

## Electronics

**OCR Advanced Subsidiary GCE H465 Unit F616**

**Coursework Cover Sheet**

Please read the instructions printed overleaf before completing this form. One of these cover sheets, suitably completed, should be attached to the assessed work of **each** candidate in the moderation sample. Please ensure that the appropriate boxes are completed and that the form is signed and dated.

|                            |             |                         |  |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Examination session</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>Year</b>             |  |
| <b>Centre name</b>         |             |                         |  |
| <b>Centre number</b>       |             |                         |  |
| <b>Candidate name</b>      |             | <b>Candidate number</b> |  |

Use the grids overleaf, or your own mark record, to calculate the candidate's score for each Assessment Objective. Enter the mark awarded for each Assessment Objective in the appropriate box below. Add together the marks for all the Assessment Criteria to give a total out of 60. Enter this total in the relevant box.

| <b>Assessment Criterion</b> | <b>Mark</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Introduction (max 12)       |             |
| Circuit (max 20)            |             |
| Testing (max 17)            |             |
| Report (max 11)             |             |
| <b>Total (max 60)</b>       |             |

| Section               | Descriptor   | Marks | Centre Mark |
|-----------------------|--|-------|-------------|
| <b>1 Introduction</b> |  |       |             |
| <b>A</b>              | The report contains limited relevant research to design the project  | 0–1   |             |
|                       | The report refers in detail to relevant sources to design the project.   | 2–3   |             |
| <b>B</b>              | The project specification is too vague for its final evaluation.   | 0     |             |
|                       | The project has been specified in qualitative/quantitative terms.  | 1–2   |             |
|                       | The project and up to five subsystems have been specified in qualitative and quantitative terms.                                 | 3–5   |             |
| <b>C</b>              | The report contains no description of how testing was performed.   | 0     |             |
|                       | The report contains a clear description of the test procedure to be carried out on the final circuit and at least one subsystem. | 1–2   |             |
|                       | The report contains a clear description of the test procedure to be carried out on the final circuit and up to five subsystems.  | 3–4   |             |

|                  |   |     |  |
|------------------|---|-----|--|
| <b>2 Circuit</b> |   |     |  |
| <b>A</b>         | The candidate designed at least one subsystem unaided.  | 0   |  |
|                  | The candidate designed up to three subsystems unaided and needed little or no help in designing the entire project.   | 1–2 |  |
| <b>B</b>         | The description of the project behaviour is vague and incomplete.   | 0   |  |
|                  | The candidate described project behaviour using a block diagram approach; one subsystem has been correctly described at component level, with a correct calculation of a component value.                             | 1–3 |  |
|                  | The entire project, including three or more subsystems, has been correctly described at component level.  | 4–5 |  |
| <b>C</b>         | The project build is untidy with a haphazard layout of components.  | 0   |  |
|                  | The project build shows evidence of a subsystem approach with logical positioning and neat wiring.  | 1–3 |  |
|                  | The project build shows evidence of a subsystem approach with logical positioning, an identifiable colour code is used in which all wires are arranged vertically/horizontally with no unnecessary crossing of wires. | 4–5 |  |
| <b>D</b>         | No working subsystem was achieved.  | 0   |  |
|                  | Up to three working subsystems were built and tested.   | 1–3 |  |
|                  | The entire project worked (applicable to a project that contains up to five subsystems).  | 4–5 |  |
| <b>E</b>         | The candidate was unable to fault-find any subsystem unaided.   | 0   |  |
|                  | The candidate was able to fault-find up to five subsystems unaided.   | 1–3 |  |

| <b>3 Testing</b> |   |     |  |
|------------------|---|-----|--|
| <b>A</b>         | The candidate did not present any evidence of testing on any part of the project.   | 0   |  |
|                  | The report contains evidence of a test procedure and has produced output data for a given set of input conditions applied to up to three subsystems.  | 1–3 |  |
|                  | The report contains evidence of a rigorous test procedure performed on the final project including five subsystems and has produced output data for the complete project in which two or more input variables have been used for all subsystems..         | 4–5 |  |
| <b>B</b>         | Data is not presented in table or graph form.   | 0   |  |
|                  | The data for the test procedure has been applied to up to three subsystems and has been presented in table or graph form.   | 1–2 |  |
|                  | The data for the test procedure applied to the final project, including at least three subsystems, has been presented in table or graph form.   | 3–4 |  |
| <b>C</b>         | The report contains evidence of only a superficial or incomplete analysis of project test results.  | 0   |  |
|                  | The report contains evidence of analysis of project test results.   | 1–2 |  |
|                  | The report contains evidence that the input/output data for up to three subsystems has been analysed with a sensible conclusion made about the specification stated in 1b.  | 3–4 |  |
|                  | The report contains evidence that the input/output data for at least five subsystems has been analysed and sensible conclusions reached; the report also contains evidence of how the project performance corresponded to the specification stated in 1b. | 5–6 |  |
| <b>D</b>         | The final project met very little of the specification stated in 1b.  | 0   |  |
|                  | The final project met the specification stated in 1b.   | 1–2 |  |

| <b>4 Report</b> |  |     |  |
|-----------------|--|-----|--|
| <b>A</b>        | At least one subsystem has correctly drawn circuit diagrams.   | 0–1 |  |
|                 | Subsystems and the final project have correctly drawn circuit diagrams.  | 2–3 |  |
| <b>B</b>        | The report made use of headings but was difficult to read, perhaps with poor spelling and grammar.             | 0–1 |  |
|                 | The report made good use of headings, was easy to read with good use of spelling and grammar, and was concise. | 2–3 |  |
| <b>C</b>        | The report contains at least one section in which the terminology used is correct.                             | 0–1 |  |
|                 | The report makes good use of terminology throughout with no errors of usage.                                   | 2–3 |  |
| <b>D</b>        | No sources of assistance have been acknowledged.   | 0   |  |
|                 | Sources of assistance have been acknowledged and references to them are detailed.                              | 1–2 |  |