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This year's exam format was changed slightly to allow students a better spread of opportunities across the various criteria than in previous exams.

In general, many candidates did not read the questions posed carefully enough, some not answering the questions being asked and many not answering all parts of the questions being posed. Many candidates forgot to refer back to the case study after the initial question about it; some students provided “pre-worked” answers that would have been suitable for any question (generic) and made either no or very limited links back to the case study (ie did not answer question).

Some students did not clearly indicate which question they were answering (ie failing to include question number and or part eg 2a) and some tried to combine their answers which in some cases worked but in most cases it made it difficult to for examiners to assess.

Criterion 5 was generally well answered whereas many candidates struggled to produce satisfactory responses to Criterion 1.

Question 1
a. Many students gave positives and negatives which were not related to the current system of recording fitness sessions; better answers came from students who focused on the system rather than how FSG were running their business (system focus rather than business focus).

b. Most students were able to make a judgement about how the current system is working for FSG. Some students again got lost between how the business was running compared to the recording of fitness sessions.

c. Better answers were from candidates who provided multiple solutions and clearly stated which improvement was their preferred choice, and why.

Question 2 (a, b, c & d)
Many candidates did not relate their answers back to the case study and instead provided generic content. Some students attempted a “shotgun approach” where they placed everything down hoping that they would get some parts right but missed the point of relating it back to FSG and showing understanding of the processes involved.

Forty minutes was allocated to this question and it appears many students did not consider this when giving their responses, many only writing three of four lines.

Question 3
Some students raised issues but did not specify which type of issue it was - ethical or social.

Understanding of what an ethical issue actually is appears to be an issue for many candidates.

Most candidates missed the opportunity to relate the issues to the type of the clientele that FSG were serving.

Many candidates focus was on the “distribution of reports”.

Question 4
a. Nearly all candidates were able to provide 3 URLs of fitness tracking systems.

b. ( & c.) Many candidates focused on the marketing hype of the “device” rather than the components of the information system. “Purchasing a smart watch” is not a procedure. Better students were able to describe appropriate information system components and make assumptions on how the “system” works and they
could clearly identify how the components interrelate. For example “The smart watch (equipment) is worn by the client (people) sends heart rate and blood pressure wirelessly (equipment) to a central server(equipment) which can then be accessed by FSG (people) and client (people)” Diagrams were also a good way to describe how the components interrelate.

Question 5
a. Many candidates identified the benefits of the chosen device to the client but failed to focus on the benefits to FSG.

b. Many candidates identified the disadvantage of the chosen device to the client but failed to focus on the disadvantage to FSG, i.e. Fitbit data is not easily accessible by a third party. Most students could recommend whether the system was feasible? for FSG.

c. Most candidates did meet the requirements of this question, addressing both parts. Some candidates did not make a judgement as to the suitability of their researched system and/or did not comment on whether they would recommend the system to FSG.

Question 6
Better answers addressed all 3 dot points and provided a description of how the information system actually worked. Many candidates provided a table identifying the components of their system, again better answers had an accompanying statement and meaningful diagrams showing how the system would work and interrelate. Better answers elaborated on the available procedures (a procedure should show how the identified components interrelate).

Some students failed to produce a “Unique and feasible” information system and struggled to comprehend what was actually required by this question.

Question 7
Many candidates demonstrated a lack of understanding of test criteria in a test plan. Many students focused on testing the system but failed to test that the systems meets specified requirements of the project (see closure phase of project lifecycle or evaluation phase of SDLC). Did the project meet time, cost and scope constraints? Can user input text into a numerical field?

Question 8
a. Most candidates were able to identify social, legal and ethical issues involved in the development of the new system. Better candidates were able to identify the Copyright Act of 1966 and Privacy Act of 1988 and explain the possible implications considering the various stakeholders.

b. Most candidates struggled to “describe the connections and inter-relationships between the issues from the perspective of the relevant stakeholders”. Better answers listed the stakeholders and then attempted to link each issue by providing a description of the relevant relationship and/or connection.

Criterion 8 was assessed throughout the entire paper.

As in previous years, structuring responses in a logical sequence to address all parts of the question asked, were key to scoring highly on this criterion. Often candidate’s responses were quite lengthy but the content failed to specifically address the question being posed. Conversely, some candidates only managed to produce 3 to 4 line responses to questions allocated 10 minutes and hence were penalised accordingly.

Many candidates used tables effectively to ensure that they addressed all parts of the questions asked eg Question 3 (above and beyond those questions which specifically asked for a table – Question 1A & 4B). Few candidates were able to incorporate relevant graphics and diagrams to great effect. Question 6 third dot point gave candidates the opportunity to do this, but many candidates did not choose to incorporate this means of communication.

The appropriate inclusion of reference URLs and information sources formed a big part in the assessment of this criteria.