OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

ICT

Advanced GCE **A2 H517**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H117**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Information and Communication Technology (H517)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Information and Communication Technology (H117)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

G061 Information, Systems and Applications

General Comments:

There are three things that make up a good response: knowledge, examination technique and application to the scenario. These have been mentioned in previous reports. Examination technique is still poor with candidates seemingly not aware of the key words in the question and therefore not targeting their responses to those keywords with appropriate depth.

The knowledge is also not there with gaps in their understanding or in their rote learned responses. The application to the scenario is, generally, good but there are still occasions where the example relates to learnt responses from class or a previous examination.

In their responses, candidates need to show that they have studied the subject and have more knowledge than "a man on the street" level of understanding.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Question	Comments
1a	Many candidates did not compare as required by the question. Instead they described text and then described audio. This limited the number of marks that they could achieve to 1. Answers often included reference to volume of information, issues with language, and interactivity. However, without drawing a comparison candidates did not achieve many marks.
1b	Unprofessional was often to be seen as a response to this question. Unfortunately without expansion this did not score marks. Candidates often descended to the lowest common denominator - copyright which in this instance is not relevant.
1c	The question required candidates to link their knowledge of static and dynamic to the advert and the context of the question. The majority of candidates achieved half marks for identifying static and dynamic but many failed to gain the example marks.
1d	This was the first of many questions where certain answers were eliminated within the stem of the question itself. Unfortunately, candidates did not read the question properly and the eliminated answer was often given.
2a	Candidates were very good at identifying features of DTP software that would be useful to create the flyer, unfortunately, this was not the question. To gain more than two marks candidates needed to describe the advantage of using the feature. Unfortunately this was not often seen.
2bi	The majority of candidates achieved one mark with very few achieving the second mark. It was common to see answers to the second part of the question given here.
2bii	Some candidates were of the opinion that the thumbnail itself was going into the flyer and had not read the question. The majority, however, successfully obtained full marks with good answers.
2ci	This question required a learnt response-definition of section and definition of frame. Section was done poorly however it was done much better than frame with many candidates thinking this referred to a border or picture frame around the outside of the document. Candidate responses are expected to be the result of at least a year's study and their use of language and knowledge should reflect this.
2cii	Examples of section and frame were to be given within the context of the flyer. It was unfortunate that many candidates gave generic examples unrelated to the scenario.

2d	This is a more technical aspect of the specification and as a result required specialist knowledge. Unfortunately this lack of knowledge amongst the majority of candidates was reflected in the answers that they gave.
2e	Generally, candidates did well on this question providing they did not give changing the font size (eliminated by the question).
3a	It was apparent from many of the answers given that candidates had not been given the opportunity to study check digits. Many had a good attempt at a check digit from the algorithm given but this was not reinforced with prior knowledge. Many did not perform the final subtraction, losing marks, whilst others attempted to give a decimal check digit.
3b	Some candidates did not read the algorithm correctly and appreciated that X was valid. If the final subtraction was not performed then the result of the check digit was 10. Only candidates who performed the entire check digit would have come up with a check digit of one and thus realised the check digit given was incorrect.
4a	Apart from those candidates who confused encoding with encryption, this question was very well done.
4b	A few candidates gave advantages, but generally the responses to this question allowed the candidate to demonstrate their knowledge which they did.
4ci	There is a difference between validation and verification and it is still unfortunate that many candidates do not know the difference. A lot of the answers given to this question were validation based and so gained no marks.
4cii	The key to this question was the fact that data had to be entered incorrectly the same way twice. Candidates who thought about it and linked their response to the surname often achieved full marks.
5a	Candidates often filled the entire space for this question by saying the same thing in many different ways. This did allow them to achieve half marks for the question but very few went on to say something different and thus gain all the marks available.
5b	Generally this question was very well done with candidates giving advantages of manual transition.
6a	This question was very poorly done by the candidates with very few focusing on the use of a spreadsheet model to answer ‘what if’ questions. A large number of responses seen were written from a business studies point of view without any IT detail within them.
6b	Variable was much better done than function with many candidates able to describe and give an example. The learned response function was very poor and the example often was incorrect.
6c	Relative referencing, for the majority of students, seems to be an unknown term resulting in very low marks for this question.
6d	As identified in the general comments for this paper there is an expectation that the candidate has studied the specification. Within the spreadsheet section of the specification they are expected to have looked at ranges. Many candidates gave answers based around validation and drop-down lists and not the area of the specification to do with spreadsheets. Those candidates that look back to figure 1 and identified there was a graph in the figure scored much higher.
7	Candidates performed well on this question with many calling on personal knowledge and experience with regard to Apple Mac and Windows PCs. Although not specifically relevant to the question the knowledge that they gave did allow them to access the marking points.
8a	On the whole this question was very well answered with the majority of candidates scoring full marks. Microphone, foot mouse and puff suck switch being the most common answers. Candidates lost marks for not describing the device but going into advantages of its use.

