

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this assignment.

## Candidate 1

### Task 1 database design and development

#### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. Entity names and instances were correctly notated. The third mark was not awarded because of an incorrect association between Route 2 and Flight 3.

#### Question 1(b)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the query was correctly implemented. Use of Format was ignored. Unique criteria were used in the WHERE clause.

#### Question 1(b)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the two queries were correctly implemented with the second query referencing the first query.

#### Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. Although reference was made to incorrect or no data, the explanations provided were vague.

### Task 2 software design and development

#### Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** as the inputs do not state that the data is coming from the file. Processes do not state finding members who walked more than 70% of furthest. Output states 'Display' instead of write to file and refers incorrectly to 'within 70%' rather than more than 70%.

#### Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because the data flow showed one correct parameter, but two incorrect parameters.

#### Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **13 marks** because implementation was correct, they met the design requirements and all evidence was in place.

**Question 2(c)(ii)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because implementation was correct and the appropriate pre-defined function was used.

**Question 2(d)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because the initial values and the changing state of the two variables are incorrect.

**Question 2(e)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

No marks were awarded for fitness for purpose as the response incorrectly states 'who walked 70% or more'. The correct response should be more than 70%.

No marks were awarded for readability as the candidate has given generic definitions that do not relate to the code or to maintainability.

1 mark was awarded for modularity as the response states separate classes to aid readability.

**Task 3 web design and development****Question 3(a)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because both functional requirements are valid and answered within the context of the Playing Cards website.

**Question 3(b)(i)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** as follows:

1 mark was awarded for the correct position of each section.

1 mark was awarded for floating the image to the right.

No marks were awarded for margins.

**Question 3(b)(ii)**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** as follows:

1 mark was awarded for the use of IDs in patience HTML file at lines 60, 68 and 81.

1 mark was awarded for three sections set to none when the page first loads. A class .patiencesections was used at lines 60, 68 and 81 in the HTML file and set to none at line 72 of the CSS file.

1 mark was awarded for onclick events added to image at lines 54 – 56 in the patience HTML file

1 mark was awarded for three functions at lines 8 – 24 in the patience HTML file.

**Question 3(c)**

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** for describing comprehensive tests using examples from the form.

## Candidate 2

### Task 1 database design and development

#### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because all entity names, instances and associations were correctly notated.

#### Question 1(b)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the query was correctly implemented.

#### Question 1(b)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the two queries were correctly implemented, with the second query referencing the first query.

#### Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because the potential problems were valid and they correctly referenced the flight table.

### Task 2 software design and development

#### Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because all inputs, processes and outputs were correctly identified.

#### Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because the data flow was correct.

#### Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **13 marks** because implementation was correct, met the design requirements and all evidence was in place.

#### Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because implementation was correct and the appropriate pre-defined function was used.

#### Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. The trace table had the initial values and correctly traced the values of distance and max distance. Ignore additional variable Maxposition.

### Question 2(e)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** as follows:

No marks were awarded for fitness for purpose as the fitness for purpose evaluation was not answered in the context of the problem, and did not reference functional requirements of this problem.

1 mark was awarded for readability. Readability was expressed using generic descriptions, but the candidate did link readability to maintainability in the last sentence by stating that 'it makes sense to other programmers'.

1 mark was awarded for modularity. The candidate described using sub-procedures and functions as well as commenting on the ability to make changes without it affecting the rest of the code.

## Task 3 web design and development

### Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because functional requirement 1 is a generic response, and was not answered in the context of the Playing Cards website.

### Question 3(b)(i)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because all elements were correctly positioned in lines 28 to 39 of the CSS file. Code is supported by evidence of the pages displayed in a browser.

### Question 3(b)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as follows:

1 mark was awarded for IDs assigned to sections at lines 68, 76 and 89.

1 mark was awarded for onclick events added to the images at lines 62 – 64.

1 mark was awarded for the three functions at lines 12 – 29.

No mark was awarded for the three sections set to display:none. At line 68, Klondike is set to display:block.

### Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. The candidate has listed types of tests that could be carried out, however they have not described how the inputs of this form can be comprehensively tested. Candidates were expected to comment on how all the inputs could be tested.