

UNIT 4: System Design and Installation
Commentary on Assessment of Student

Assessment criteria – Unit 4: System Design and Installation – part a)				
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3	Mark awarded	Comments by assessor
The learner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • carries out a limited investigation of the client’s requirements • produces limited needs and analysis, but with some omissions • provides a brief description of at least two existing systems that meet similar needs 	The learner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • carries out an adequate investigation of the client’s requirements • produces a sound needs analysis • provides a detailed description with some evaluative comments of at least two existing systems that meet similar needs 	The learner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • carries out a thorough investigation of the client’s requirements • produces a comprehensive needs analysis • provides a detailed description and considered evaluation of at least two existing systems that meet similar needs. 		
(0 – 6)	(7 – 9)	(10 – 12)	6	

Principal Examiner comment -

The learner appears not to have fully understood the assessment evidence brief properly. The client involves 2 people with differing needs and 4 systems have been evidenced. This is rectified to a certain extent in the h/w s/w section where the learner has made a recommendation at the end bringing the 2 clients together as one unit which is sensible. This has not affected the moderation of this portfolio as it is assumed that the learner did mean to treat the husband and wife team as one client.

The learner would have addressed the mark bands and assessment guidance more accurately if the guidelines for the Needs Analysis section of Delivering this Unit had been more closely examined. The learner should have found out what the client requirements were (Needs Analysis), examined existing systems available and then made a detailed recommendation. This would have enabled the learner to have addressed the high mark bands a and b more easily. Paragraph one on this pages states "The complexity of the client's needs will determine which mark band a learner is eligible for. A needs analysis of a client with straightforward needs is only eligible for Mark Band 1 no matter how well it is carried out and documented."

The areas a Needs Analysis should cover are clearly listed on p60 of the unit specification.

Mark Band 1

The introduction to the portfolio on the home page explains who the clients are and that there was an initial meeting. The learner would have benefited by bringing the 2 clients together with an overall need. The learner also produces a questionnaire for a face-to-face follow up interview with the clients which can be seen in the requirements' link.

There is a needs analysis which can be seen under this link. Not all areas are covered, see 4.1 page 60.

The h/w and s/w costs give details of 2 existing different systems for each client.

The learner has used interview and questionnaires as investigative techniques and has matched the systems to the client. Mark Band 1 is fully addressed.

Mark Band 2'

The first bullet point is addressed with the 2 interviews and questionnaire

The needs analysis covers:

- Establishing how current system works – clearly stated in the current system section
- Identifying the problems/limitations of the current system and therefore any user dissatisfaction – these are also clearly specified
- Identifying the requirements of the new system – the section on Requirements is detailed and involves an interview using a questionnaire to ensure the relevant aspects were covered properly. However, timescales and costs/budgets were not covered and these are important considerations.
- The questionnaire has a Comments column which clearly suggests main hardware considerations for the 2 clients. This includes processor, memory, HDD, printers. Thought is given to security and breakdown. Software is covered with mention of operating system, applications software and security software. Ergonomics is also considered. However, the needs analysis is incomplete which means that the learner remains in Mark Band 1.

There are two existing systems identified in the hw/sw section and the learner has indicated that she has taken existing specifications and changed the wording to make it more user friendly for the clients. However, the learner has not explained **all** the different parts of the specification clearly to the clients.

There are some evaluative comments on the existing systems.

Mark Bank 3

The learner has not carried out a thorough investigation of requirements. More questioning about networking and mobility (thinking about the future and how a self employed person may find they are working) would have been sensible. No thought was given to costings.

The Needs Analysis was not complete.