8b	Candidates generally did well on this question providing they continued to focus on the new member of staff who did not have use of their arms. Answers to do with text-to-speech, screen magnifiers or mouse trails were not relevant.
9	It is unfortunate that after many years of this type of question being asked in the paper candidates are still unaware of the difference between health and safety. Many marks were lost because of answers to do with RSI, eyestrain and bad backs. Candidates that did identify safety problems often failed to give detail; for example, fire is not specific enough to be awarded marks at this level.
10a	It was good to see candidates attempting this question although very few achieved full marks. Many of the diagrams given would not have worked. Some candidates did not give the degree of the relationship between the entities as required by the question.
10b	Generally candidates did well on this question achieving full marks.
10c	The most common responses to achieve marks were based on removal of duplication of data. Very few 'other responses' worthy of credit was seen.
10d	Whilst most candidates achieved full marks, the most common error for those that did not, was for mobile number to be an integer.
10e	'Form controls' was an area that was generally well known and half mark allowed was very common. To gain the other two marks, the candidate was required to link their control to an example on the form for Learn@OCR. This was often not done or if an attempt at an example was given, it was generic. This was another area where the candidates failed to read the question and the example given – buttons, and used this in their response, achieving no marks.
11a	Candidates seem to think that the BCS was a union or a training establishment to solve problems for the company. Many were of the opinion that it was used to hire network managers. This question focused on the purpose of the BCS and not the advantages of belonging to the BCS which is the question that the majority of the candidates answered.
11b	This was very well answered with most candidates achieving full marks.
12	The "go to" answer was passwords which most candidates gave. Unfortunately, a misunderstanding of encoding from earlier in the paper led to this being given as an answer here, achieving no marks.
13	There seems to be a big difference between the candidate's idea and the examiners' idea of what is a future development. Parking assist, electric windows, GPS and electric cars were often seen in this question. Candidates need to retain a sense of common sense in the suggestions that they make, some were not practical or sensible. At the age at which these candidates sit this exam, inappropriate answers should not be found – answers should be based on some sort of realistic expectations. Those that did think about it gave good responses and their advantages well thought through and gained the marks. Traditionally, the final question has been a discussion question. This question took the knowledge that the candidate would normally show in the discussion and broke it down allowing them to demonstrate what they know and achieve higher marks overall.

G062 Structured ICT Tasks

The presentation and quality of much of the candidate work was very good. Most centres did provide candidate work that was clearly organised with a cover sheet containing the candidate's name and number and this was appreciated. The level of teacher annotation to indicate where and why the mark had been awarded differed from centre to centre. It is recommended good practice to follow the guidance on marking work, as indicated on the front cover of the mark scheme, which states 'If a candidate meets the requirements for a mark then tick the box next to that mark'. It is beneficial to use the numbers on the left-hand side of the tick boxes to cross-reference evidence on the candidate's work. Those centres that exhibited best practice, made it considerably easier for the centre marks to be verified during moderation.

