GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

ICT
AS/Advanced

SUMMER 2014

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

ICT

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

IT1 - Information Systems

Principal Examiner: Click here to enter examiner name.

Performance was in general in line with previous years. One issue is the number of centres over structuring the spreadsheet preparation. When the candidates are given templates or semi-prepared spreadsheets, they have no ownership of the spreadsheet and consequently do not fully understand what they have used and find great difficulty in explaining why they did things and do not score well on question 10. A better approach is for the candidates to design/use a simpler spreadsheet using all the features.

Specific Questions

Q.1 (a) Candidates were quite good at giving the definitions but struggled to give correct examples of knowledge and providing a second example seemed to stretch most candidates.

(b) Most candidates were able to make a good attempt at the question and give one process, which is an improvement on previous years.

Q.2 Most candidates were able to give a definition of validation. Where candidates mainly dropped marks in this question were by either not giving an example related to online banking, not giving enough detail (missing field or unit) or by selecting inappropriate validation checks, such as type checks or length check on surname.

Q.3 Most candidates could give the factors hardware and software but few gave the hardware device and how it affected efficiency. Very few candidates could give three factors with an expansion.

Q.4 (a) Most candidates could explain what CAD and CAM were. The final mark was awarded if the candidate could state both the object and process e.g. clothes designed in a CAD package and then cut out correctly and stitched by a CAM package.

(b) Most candidates could give an example of an advantage or disadvantage but candidates lost marks by being too general, i.e. more accurate was a common answer but did not state more accurate than what.

Q.5 (a) - c Generally these three sections were badly answered and this was the worse answered question on the paper. One mark was frequently obtained for the query question but the example often lack why patient(s) need to be searched for. Few correct answers were given for section b. In section c many candidates did not appreciate that it was the transfer of data between software and instead wrote about systems, media or files.

Q.6　　Some candidates could not name any Act and hence did not get any marks for this question. 'The Computer Misuse Act' was sometimes referred to as 'The Data Misuse Act' for no marks. Candidates also lost marks if the consequences between their examples were identical.

Q.7　　Most candidates knew what EPOS stood for but then mixed this up with EFTPOS and wrote about the movement of money and not about the process. Most though could give an advantage of EPOS for the customer.

Q.8　　(a)　　Generally well answered. Most candidates knew the three main components. A few failed to read the question properly and wrote about blood tracking and body scanning only to find them repeating their answer in part b.

　　　　(b)　　Again generally well answered. Candidates who had revised these topics were well rewarded. Some candidates tried to write about sensors which had appeared in previous questions.

Q.9　　(a)　　Marks were lost when candidates failed to state that software (or equivalent) was used in the process.

　　　　(b)　　A few candidates muddled this with testing the safety of cars however this question was answered better this session than similar questions in previous sessions.

Q.10　(a)　　Centres have clearly informed candidates of the requirements to number the pages of their spreadsheet documentation and to refer to these pages when answering these questions. Far fewer candidates lost marks because the examiner was unable to find the evidence than in previous sessions. Never-the-less there were still candidates who did not heed this advice and did not reference their work and consequently lost marks. Some candidates merely referenced their work using just titles, this should be discouraged. Furthermore the use of plastic wallets/folders is not recommended as it adds to the cost of dispatching and is time consuming to take them out to inspect.

　　　　　　　Parts a), c) and d) required candidates to write **what** they used the function/feature for and why they used it. Candidates were generally very poor in saying **why**. Again the question therefore needs to be asked about how well they understood the spreadsheet that they produced and therefore how much of it was their own work. Candidates who have wrestled with getting, for example, an IF statement; multiple IF statements; validation routines correct, are very unlikely to forget why they were needed within the spreadsheet. Centres that produce spreadsheets minus the data and all that candidates need to do is type in the data, are doing a disservice to their students. The candidates clearly do not understand what is going on within the spreadsheet, as they have no ownership and their marks reflect this.

ICT

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

IT2 - Presenting Information Task

Principal Examiner: N Kay

GENERAL POINTS

Some Centres should take note of the comments made in the moderator report as they are making exactly the same mistakes as last year. It would be beneficial if they ensure they see this report especially if marks have been adjusted.

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 teacher.

Most portfolios were very clear and well presented.

However where moderators disagree with the Centre it is in generally the same areas as last year.

ANALYSIS.
Background. Again this was well done.

Identification of 3 documents.

At this stage candidates are only required to supply and identify three different types of document and for each type of document, outline its purpose and its potential audience. The original documents or scans of the documents must be included. They must be obtained from the organisation or a similar organisation.
They cannot be drafts of the documents they go on to produce.

Ethos or house style.
Although this area is beginning to improve there are still some Centres who award marks for descriptions rather than an analysis.
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?

Some candidates are still not being analytical and only describe colour schemes, fonts etc

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

Analysis of an organisation's documents.
This has improved but is still the most troublesome section. The comments are the same as last year. Where mistakes are made it tends to be made by the whole centre. Therefore it is a centre interpretation problem.
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*

For Section 1 the candidate must **get 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.

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.

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.

NB It is only for the automated document and website that they can take this potential approach. The same mark scheme applies whichever approach they take

Section 1 Detailed analysis of two paper based DTP documents.

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** include fonts and fonts styles
- does **not** include 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.

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.

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

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

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 four describe four **different** multimedia features but some Centres still gave full marks, e.g. 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: <u>DESKTOP PUBLISHING</u>

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.