Assessment criteria – Unit 4: System Design and Installation – part b)				
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3	Mark awarded	Comments
<p>The learner produces an outline system specification that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets some of the client’s needs • is written using simple, non-technical language • gives some explanation for the choices made, but without fully justifying them • includes little or no consideration of ergonomics 	<p>The learner produces a detailed system specification that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets most of the client’s needs • is clearly presented, using simple, non-technical language • gives a detailed explanation for the choices made, with some justification • includes some consideration of ergonomics. 	<p>The learner produces a comprehensive system specification that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fully meets the client’s needs in some most appropriate way • is effectively presented, using simple, non-technical language, demonstrating full awareness of audience and purpose • gives a detailed explanation and full justification for the choices made • includes full consideration of ergonomics. 		
(0 – 9)	(10 – 13)	(14 – 18)	8	

Principal Examiner comment –

Mark Band 1

The learner has recommended one system to each of the clients and this is written in easy to understand language. There is an explanation for the choices but these are not fully justified. The recommended specifications do not address ergonomics although there was mention of this in the needs analysis requirements questionnaire. This should have been followed up in the recommendation that could have included mouse, keyboard screen as well as recommending, chair, desk. The first 3 bullet points have been addressed in sufficient detail to bring the learner into Mark Band 1 but not enough to gain full marks. Not all aspects of section 4.7 were addressed which is clearly stated in the Assessment Guidance. Therefore, the learner cannot achieve maximum points for this mark band.

The learner has realised that the recommended specification needs to include further details and has covered networking the clients' 2 computers together and given full consideration to the Broadband provider.

Mark Band 2

Not all parts of the system hardware are fully described. (see 4.4) The software is covered briefly but more consideration of 4.2 and 4.3 should have been evidenced.

4.6 was not covered in the specifications and this is essential to achieve this mark band.

Consideration of security and backups is demonstrated. There is a plan for the installation which implies removing old system hardware as the new hardware is proven. This shows some consideration of testing.

There was some consideration given to alternatives with methods of accessing Broadband.

This learner could easily have reached mark band 2 by paying more attention to the unit specification.

Mark Band 3

The learner has not covered mark band 3 and would need to provide a much more detailed specification explaining all aspects (in easy to understand terminology) to the client. The evidence does presume that the client has knowledge.

Assessment criteria – Unit– part c)				
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3	Mark awarded	Comments
<p>The learner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produces a functional system that meets the specified requirements, with extensive prompting carries out some configuration of basic system settings. <p>Whilst working on the installation and configuration of the system the learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, but needs frequent prompting.</p>	<p>The learner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produces a functional system that meets the specified requirements, with limited prompting carries out sufficient configuration of system settings to customise the system to meet the specified requirements. <p>Whilst working on the installation and configuration of the system the learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, needing only occasional prompting.</p>	<p>The learner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produces a functional system that meets the specified requirements independently carries out extensive configuration of system settings to optimise the system to meet the specified needs efficiently. <p>Whilst working on the installation and configuration of the system the learner adheres to relevant standard ways of working, independently.</p>		
(0 – 8)	(9 –12)	(13 – 15)	12	

**Principal Examiner comment –
Mark Band 1**

The learner has produced a functional system. The option to upgrade Lola’s system was selected as the built system. It should be pointed out that the system built does not have to be one that is specified in strands a and b. Throughout the evidence relating to these strands the learner talks about an upgrade. Strictly speaking the system built is more suited to Unit 6 than this unit but some Principal Examiner discretion has been allowed in this instance. There is evidence of the Requirements for the system. The evidence to support the functional system can be seen in the Introductory Video which is very good evidence. This is followed up by the section on Upgrade HDD and also in the Installation of Windows XP on to the new HDD. (see section on OS installation) There is also a section showing the Office Installation and the installation of service pack 2 which is in the testing section This shows configuration of toolbar. This is weak evidence as toolbars can be easily turned on and off and does not really count as configuration of the software. There is evidence on creating some shortcuts for the desktop for Office. However, this can be done automatically when installing Office so, again, weak evidence. The testing section shows that the time and date are synchronised and also the time zone. The learner has shown little evidence to show that the configuration specified in the assessment guidance for this mark band has been carried out – see paragraph 1 under section c on p 72. There is evidence to show the formatting and partitioning of the HDD and some compensation has been made for this. In addition the learner has shown that the BIOS was checked when installing the new HDD. There is evidence of accounts created for Lora and Peter and the creation of passwords in the Testing section. Learners working at this level are expected to be able to demonstrate they have undertaken a good range of relevant activities as listed in 4.9. The configuration of the applications software is not well addressed. The learner has produced a system which can be used but does need further customisation. There is sufficient evidence to award all the marks in this mark band.