A wide range of different software applications and utilities were successfully used to solve the structured ICT tasks this year. This included both freeware and proprietary software packages. It should also be noted that some packages will make the solutions to the tasks considerably easier than others for a given task, and centres are reminded that the Teachers' Guide, downloadable from the subject webpage, provides suggestions for suitable software packages. The Teachers' Guide also contain a list of skills that it would be beneficial to teach the candidates before the candidates tackle the tasks.

Many candidates continue to find questions that ask for annotated evidence to 'explain how' a feature or routine was implemented difficult. Candidates need to be encouraged to provide detailed explanations to demonstrate that they have a clear understanding of the solution that they have produced. This is often a key differentiator of good candidates. This particularly applies to annotating formulae within the spreadsheet task, queries and expressions within the database tasks and HTML code in the website task.

1	a		Most candidates provided a diagram to show the design of the structure of the website. Some candidates did not include links to external sources.
	b		Some candidates provided a fully annotated external CSS file. Some candidates did not have an external CSS file. If the file is not external, as requested, the marks cannot be awarded. Some candidate did not fully annotate the CSS file, leaving out certain design elements.
	c	(i)	Most candidates produced the webpages they created. Most had the correct information present on each page. Some candidates had minor errors in their data on the Home page. The data must be exact, as provided in the task.
		(ii)	Most candidates provided evidence of how a navigation link was created.
		(iii)	Some candidates provided full evidence of how the weather source and map were embedded. Some candidates did not provide full evidence of this, either missing clear detail about the source had been taken from, or how it was embedded into the site. Candidates must provide evidence of the full process.
		(iv)	Most candidates showed how the CSS file was amended to the new requirements. Some candidates did not annotate the changes made, just provided the old and amended CSS files without annotations. Marks could not be awarded for the changes unless annotations were present to show what changes had been made.

	d	(i)	Some candidates showed evidence of how the animated picture sequence was created. Some candidates did not provide evidence of four images being present and did not explain how a fade in/fade out effect was applied. Stating 'the effect is applied' is not enough evidence, it must accompany a screenshot showing either how the effect was created or that a pre-set effect was applied.
		(ii)	Most candidates provided a suitable help sheet about cropping, resizing and watermarking an image.
	e	(i)	Most candidates demonstrated how two different types of validation were added. Some candidates did not provide enough evidence for the second validation, merely stating they added a second validation to a particular field, but not stating how they did this.
		(ii)	Few candidates provided adequate evidence of how the data was added to the .csv file. Many candidates also did not apply the CSS file to the confirmation page. Candidates need to describe the whole process and not just state they submitted the data and it was appended to a .csv file. Due to candidates appearing to use a number of external sources to do this, it was evident that they did not understand the process involved from the lack of annotation.
	f		Many candidates provided evidence of a plan for three different tests. Some candidates did not provide enough detail for a test, missing reference to particular webpages involved. Some candidates also provided repeated tests, testing different navigation hyperlinks. Marks could not be awarded for this as the task stated 'each test must be a different aspect of the site'.
2	a	(i)	Most candidates produced printed evidence showing the correct values and quotation.
		(ii)	Some candidates explained how the booking reference was generated. Some candidates merely stated that a booking reference was created but not how this was done. Candidates are reminded that they must describe how a process is carried out. Some candidates did not explain interim calculations that were used in the process of generating the quotation. Candidates must demonstrate all calculation used in the process of generating the figure, and not just the final stages of the calculation. Some candidates also merely labelled their formula or provided superficial understanding, for example 'I used a Vlookup formula, this looks up a value in a table'. This level of annotation does not provide the understanding required of the process.
		(iii)	Many candidates demonstrated how the form controls were set up. Some candidates did not provide the full process, such as missing information about a cell link.
		(iv)	Many candidates provided evidence of how the validation rules had been set up.
		(v)	Many candidates provided evidence of how the cells had been locked to only allow the cells that were variable to be changed.

