5220-21 Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies

Examination Series - April 2017

Chief Examiner Report

Introduction

This document has been prepared by the Chief Examiner, it is designed to be used as a feedback tool, for centres to use in order to enhance teaching and preparation for assessment. It is advised that this document be referred to when preparing to teach and then again when candidates are preparing to sit examinations for City & Guild Technical qualifications.

This report provides general commentary on candidate performance and highlights common themes in relation to the technical aspects explored within the assessment, giving areas of strengths and weakness demonstrated by the cohort of candidates who sat the April 2017 examination series. It will explain aspects which caused difficult and potentially why the difficulties arose, whether it was caused by a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique or responses that failed to demonstrate the required depth of understanding.

The document provides commentary on the following assessments;

- 5220-022 Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Network and Infrastructure) - Theory Exam
- 5220-024 Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Software Applications) – Theory Exam
- 5220-526 Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Web Design & Social Media Development) – Theory Exam

Theory Exam – April 2017

5220-022/522 - Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Network and Infrastructure)

The table below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel;

Total marks available	80
Pass mark	30
Merit mark	43
Distinction mark	56

Chief Examiner Commentary

This series has demonstrated some common challenges for candidates in all centres offering it and completing the theory examination.

Some candidates across whole cohorts demonstrated a lack of knowledge in key areas. Generally, the quality of the language used in responses was good and candidates paid attention to spelling and grammar. Some candidates failed to answer questions in the style required by the command verbs in the stem of questions. Candidates should be clear about the type of answers required when asked to 'state', 'explain', 'describe' and 'discuss'.

Where candidates were asked to state or identify from the range described in the qualification syllabus, some offered more than was required by giving explanations rather than just providing the fact. It was noted by examiners that candidates lacked detail in the answers provided and relied on generalised commentary based on their own understanding and experience rather than precision in recall of the topics covered in the syllabus. Many answers lacked depth and often resulted in partial award of the available marks.

Through discursive answers, generalisation and a failure to use correct precise technical language it was not always clearly demonstrated that candidates had the correct understanding. Once again, candidates seemed to rely on their own experience and background knowledge, rather than demonstrating understanding of the topics from the qualification syllabus.

In several questions, candidates failed to answer the question asked. For example, candidates described threats instead of vulnerabilities or a description of something instead of its purpose where this was required in the question.

Candidates failed to demonstrate understanding of differences between technologies despite having some understanding of the technologies considered.

In extended answer questions, most candidates made an attempt indicating they were aware of the different expectations of such questions and that the time allowed for the test was

appropriate. In most cases, candidates achieved marks in these questions but did not provide sufficient depth to access higher mark bands.

In extended questions, candidates should be able to follow arguments through when expanding content. In some cases, good opportunities were missed when candidates proposed several themes for their answer but focussed on a single aspect of the proposals, rather than expanding on all of them. Candidates failed to provide recommendations based on the arguments they proposed and this limited the marks gained.

Theory Exam – April 2017

5220-024/524 - Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Software and Applications)

Below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel;

Total marks available	80
Pass mark	31
Merit mark	43
Distinction mark	56

Chief Examiner Commentary

This series has demonstrated some common challenges for candidates in all centres offering it and completing the theory examination.

Generally, the quality of the language used in responses was good and candidates paid attention to spelling and grammar. Some candidates failed to answer questions in the style required by the command verbs in the stem of questions. Candidates should be clear about the type of answers required when asked to 'state', 'explain', 'describe' and 'discuss'.

It was noted by examiners that candidates lacked detail in the answers provided and relied on generalised commentary based on their own understanding and experience, rather than precision in recall of the topics covered in the qualification syllabus. In questions where candidates were asked to demonstrate understanding of knowledge recalled, the answers lacked depth and often resulted in partial award of the available marks. This was particularly evident in questions dealing with networking technologies and the underlying principles that support them.

Through discursive answers, generalisation and a failure to use correct precise technical language it was not always clearly demonstrated that candidates had the correct understanding. Once again, candidates seemed to rely on their own experience and background knowledge rather than demonstrating understanding of the topics from the syllabus.

In several questions, candidates failed to answer the question asked. For example, candidates described programming languages rather than styles. Many failed to demonstrate understanding of differences between technologies despite having some underlying awareness of the technologies considered.

Some candidates across whole cohorts demonstrated a lack of knowledge in key areas. It was notable that candidates lacked certainty about data handling in application development.

In extended answer questions, most candidates made an attempt indicating they were aware of the different expectations of such questions and that the time allowed for the test was appropriate. In most cases, candidates achieved marks in these questions but did not provide sufficient depth to access the higher mark bands.

In extended questions, candidates should be able to follow arguments through when expanding content. In some cases, good opportunities were missed when candidates proposed several themes for their answer but focussed on a single aspect of the proposals, rather than expanding on all of them.

Theory Exam – April 2017

5220-026/526 - Level 2 Technical Certificate in Digital Technologies (Web and Social Media Development)

The table below identifies the final grade boundaries for this assessment, as agreed by the awarding panel:

Total marks available	80
Pass mark	32
Merit mark	44
Distinction mark	56

Chief Examiner Commentary

This series has demonstrated some common challenges for candidates in all centres offering it and completing the theory examination.

Generally, the quality of the language used in responses was good and candidates paid attention to spelling and grammar. Some candidates failed to answer questions in the style required by the command verbs in the stem of questions. Candidates should be clear about the type of answers required when asked to 'state', 'explain', 'describe' and 'discuss'.

Some candidates across whole cohorts demonstrated a lack of knowledge in key areas. It was noted by examiners that candidates lacked detail in the answers provided and relied on generalised commentary based on their own understanding and experience, rather than precision in recall of the topics covered in the qualification syllabus. In questions where candidates were asked to demonstrate understanding of knowledge recalled, the answers lacked depth and often resulted in partial award of the available marks.

Through discursive answers, generalisation and a failure to use correct precise technical language it was not always clearly demonstrated that candidates had the correct understanding. Once again, candidates seemed to rely on their own experience and background knowledge, rather than demonstrating understanding of the topics from the syllabus.

In several questions, candidates failed to answer the question asked. For example, candidates described threats instead of vulnerabilities or a description of something instead of its purpose where this was required in the question. Many failed to demonstrate understanding of differences between technologies despite having some appreciation of the technologies considered.

In extended answer questions, most candidates made an attempt indicating they were aware of the different expectations of such questions and that the time allowed for the test was appropriate. In most cases, candidates achieved marks in these questions but did not provided sufficient depth to access higher mark bands. In extended questions, candidates should be able to follow arguments through when expanding content. In some cases, good opportunities were

missed when candidates proposed several themes for their answer but focussed on a single aspect of the proposals, rather than expanding on all of them