Mark Band 2

The learner as produced a functional system and it would appear has done this with no prompting. The second bullet point is addressed. There is sufficient evidence for the configuration of the systems software but the applications software is very weak as mentioned in mark band 1. Sections 4.9 and 4.10 give further guidance on configuration that could be evidenced. The learner would have addressed this mark band better if he had customised the desktop for the user. He could have created customised toolbars, eg added relevant macros for the user. However overall there is sufficient configuration of the system to gain all the marks in this mark band.

Mark Band 3

There is insufficient evidence to show extensive configuration has been undertaken as shown in the first paragraph of the assessment guidance and as has already been commented on. Therefore this learner has not addressed mark band 3 for this strand.

Assessment criteria – Unit 4: System Design and Installation – part d)

Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3	Mark awarded	Comments
The learner carries out some limited testing of parts of the system, but not sufficient to guarantee that it functions correctly.	The learner carries out adequate testing of the whole system to ensure that it functions correctly.	The learner carries out extensive testing of the whole system to ensure that it functions correctly and is fully fit for purpose.		

(0 – 4)	(5 – 6)	(7)	5	
<p>Principal Examiner comment – Mark Band 1 The learner has tested the installation of the HDD as there are before and after screen prints of the BIOS in the upgrade section. There is also a section on Testing the OS. This evidence supports all marks in this mark band.</p> <p>Mark Band 2 Testing has covered all devices are installed properly and shows the installation and set up of service pack 2. The installation of Office 2000 is also tested to show it is working correctly. The short cuts are shown. A full screen print of the whole desktop would have been better evidence. The evaluation explains further testing. However this is still somewhat limited and just covers this mark band.</p> <p>Mark Band 3 The learner has not maximised efficiency of the system by configuring it fully.</p>				
Assessment criteria – Unit 4: System Design and Installation – part e)				
Mark Band 1	Mark Band 2	Mark Band 3	Mark awarded	Comments
The learner makes some evaluative comments about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the performance of the system their own performance. 	The learner evaluates : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the performance of the system their own performance, Incorporating feedback from others and makes recommendations for improvements. 	The learner fully evaluates : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the performance of the system their own performance Incorporating feedback from others and makes realistic recommendations for improvements. 		

(0 – 4)	(5 – 6)	(7 – 8)	3
<p>Principal Examiner comment – Mark Band 1 There is an evaluation which explains the learner’s performance. The learner has also commented on the performance of the system. The learner makes some evaluative comments about the processor and RAM but needs to have commented on several (note – at least 3) aspects of the system as shown in the assessment guidance for this mark band. Therefore full marks cannot be awarded.</p> <p>Mark Band 2 The learner has not really addressed feedback from others in his evaluation. He does refer to the clients and uses them to carry out some of the testing. The comment made was not strictly relevant to the system being tested but related to improvements, ie the inclusion of a sound card.</p> <p>Mark Band 3 The evaluation would have benefited from comments on several aspects of the system rather than just 2. This would have enabled the learner to have moved to mark band 2. The learner should have reported on feedback from others, in this case the clients. The feedback did not relate to the requirements of the assessment guidance closely enough. The recommendations for improvements are there. However, it is somewhat strange that the sound card was included as part of the initial built system. This would have made a system which would have addressed the unit requirements more closely. It would appear that the recommendations are to enable the learner to carry them forward to Unit 6. Note – the eportfolio for unit 6 is from another learner so does not follow this eportfolio.</p>			
		Total marks	34/60
<p>Overall Comment - It is essential that learners are taught and fully understand all areas of the unit specification, ie 4.1-4.12. This learner clearly could have achieved far more marks should more attention been paid to the specification. In addition it is essential that assessors not only the assessment guidance when looking at the mark bands but also look at the guidelines for delivery of the unit. Although the learner did not clearly explain the fact that the husband and wife team were treated as one overall client, the moderation of the portfolio has assumed this is the case and given the benefit of the doubt. Overall the learner looked at four systems but did not document them exactly to the requirements of the specification. The learner has really carried out an upgrade to a system rather than installing a stand-alone PC. Page 74 clearly states they should build and configure a computer for this unit which gives sufficient scope to upgrade in Unit 6.</p>			