		(vi)	Many candidates gained marks for a thorough testing table. Some candidates did not refer to a full location for their test, including the correct worksheet. Tests that do not have a full location cannot be awarded a mark.
	(b)		Most candidates provided evidence that the reset and process quotations buttons to the interface. Candidates are reminded that if they print their worksheet and it does not show the controls, they can provide a screenshot of the form as evidence.
	(c)	(i)	Most candidates provided evidence of the room occupancy worksheet in the correct format. Some candidates did not display the figures to one decimal place, as shown and stated.
		(ii)	Many candidates provided evidence of how they had populated the table, with the formulas they had used. Some candidates merely labelled their formula or provided superficial understanding. Some candidates did not round down to one decimal place, but instead formatted the figures to one decimal place.
		(iii)	Most candidates demonstrated how they had used conditional formatting to colour code the room occupancy percentages as requested.
	(d)	(i)	Most candidates provided evidence of the graph they created, with the data displayed for Orange.
		(ii)	Many candidates provided evidence of how they had created the graph. Some candidates merely labelled their formula or provided superficial understanding. Some candidates did not clearly identity the data range that the graph was based upon. This was not shown highlighted in a screenshot, or referred to in any text.
3	(a)	(i)	Most candidates provided evidence of the relationships they had created. Some candidates did not provide enough evidence of the relationships, just providing a screenshot of the ERD showing the links and not the relationships. In some database programs, if referential integrity is not enforced, only the link, not the relationship is displayed.
		(ii)	Most candidates provided evidence of their table designs and had implemented suitable data types.
		(iii)	Most candidates demonstrated how they had imported the data for the instructor file.
	(b)	(i)	Many candidates provided evidence of how they had stored the photograph and displayed it on the form. Some candidates did not show the photograph displayed on the form, and therefore did not demonstrate the complete process.
		(ii)	Many candidates provided evidence of how they had displayed the instructor number with leading 0's. Some candidates just showed the screenshot that they had been set, but did not provide any annotation of how it was set. For annotated evidence, a screenshot is not adequate so there must be some annotation present to describe the process.
		(iii)	Most candidates provided evidence of how record navigation buttons were added and how the correct details were set to be locked.

		(iv)	Some candidates provided evidence to show how they had created the bonus payments and total salary. Some candidates did not show interim queries and calculations that were used in the process. Candidates are reminded that they must show all queries and calculations in the process. Some candidates merely labelled their queries and calculations or provided superficial understanding. For example, this formula means people who have worked less than four years get £500 and more than 4 years get £2500.
	(c)	(i)	Many candidates provided evidence of the report they had created, with the correct details. Some candidates did not include 'Ibrahim Park' in their report. A separate search needed to be carried out for this.
		(ii)	Some candidates provided evidence of how they had created the report. Some candidates provided very superficial evidence and could not explain the full process of how the report was created, often missing the detail about how 'Ibrahim Park' was added.
	(d)	(i)	Most candidates provided evidence of a form created with the correct data and controls. Candidates are reminded that if they print their form and it does not show the form controls, they can provide a screenshot of the form as evidence.
		(ii)	Many candidates provided evidence of the report with the correct data.
		(iii)	Many candidates provided evidence of the process used to generate the list. Some candidates provided very superficial evidence and could not explain the full process of how the report was created.
	(e)		Most candidates provided evidence of the menu system they had created.
	(f)	(i)	Most candidates provided evidence of the archive table they created.
		(ii)	Some candidates provided evidence of the archive routine they had created. Many candidates did not explain the archive routine in full, leaving macros and confirmation unexplained. Candidates are reminded that they should personalise and confirmation messages to the task and not just use the generic messages of the program.
	(g)		Most candidates provided a suitable user guide.

G063 ICT Systems, Applications and Implications

General Comments:

As with previous years, a significant number of candidates lacked the breadth and depth of knowledge needed for this paper. It is expected that all parts of the syllabus are studied to the same depth.

The responses by some candidates contained little more subject knowledge than that of a lay person, rather than a student that has studied the topic for two years.

A small number of candidates appeared to have learnt the mark scheme for previous years' examination paper and simply tried to use this as a basis for answering questions this year.