<u>The final leaflet must be printed out and included in the coursework.</u>

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 **<u>8 special features</u>** 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.
<u>**THE FEATURES MUST APPEAR ON THE FINAL DOCUMENT NOT JUST IN CONSTRUCTION EVIDENCE.**</u>

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 two 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: <u>AUTOMATED DOCUMENT</u>
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 **<u>three</u>** macros on their design and identify the **<u>mailmerged fields</u>** 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 should 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. **<u>NOTE: NO copy and paste macros.</u>**
- 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 when 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 <u>SHOULD SHOW THE MAILMERGED FIELDS IN THE BACKGROUND</u> AND THE SAVING AS A TEMPLATE DIALOGUE BOX IN THE FOREGROUND. THE LATTER IS STILL THE COMMONEST FAULT. IF YOU CANNOT SEE THE FIELDS DO NOT GIVE THE MARK.

- 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: <u>WEBSITE OR PRESENTATION</u>
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
<u>Background style</u>
This must be original and not chosen from a library of design styles.
They were generally very well done.

<u>Animations and transitions using **INTERNAL** features of the software provided for candidates use.</u>
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

<u>Use of Sound</u>
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.

<u>Use of original video.</u>
Please note that the storyboard is 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.

ICT

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

IT3 - Use and Impact of ICT

Principal Examiner:

Candidates seemed to find the exam a little easier this year.

Specific Questions

Q.1   Most candidates answered this question well. Marks were dropped by candidates not being able to give the differing needs of novices and experts.

Q.2   Again most candidates were able to give 2 factors with justification and gave others but they did not justify them.

Q.3   Again most candidates were able to give 2 advantages/disadvantages but dropped marks by not being accurate enough i.e. saying old walls rather than walls in listed buildings.

Q.4   The best candidates answered this well but weaker candidates either did not attempt 6 factors or tended to give more than 1 cost or knowledge answer.

Q.5   A significant number of candidates either did not attempt or could not explain properly why a company should have a security policy. Weaker candidates also dropped marks by not giving 3 examples from distinct categories.

Q.6   Most candidates were able to explain 2 out of the 3 items auditing keeps a log of.

Q.7   It is still disappointing to see the number of candidates who do not seem to realise the difference between distributed databases and distributed processing. To get the second the second example mark candidates had to say something extra i.e. if they were discussing SETI they had to say something more than searching for extra-terrestrial life, which had gained them the first mark.

Q.8   Most candidates could give 2 advantages/disadvantages. Weaker candidates dropped marks by jumbling up the advantages/disadvantages.

Q.9   Candidates lost marks by not being able to give the 'standard' in the definition and tended to give an example on banking rather than a survey company as requested in this question.

Q.10 Candidates found this question hard with only the very best candidates scoring well. To get up to 3 marks candidates could give 3 distinct moral/legal issues but to get more than 3 candidates had to compare legal and moral points for related issues as shown in the mark scheme.

Q.11 It is disappointing to see how many candidates could not identify potential risks or discuss their likelihood of occurring.

Q.12 It would appear from their responses that a number of candidates had not heard of the different methods of maintenance. To get the mark for an example candidates either had to name the method or describe it.

Q.13 Most candidates could make 1 or 2 points but failed to explain the 6 good or poor points in sufficient detail and again mixed up points.

Q.14 The best answered question on the paper with most candidates being able to give 6 advantages/disadvantages.

Q.15 and Q16 Both well answered.

Q.17 Only the very best candidates could explain how the structure could be improved.

Q.18 This question was a good discriminator with the best candidates scoring well.

Q.19 Not as many candidates answered this question. Candidates wrote well but on the whole it was chosen by the weaker candidates and there was a lot of duplication in their responses i.e. gaming allows you to communicate well, email allows you to communicate well and mobile phones allow you to communicate well.

<div align="center">

ICT

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

IT4 - Relational Database Project

</div>

Principal Examiner: N Kay

GENERAL COMMENTS

A few centres clearly did not read the moderators report sent to them last year and they still make the same mistakes.
Some possibly new centres do not understand the specification requirements and should note the comments made in the moderator report and look at exemplar material provided by the WJEC.

Many high quality projects were seen. Most of the samples submitted showed that centres have a clear understand the requirements of the specification.

Many centres provided helpful teacher comments and marking grids to show where marks had been awarded.

Some centres should note that the project is in the following separate and distinct.
sections;
- Background and Analysis of User requirements
- Design
- Implementation
- Testing
- User documentation
- Evaluation

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

To assist new centres it is worth re-iterating the areas of misinterpretation in the hope they will not be repeated next year.

Background

1 mark is for general background.
1 mark is for describing what data handling / existing data processing goes on at present.

Analysis and user requirements

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. It should not appear to be a retrospective list of what they did in design or candidates should lose a mark.

Hardware requirements.

Note 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

Again it is worth noting that implemented features are not 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.

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**
  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**.

In total there a six queries required.

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.

- **Not presence checks unless the =null statement is extended with something original other than the default selection.**

- **Not data type checks.**

- **Drop down list /combo boxes and input mask wizards provided by Access are not acceptable** 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.

- 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 test.

Design of reports

Again improved but centres should note;

- Candidates should design and implement <u>**original**</u> headers and <u>**original**</u> 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 and 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 **do 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 sorting 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 <u>more than one record.</u>

- 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 edit the existing code to perform some extra function** or this is not acceptable.

TESTING

Most candidates had good and detailed test plans.

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

This is much improved but the main problem area is still the add, edit and delete a record. Backup and recovery was done very well by most centres but there are still a few that only do backup

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. Candidates should note it is not how to construct a query so there should be no evidence of queries in design view. In 'User documentation' we want to see evidence of how each of the different types of query are run.
- 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. It is not sufficient to say *'the technician backs it up at night and he will recover it if it gets corrupted'*, or any similar general statement.

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.

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