not benefiting their candidates by giving them a template which they just add data to. Weaker candidates tended, consequently, not to understand the spreadsheet or what the formulae did. Many candidates did not properly understand the use of a 'start up user interface' in particular. A few weaker candidates explained the use of functions in generalised terms rather than referring to their application. Candidates would score better if they produced their own simpler spreadsheet from scratch

Q10a

Again a large number of candidates were unable to state why the function was used.

Q10b

Candidates lost marks for vague answers about an interface, and could not give a benefit. Better candidates just related it back to macros.

Q10c

Candidates lost marks by thinking the question was about validation and again not being able to state why the techniques were being used.

Q10di

Most candidates could describe a sort they used but could not state why it was used.

Q10dii

Most candidates now give a before and after screenshot. Some candidates incorrectly thought that a sort, the find function and VLOOKUP are appropriate searches. Often candidates did not state why they had carried out the search. Answers such as I wanted to find all the customers who lived in Basingstoke are too vague, need to say why.

Q10diii

More candidates seemed to understand this year what is absolute cell referencing but only the best seem to know why they use it.

WJEC
GCE ICT
Summer 2017
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced
UNIT 2

GENERAL POINTS

Many candidates scored very highly on this unit, as most centres now fully understand the requirements of the specification.

Most candidates presented clear and easy to follow coursework portfolios with many centres provided the detailed one sheet marking grid and explanatory comments. This aided the moderation process and helped us to support the marks awarded by the centre.

An increasing number of centres are submitting in electronic form. Note electronic submission is not acceptable at present. The work submitted is generally unstructured and disorganised in several folders with repeated files. This makes moderation extremely difficult and time consuming.

ANALYSIS

Background This was well done.

Identification of 3 documents

This was much improved with candidates supplying and identifying three different types of document and for each type of document, outline its purpose and its potential audience.

Ethos or house style

Candidates should look at the three documents collectively, **not individually**, and ask themselves two questions.

- What is the house style/ethos?
- What tools and techniques are used to portray this image?

This is a piece of **analysis** not a description.

Common mistakes:

- Some centres who award marks for descriptions rather than an analysis.
- Some candidates are still not being analytical and only describe colour schemes, fonts etc.
- Some candidates copy mission statements from online brochures.

Analysis of an organisation's documents

This has improved but is still the most troublesome section.

Some centres have not followed the detailed advice given in moderator reports and continue to make the same mistakes. As this generally is a centre misinterpretation, candidates are given the wrong guidance as to how to achieve the marks.

Candidates must think of this as three sections.

1. *Analysis of two paper DTP documents*
2. *Analysis of an automated document used by the organisation*
3. *Analysis of organisations website or a presentation used by the organisation*

Section 1 Detailed analysis of two paper based DTP documents

For Section 1 the candidate must:

- Describe in detail the data in two papers based documents and label four different DTP techniques used in two paper DTP documents from their organisation.
- They cannot use their own documents created in task 1 task 2 and task.
- They cannot say potential documents for this section and they cannot use a website or presentation or their automated document.
- It is **not** acceptable to use a website in the analysis of two DTP (paper) documents. We are looking for the purpose, **data** and audience of both documents.

1 mark is for identifying the **data/information** on **both** paper documents.

This is a description of the information contained within both of the paper documents, what does it say? what is the content?/ what does the text describe? /What are the images? / what is the logo? General statements of purpose are not detailed enough.

1 mark is for identifying at least 4 different tools and techniques on either one document or between both documents.

NB.

- the latter does **not** including fonts and fonts styles.
- does **not** including clipart/logos unless some photo editing feature is identified.
- all 3 of bold, centre and underline must be present and can only be awarded as 1 mark.

The moderator cannot support marks for features which cannot be seen.

A screenshot or the actual document must be included and candidates have to annotate/circle/arrow on the screenshot or actual document at least 4 different features across the two documents.

A separate list or paragraph saying the documents have these features is not acceptable.

Centres were often incorrectly giving this mark when only 2 features were identified or where the same feature was identified twice. Most documents had features which could have been identified but were ignored.

Section 2 Automated documents

For section 2 the candidate should try to get an automated document.