Poor examination technique restricted the mark of some candidates who, for example, described features rather than explaining. Candidates should read the question fully and pay particular note of the command word before answering a question.

Many candidates failed to apply the context to their answers to section B, instead providing generic responses that were often not relevant.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Question	Comment
1	Most candidates could describe two characteristics of RAD. Some candidates gave an answer about the methodology lasting six months which was not considered worthy of credit.
2	Poor examination technique meant that some candidates did not score well on this question. Candidates were asked to describe two differences between batch processing and a real time operating system. Many candidates simply described the operating system type, rather than describing differences. A small number of candidates provided the answer learnt from a previous examination series for a question about a real time operating system which was not credited.
3	Many candidates were able to correctly describe two characteristics of the internet. Some candidates described types of files, such as MP4, which restricted the score for this question.
4	The specification lists mobile phone, satellite phone and wireless networks as mobile technologies. Candidates that had studied this section of the specification were able to score highly on this question.
5a	Many candidates were able to successfully describe two ways an MIS could be used to determine if the supermarket loyalty scheme was successful. Some candidates gave specific examples, in context which is an example of best practice.
5b	Most candidates were able to describe a limitation of using an MIS for the purpose listed, with the most frequent answer being garbage in, garbage out.
6	Many candidates were able to give a realistic limitation of current mobile technology and give a suitable way the limitation could be overcome. The most frequent suggestions were battery life and screen size.
7	Many candidates were able to explain two advantages to the hotel chain of using the pilot installation method. A small number of candidates confused pilot and phased installation methods.
8a	This question was not well answered by many candidates. Some candidates simply

	stated principles of the data protection act, or described what a code of conduct was.
8b	Again, poor examination technique meant that many candidates explained what a code of conduct was, rather than advantages of the company including ethical behaviour in the code of conduct.
9	Some candidates did not fully read the question and gave answers regarding staff capability and costs, which had been specifically excluded. Those that had read the question were able to successfully describe two factors that the Brain Trust should consider before upgrading the reporting system.
10	Poor examination technique meant that some candidates described what each of the stages of the system life cycle, rather than describing how The Brains Trust will be involved as a client.
11a	Most candidates were able to correctly describe how a Gantt chart could be used to plan a project. A small number of candidates gave answers relating to the monitoring of a project, which were not suitable for credit.
11b	Most candidates were able to describe the responsibilities of the systems analyst and the tester.
11c	Most candidates were able to describe two factors that should be considered when designing the input form. Poor examination technique meant that some candidates did not fully read the question and gave answers relating to the layout of the forms, the fonts and the colours used. These answered were not worthy of credit.
11d	Most candidates were able to describe two ways the MHP can be applied to the design of the forms. Poor exam technique meant that some candidates failed to provide examples, which prevented them from scoring full marks.
11ei	Most candidates were able to correctly identify another method of database distribution Sigma Software could use. A small number of candidates gave types of partitioning rather than distribution.
11eii	This question was marked using a banded response mark scheme. To score full marks, candidates needed to explain at least one positive and one negative point about horizontal partitioning as well as provide some form of conclusion.
12	Most candidates were able to explain two reasons why a review meeting would be held after the installation of the new reporting system.
13	This question was marked using a banded response mark scheme. To score full marks, candidates needed to justify the decision to assess the current level of staff capability. When providing answers to this question, all of the points should be positive i.e. The Brains Trust had already decided to do this, so disadvantages would not be relevant.
14	Some candidates did not fully read the question and simply described impacts of using mobile communication services, rather than a range of mobile communications services.
15a	Many candidates gave superficial answers to this question, with a significant number giving stock ‘data protection act’ style responses. Whilst these were acceptable, the lack of depth of the response meant that candidates did not score highly.
15b	Many candidates did not understand the difference between authorisation and authentication.
16a	Again, poor examination technique meant that some candidates gave answers related to the cost of employing a network manager. Many candidates were able to describe two suitable disadvantages of a client server network.
16b	This question was marked using a banded response mark scheme. To score full marks, candidates needed to justify the decision to run software applications servers in the schools. When providing answers to this question, all of the points should be positive. Many candidates did not appear to understand what a software applications server was.
17	In general, most candidates could structure a comparison, but weaker candidates

	continued to generate a list of distinct points instead. Some candidates believed that a bulletin board was a notice board in the school, rather than bulletin board technology.
18	Some candidates did not read the question correctly and discussed hardware and software developments, rather than choosing one. Many candidates continue to offer the 'scatter gun' approach, providing many different points in little detail. To score well in this question, candidates need to develop their points to show depth of understanding of the topic chosen.

G064 ICT Project

General Comments:

Most centres are supporting the moderation process, by completing the URS (Unit Recording Sheet) in full, with candidate and centre information fully and accurately completed; annotation providing an explanation to where marks have been awarded, along with page numbers and the marks awarded clearly stated. The inclusion of page numbers assists the moderator in locating evidence, especially where it is not entirely apparent. When little or no annotations are provided, it is sometimes very difficult for the moderator to find the work that has been allocated the marks and also to understand in some cases, why the teacher has awarded the mark. The use of the interactive URS helps to avoid clerical errors in the addition of candidate marks, as this is done automatically, but centres must make sure that all marks are inputted, to avoid these being omitted. It is also helpful if candidate work has a cover sheet, stating candidate and centre details. As the URS is removed during moderation, this helps candidate work to be easily identified.

Comments on Individual Questions:

a(i)
Nearly all candidates were awarded full marks for this section, with an overview of the organisation, client and a brief introduction to the current problems faced.

a(ii)
The first element of the investigation was completed well by candidates. Most provided details about where, when and how the investigation would be conducted; along with justification of their chosen investigation method and why alternative methods were not suitable. Most candidates had also clearly communicated these plans with the client via email or letter.

The first reasoned set of questions should only cover the current system and will enable the candidate to fully investigate and understand how the current system works at present and the issues faced by the client. A few candidates asked questions relating to the new system in this first investigation and this needs to be avoided at this stage. For 3 marks to be awarded, candidates should be covering all aspects of the current system, with all questions justified and follow up questions considered.

All candidates were able to provide a record of the interview response via a transcript of questions asked and responses given by the client.

The analysis of the current system should first of all provide a detailed overview of the organisation's system at present and how it operates. Candidates should also identify the problems faced by the client and organisation. For the full 3 marks to be awarded, candidates should be discussing and analysing these problems in detail and consider the potential impact that they may have on the organisation and customers. This level of detail was sometimes missing from candidate work.

The second investigation focuses on the client requirements for the new system and is separate from the requirements specification that is developed in section a(iii). The investigation should cover similar areas to the first investigation, but this time it will focus on the new system and what the client would like from it, subsequently forming the basis for the requirements specification to be developed. Marks cannot be awarded by simply referring to the requirements specification as evidence.

a(iii)
The requirements specification tended to be completed well by most candidates, but some candidates were awarded the full 3 marks for their requirements, despite them not being specific and measurable. Most candidates discussed the three alternative methods to a good standard, with their suitability in comparison to requirements specification, cost, feasibility and benefits all discussed to provide a reasoned choice to be made. The chosen method was identified and agreed with the client. For 3 marks to be awarded for the hardware and software section, candidates need to ensure that the list is complete, along with each component discussed in relation to the system to be developed.

b(i)
Designs continue to be detailed and clearly enable the client to visualise and understand how the developed system will look and operate. For top marks, candidates must ensure that their designs are in sufficient detail, so that a third party may successfully recreate them. A range of diagrams to explain various processes within the system should also be included for top marks to be awarded. This high level of detail is also applicable for the test plans, which must have specific test data and expected outcomes to be awarded full marks. The user test plan is also expected to be present within the design section, especially when full marks are being awarded.

b(ii)
The majority of candidates are focussing solely on the system development aspect for their project plans, rather than the whole project. For 2 marks to be awarded, project plans should cover all elements of the system development, with each being listed as a separate task. Predecessor and successor tasks should also be taken into consideration and included. If a candidate includes the whole project in their project plan and simply lists 'system development', as one task, this is not sufficient for marks to be awarded.