- **However if this is not possible**, they can take an approach of what would be to identify a process which could be automated and result in a potential 'automated document' the organisation could use.
- The must describe in detail the data and the mailmerged fields no matter which approach is used.

The mark scheme states:

1 mark for a description of the purpose, data/information contained in the document and audience of an actual document or a potential document.

The description of the data/information is in the same detail as the paper DTP documents. A general statement about the purpose is not enough.

The second mark is for listing/identifying in detail the individual fields which would be in the database linked to the document.

Therefore, for example, name and address are too general and should not be awarded a mark.

They need to list Title, Firstname Surname, etc.....

Some centres are still giving the mark when they just say address block and this is wrong.

Section 3 Webpage or presentation

For section 3 the candidate should analyse the organisations website or a presentation used by the organisation.

- If the organisation does not have a website they can analyse the website of a similar organisation.
- If there is no similar organisation they could describe in detail, the data and multimedia and web features that would be contained within a potential website for their organisation.

This was generally well done but it is still worth noting the following for new centres.

When analysing an existing or potential web page candidates were required to:

- **identify/annotate/circle/arrow at least 4 different techniques** which were used.
- Some candidates incorrectly identified DTP features instead of multimedia features.

If there was no website or presentation and candidates chose to identify potential ones then they must describe in detail multimedia features which could potentially be used to get the second mark.

Vague statements such as could include hyperlinks, sound and a video should not be credited. What would the hyperlinks do in detail? What would the video be about and what is its purpose etc.

Many did not identify or describe four **different** multimedia features but some centres' still gave full marks, so not three hyperlinks counting as three features.

It is possible to have a mixture of the two approaches. If a website is basic and a candidate can only identify two multimedia features they could suggest how it could be improved by giving two extra concrete suggestions for other multimedia features that could be used.

Task 1: DESKTOP PUBLISHING

Again centres are again to be congratulated on encouraging pupils to give clear evidence enabling moderators to support most centres marking in this section.

Purpose: well done.

Image/ethos/house style

Some candidates still confused image or ethos or house style with the target audience. Candidates should ask themselves two questions.

- *What house style/image/ethos do I want to portray?*
- *How am I going to get that image over in my leaflet?*

In order to gain the mark candidates needed to explain **how** they are going to get over their chosen ethos or house style in the document, not just describe their colour scheme. They should stress why this colour scheme? Why this font style? Why this imagery? Gets over the house style or image they are trying to portray.

The final leaflet must be printed out and included in the coursework.

Detailed design of the document

This was very much improved.

- 1 mark was awarded for an outline layout with inherent page orientation and identifying which frames were text and which were for pictures.
- 1 mark was awarded for **details** of the **'data'** both text and graphics.
- 1 mark was awarded for details of fonts and font sizes to be used.
- 1 mark was awarded for details of at least **8 special features** used such as tables, bullet points, tab settings, line spacing paragraph styles etc.

Moderators wish to thank those centres who encouraged their candidates to use highlighter pens to make the features stand out.

Design cannot be inherent!

There must be evidence of a design process so either hand drawn designs if DTP used to produce the design. The latter must clearly be design and not a first draft of the leaflet.

Use of Basic Features

Again this was well done.

Candidates **must printout** the final document. **Only features which appear on the final printed leaflet will be given credit.** Some candidates clearly show the construction of the header and footer, page number but this does not appear on both sides of the final printed document and should not be credited.

The only extra evidence required in the evidence of basic features is screenshots of the origin of two different sources of graphics.

Use of Advanced Features

It would be helpful if centres would indicate on the IT2 marksheet which advanced features were used. Here supporting evidence is absolutely essential for the features used.

This was usually well done with clear evidence but for new centres it might be worth mentioning the following again.

The features must appear on the final document not just in construction evidence.

Again the most popular techniques attempted by candidates included customised tables, pagination, page or frame borders, and drop capitals for paragraph formatting.

If these are clearly seen on the final document then no further construction or before and after evidence is needed.

Customised tables. This is cell merging or rotation of text within a cell not shading borders or cells.

For all other advanced techniques further evidence is required.