c(i)
Many candidates are developing complex non-linear systems, using a range of methods including spreadsheets, databases and websites, with backend databases automatically linked to the site. A few candidates are developing projects that are classed as linear and these are frequently over-marked by Centres. For any type of project, Centres must ensure that they follow the non-linear processing requirements if they are to be awarded marks from the middle and top mark bands. To achieve this, data must be processed in two different ways for a system to be classed as non-linear. To be graded in the top mark band, candidates need to have solved the problem faced by the client, with a fully working system that meets the requirements specification.

The system processing is an area which is sometimes over-marked by Centres. Candidates should show how one element of their system that processes data was firstly developed and then show that it is working as expected; using sample data to show the correct flow of data throughout the system. If someone were to then recreate this element, they would be able to judge whether it is working as expected, through the sample data that has been used. A number of Centres simply refer to the system development evidence when awarding marks and it is sometimes very difficult for the moderator to identify the specific evidence required for this section.

The evidence showing the system HCI was completed to a good standard. Candidates should discuss how any relevant requirements have been met, along with evidence demonstrating different aspects of the developed system and how the HCI has been amended accordingly e.g. forms and reports in a database system. Simply providing screenshots of the finished system, with no annotation of HCI is not sufficient for full marks to be awarded.

The testing evidence tends to be marked accurately by Centres, with candidates providing screenshots of tests being carried out, along with a discussion of the results.

c(ii)
The description of training required is frequently written in detail and the plans clearly show that candidates have thought about the training needs of their client and additional staff where applicable. The data transfer sometimes needs further expansion, with regards to the volume of data needing to be transferred from the old system to the new. Nearly all candidates are able to provide a detailed comparison of the different changeover methods available. Fewer are able to discuss each method in relation to the organisation and how each would impact it, which is necessary for 2 marks to be awarded.

d
Most user guides are produced to a high standard and provide the user with a complete overview of the system and how it operates. To be awarded marks in the top mark band, candidates should be producing a manual that covers the complete system. If elements have been omitted, then marks should be placed in the middle to lower mark band. In addition to the complete system overview, candidates also need to provide an onscreen guide to the user for the top mark band. Simply providing a hyperlink to an electronic copy of the user guide is not sufficient for marks to be awarded and candidates should be providing users with some form of onscreen guidance, explaining how to use various elements of the system. The manual should also include all 'common elements', including: contents page, index, glossary, screenshots and a troubleshooting guide, along with evidence of on-screen help which is present to support the user.

e
The first section of the evaluation requires candidates to evaluate their solution against their requirements specification. For 4 marks to be awarded, candidates should list each of their requirements and clearly discuss where and how each requirement has been met within the system. The candidate should also discuss any shortfalls. Simply stating that a requirement has been met or not met is insufficient and no more than 1 mark should be awarded. Most candidates were able to provide a good discussion of each requirement and shortfalls were discussed where applicable.

Possible extensions to the system should be discussed by the candidate and simply listing a range of ideas of possible extensions can only be awarded 1 mark. Extensions should also be valid and appropriate to the developed system. This section is frequently over marked by Centres, with candidates failing to provide a description of exactly how each extension would be achieved for the 2nd mark to be awarded.

The final section of the evaluation compares the project plan against the actual development of the system. If a candidate has not developed a project plan, no marks can be awarded for this section, as there is no way to make a comparison. Candidates should discuss the differences between the two. For one mark, they will identify the differences and for the second mark, candidates will explain why the difference occurred. Most candidates completed this section successfully where a project plan was developed and Centres were accurate in the marks awarded.

Most reports are easily navigable and structured in a logical order, with candidates providing a detailed contents page, all pages numbered and clear section headings. The majority of candidates also provided a comprehensive log of events and this is required for candidates to be awarded full marks for this section. However, some Centres are awarding the full 3 marks, even when a log of events has been omitted. Without the log of events, only 1 mark can be awarded for this section.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553