A reminder that layering is not moving to objects to one is on top of the other. It is showing the objects, one in front and one behind and then reversing their positions.

Before and after evidence of line spacing must be clear. Sometimes there is no perceptible difference in the evidence or in the position of the text on the final document.

Many candidates could have improved their reports by providing clear before and after screenshots for:

- different paragraph formats
- own tab settings
- own indents
- Dropped caps.

Superscripts and subscripts both needed to be used and it is essential that screenshot before and after evidence is given or candidates will not be awarded the mark

Task 2: AUTOMATED DOCUMENT

Many of the mistakes this year were similar to last year.

Purpose: well done

Design of document

This was generally well done but candidates must remember to plan their **three** macros on their design and identify the **mailmerged fields** not just say address block: - what are the actual fields to be used?

A few candidates did not achieve the 'data' mark because they just wrote 'body of letter and did not describe the content of the letter.

Some '*designed*' letters looked identical to the template letter and could not be awarded any marks.

Use of Basic Features

This was generally well done but some Centres did award marks when there was a clear spelling or capital letter mistake or inconsistencies in the use of capital letters in titles. Again it is worth noting that **any** spelling or grammar mistake in the database or the letter will be penalised. Candidates should also check for capital letter mistakes in the data from the database.

Most candidates did ensure they had the contact details and the date on the letter or else the letter would not be a suitable format for a professional letter.

Use of Advanced features

- Again this was well done but some candidates need to think about the 'professionalism' of their macros. **Silly, nonsense macros** should not be credited e.g. first macro puts in Yours; second macro puts in sincerely; third macro puts in a comma.
- Candidates should **not** be given credit for macros which already exist on the toolbar e.g. **print and save**.
- There is still a problem with copy and paste macros in a very few centres. **NOTE: NO copy and paste macros.**
- Please note that **unless the macro code is included**, no marks should be awarded for macros even if construction evidence is there.

- Saving as a mail merge template is still poorly evidenced.
- Some candidates continue to crop the evidence especially saving their mail merge template. It is not saving letter headed notepaper or a blank page. It is saving the mailmerge template/skeleton which has the linked fields embedded in it. The display the dialogue box is often on top of the mailmerged letter so the moderator cannot see it is the mailmerged fields.
- Candidates should show the mailmerged fields in the background and the saving as a template dialogue box in the foreground.
If there are difficulties in showing this then as much of the process should be shown and a screenshot of the originally named template file appearing in the template folder and not the document folder, should be shown.
- Candidates should be encouraged to put in one final screenshot of the mailmerged template with the fields clearly visible and the macro buttons on the toolbar for that template. This shows that the code provided for the macros is linked to that mailmerged template.
- Candidates who re-use their mailmerge template must include the template version of the new letter as well as the letters with the merged records.

Task 3: WEBSITE OR PRESENTATION

Again the evidence for this was generally very good. Most centres chose to do a presentation rather than a website.

The main problem areas was the detailed design of data including images and the extra mark for features such as hyperlinks, hotspots, bookmarks, animations, transitions, background template, sound, video and animations

Basic features

Background style

This must be original and not chosen from a library of design styles.
They were generally very well done.

Animations and transitions using **INTERNAL** features of the software.

Again usually very well done.

For new centres it might be useful to note that candidates doing web pages that:

- For animations candidates could use scrolling banners/leader boards/interactive galleries etc.
- For transitions they can use rollover buttons or some edited the html coding to change the colour sequence from one page to another. If the software has linked features, another alternative for transitions could be interactive image effects.

Evidence must be clearly provided. It must be made clear if the technique is used as transitions and not repeated for animations.

Hotspot/ hyperlinks and bookmarks were generally well done with good supporting evidence.

Advanced features

Use of Sound

Again well done. Most candidates now attempt to capture sound or create original sound rather than load sound files in from a library or backing store in order to gain the extra mark.

Use of original video.

Please note that the storyboard for the original movie not the animation. The level of detail in most storyboards was very good but some did not put details of **timings and effects** used on their storyboard.

It must be an original video. Candidates should take their own video footage or take their own original photos for use in the film.

If they use images from the internet it is not original and should not be awarded this mark. They could still be awarded the two marks for editing.

Many candidates must produce their own original individual video and applied effects but some gave much reduced sized or cropped screenshots so it was difficult to see the evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to annotate their screenshot evidence with at least a title to say what the screenshot is showing.

Use of original animation using EXTERNAL software packages

This was generally well done but a complex animation is not 3 frames/clones where an object moves a very small distance in a straight line. Three frames were given as a guide to **3 different events.**

EVALUATION

Again we agreed with the majority of centre marking of the evaluation section. The quality of evaluations has steadily improved. Most centres are more demanding, expecting more detailed and critical analysis before awarding the marks. However some seem to award marks for very shallow evaluations lacking any analysis and moderators could not support the Centre marks. Again this section was a clear differentiator with a wide variety in the standards of candidates' quality and quantity of answers.

COMPRESSION AND STORAGE TECHNIQUES

Centre understanding of this section of the mark scheme is now very good for the most part. Candidates are expected to discuss in detail the relative merits of at least 3 different compression techniques they have used. They should identify and relate it to their files used and justify their choice of the techniques used.

A few centres **still incorrectly** awarded marks for:

- Zipped files: a description of how they zipped their files will not gain candidates marks.
- Reducing text field length in the database is not compression it is saving memory.

WJEC
GCE ICT
Summer 2017
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced
UNIT 3

General

It is disappointing at this level seeing the number of candidates who do not read the questions thoroughly and give answers which are precluded. The general impression was that a significant number of candidates had not prepared themselves well for some of the traditional type questions.

Q1. Most candidates were able to describe at least 1 factor that should be considered when designing a suitable HCI for the workplace. A significant number of candidates still mix up some of the factors.

Q2. Candidates mixed up the factors and most candidates did not give the level of detail in their answers to score well.

Q3. Configuration management appeared to be a term that many candidates had not come across and answered the question as if it was remote management. The better candidates thought about the term and produced some very good answers.

Q4. Most candidates could explain what is meant by network topology. Weaker candidates seemed thrown a little by being restricted to only giving the advantages of each of the topologies.

Q5. On the whole this question was well answered.

Q6. A number of candidates tried to discuss China even though the question precluded censorship, looked just at crimes or tended to repeat the same areas. There were some very well thought out answers from the better candidates

Q7. Most candidates were able to give an advantage of videoconferencing, more dropped marks by being a little too general in their disadvantage. Only the better candidates were able to give actual uses, generally candidates were too vague in their descriptions.

Q8. Most candidates were able to gain one of the marks for explaining what is meant by a code of conduct. It was disappointing to see the number of candidates describing problems from viruses, which were precluded by the question. Candidates also lost marks by concentrating their answers on just one problem, personal use of equipment or software.

Q9. A number of candidates seemed to have forgotten the definition of a Management Information System. Weaker candidates seemed to be thrown by being restricted to describing factors which can lead to a poor MIS.

Q10. On the whole this was quite well answered with most candidates being able to discuss at least one worry. Some though did seem to confuse these worries with each other.

Q11. Most candidates were able to gain a mark for describing what is meant by distributed computing and give an advantage or disadvantage. Only the very best scored really well.

Q12. A significant number of candidates thought that they were answering a question on the feasibility study. Those that didn't scored better than they had in previous years.

Q13. Most candidates were able to gain 2 or 3 marks here by being able to describe direct and parallel changeover method, Giving examples as always provided the problem.

Q14. Candidates lost marks by mixing up the maintenance methods and then it was not clear which method they were describing.

Q15. Foreign keys were better described than primary keys. It was disappointing to see the number of candidates who could not explain clearly what is meant by a primary key, even though they have used it in their coursework.

Q16. On the whole well answered with most candidates being able to give 2 possible tables. If the question is read carefully, it tends to lead candidates to appropriate tables. Candidates lost marks by not indicating which were primary and foreign key fields, not naming the tables sensibly or by giving the same foreign key in both tables.

Q17. Reasonably well answered but there were still a significant number of candidates who still thought that they were describing distributed processing not distributed databases.

Q18. Most candidates were able to explain what is meant by data mining. Only the very best could describe why it was used.

WJEC
GCE ICT
Summer 2017
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced
UNIT 4

GENERAL COMMENTS

Many candidates score highly on this unit reflecting the amount of time spent upon it. Centres should consider if they are going beyond the recommended time suggested for this unit.

Most of the samples submitted showed that centres have a clear understand the requirements of the specification.

Many high quality projects were seen and candidates are to be commended.

Many centres provided helpful teacher comments and marking grids to show where marks had been awarded but others did not. This meant effectively remarking the work submitted and finding the evidence to find to support the mark awarded by the centre was sometimes very difficult.

The problem areas are the same as in previous reports and Centres should be encouraged to read these reports.
Some centres clearly did not read the moderators report sent to them last year and they still make the same mistakes.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Some centres were awarding two marks when there was no outline of existing data processing activities.

1 mark is for general background and 1 mark is for describing what data handling goes on at present.

Analysis and user requirements

Centres take different approaches to this section and are becoming more demanding in the level of detail required for full marks at A2 but some centres still award high marks for a retrospective list of what the candidate did or a brief very outline of what the system is required to do. Moderators cannot support the marks awarded for the latter.

For full marks there should be a detail description of:

- data and outline data structures required
- data capture methods and data input methods
- security and suggestions for backing up the database
- data processing including all calculations and searches
- outputs required from the system and user documentation requirements.
- the desired house style

This should be written up **as though an end user had been interviewed or consulted** in depth.

Non IT specialist would not be using technical and precise language as *“I want a multi table query which looks for*”

Hardware requirements

It is not sufficient to just say a laptop; a network; a tablet etc.

Hardware must be a complete list including mention of keyboards, mouse, type of monitor, type of printer, USB port or other backup devices.

User interface requirements

This was well done with many candidates covering areas such as forms dialogue/ menu driven systems; house style for forms and reports; health and safety issues such as eye strain or colour blindness.

DESIGN

No marks can be awarded under design for implemented features. There must a clear and separate section.

Design of queries

Although greatly improved, this is still one of the biggest problems. Candidates doing the same topic e.g. a caravan park must produce different queries. Candidates doing different topics must produce different queries. It is doubtful if when all candidates in a centre base their first query on a search for ‘Mr Jones’, that this is all the candidates own work.

Again some candidates do not seem to understand the difference between purpose and reason.

e.g. ‘The purpose of this query is to produce a list of sales in Aberaeron’.

This does **not** explain the **reason** why a list of sales in Aberaeron is required by the manager. It only describes the output from the query not why the information is required. Therefore this type of ‘*reason*’ should not be given a mark. A **reason** would go on to say ‘because the manager wants to compare Aberaeron sales with other areas to assess performance and see if an advertising campaign is needed to boost sales’.

Although only in a few centres, there is still some confusion about the number and type of query required in the new specification.

- Although greatly improved, this is still one of the biggest problems.
- Centres should encourage candidates to produce different queries with different reason if they are doing a similar topic e.g. a stock control system.
- Reasons for queries must be sensible.
- Again some candidates do not seem to be able to differentiate the purpose/output from the query and why that output is needed/reason.

Although only in a few centres, there is still some confusion about the number and type of query required.

In total there a six queries required. Candidates who design the wrong type of query could go on to lose implementation and testing marks.

NB Candidates are required to design, implement, test and document.

- 2 x queries which use a single table and which **both have criteria and a realistic reason and sorts are not acceptable for these queries.**
- 1 query which uses linked tables and which **has criteria and a realistic reason**
- 1 query which uses linked tables and which has **NO criteria and a realistic reason**
The most common use of this could be to:
- *select only certain fields for a report*
- *sort data*
- *produce a calculation. NB This must be a separate and different calculation to the one done in a different query or form or report so if this is the use for this query then 3 different calculations need to be done for full marks.*
- 1 query which uses a **parameter search and a realistic reason.** (This could be on a single or linked tables depending upon the reason).
- 1 action query (append/ delete/ update) **and a realistic reason.**

Design of validation

Most centres now understand that;

Two different types of validation techniques are required not two range checks If a candidate does 2 range checks the second range check should not be awarded any marks in design implementation or testing.

- **Input mask wizards are not acceptable at A level.**
Drop down list /combo boxes and input mask wizards provided by Access are not as suitable validation techniques. Candidates should not be discouraged from using such techniques but they cannot be awarded marks in the validation section.
Validation using input mask wizards should not be awarded any marks in design implementation or testing.
- **Not presence checks unless the =null statement is extended with something original other than the default selection.**
- **Not data type checks.**
- A problem arose with Access 2010 when OR validations were correctly designed and implemented. However testing them was difficult when it was automatically turned into a combo box. If the construction was clearly shown then it was still an acceptable validation.
NB There should still be a proper test.

Design of reports

Again improved but centres should note:

- Candidates should design and implement **original** headers and **original** footers. Many design original headers but use the default footers.
- **Calculations do not form part of the original footer.** They are already awarded a mark and so there must be something else e.g. web address / catch phrase / email address etc. are the commonest.
- **Calculation in the report should be different to that in the query or form.** Many candidates use the same formulas and this should be discouraged.
- =Date() by itself is not acceptable as a calculation in a report.
- =Now() is not a formula and is not acceptable as a calculation in a form.
- Candidates should not have implemented solutions as their design

Design of automated routines

Again centres should note:

- **Timers / =Now() etc / =Date()** by themselves are **not** regarded as sufficiently complex to count as an automated routine.
- Design of buttons to go from form to form (wizards) are **not** original code.
- Candidates should not have implemented solutions as their design

IMPLEMENTATION

Most candidates gave good evidence of implementation. The following points were made last year but in a few centres they caused problems this year so it is worth repeating them.

- Reports must have original headers and original footers. Many implement original headers but use the default footers. Original footers **does not** include date/page no generated by the wizard. It does not include a result of a calculation or function as this will already have been awarded a mark.
- Suitable test data should be used to show sorted and grouped data on the final report **not just construction evidence**.
- Therefore this should be evident in the data in final report not just in construction.
- Reports with only one record cannot show sorted and grouping worked. Two reports one showing sorting and a different one showing grouping are not acceptable. The sorting and grouping must take place in the one same report. This will not show if the test data is not suitable.
- Calculated fields in the report should total up data from more than one record.
- Calculations in a report must be a different calculation to that used in a form or query.
- Candidates should create their own macros not use the wizards on buttons in forms. They should create macros which perform two different functions not just two navigation macros.
- Splash screens and security VB should be more clearly separated out as two different routines. Candidates are advised not to merge them into one routine.
- Creation of original (not button wizard) macros.
The new version of Access originally caused some centres problems. It would appear that most centres using the new software have no difficulty in creating original macros and in using VB.
- Creation of original code.
Should centres need to use existing macros for original code they must make **substantial** edits to the existing code to perform some extra function or this is not acceptable.

TESTING

Most candidates had good and detailed test plans. However some Centres have extremely long tables with un-numbered screenshots which makes it very difficult to match up. It is recommended that there is one test per page with the evidence on that same page.

Again centres should note:

- Calculation in query or form should be tested. This means the **result** of the calculation should be in the test plan before running the test (dry running). It is not good enough to simply say 'yes it works as you can see in my screenshot' How do we know that is the correct total? Some candidates showed very good screenshots of testing the calculation on the on screen calculator and then comparing the result with that in the form.
- Candidates should test password routines with valid usernames and passwords and also invalid usernames and passwords if they form part of their automated code routines.

USER DOCUMENTATION

Centres should note:

- In user documentation candidates should **show before and after** in the add a record; edit a record and delete a record section. It is **not enough to say click a button** when describing how to add, edit, delete data and run different queries.
- In 'User documentation' we want to see evidence of how each of the different types of query are run. Parameter queries must have the search criteria in the dialogue box.
- Disaster recovery needs recovery instructions not just backup. Disaster recover should be extended to a detailed description on how the database can be recovered and reinstalled not just backup. It also requires a level of detail.

EVALUATION

The candidates are responding by being more critical and analytical. However it still tends to be an area where some centres are slightly over generous. Problems should be recorded and strategies used to overcome these should be discussed.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk