

Examiner Report	
Qualification Name	Higher Education Qualification
Qualification Level	Diploma
Date/ Series	April 2026
Module	Software Engineering
Question no.	Comments
A1	This question was the least popular with a low (but passing) average mark. The scenario was designed around the MVC/MVVM architecture, which, if followed, provided a clear framework for the answer. The waterfall model was totally inappropriate and lost many candidates many marks. Part B required a straightforward testing plan, which again was not often given.
Question no.	Comments
A2	Most candidates provided an at least passable description of RAD but failed to justify where it was appropriate or not. Many of the answers given seemed to be more appropriate for the waterfall model.
Question no.	Comments
A3	This question was designed to show that candidates could choose the most appropriate design method for each scenario. Candidates often preferred the waterfall method, which was generally not the most appropriate, and therefore failed to gain marks on this question. Candidates were also expected to give reasons for why they rejected other methods. No candidate did this, losing a significant proportion of the marks.
Question no.	Comments
B4	Again, answers to this question often fell back on bookwork descriptions of the waterfall method, rather than answering the question as asked. There seemed to be at least a basic understanding of version control, but it was unclear whether many of the candidates had much practical use of any such system.

Question no.	Comments
B5	This question was the next least popular. Marks for Part A were generally lost by providing several descriptions for what were essentially the same reasons errors are missed. In Part B, the problem was that many candidates did not clearly separate the various partitions and show the test case to show that each is met.
Question no.	Comments
B6	This question was designed about the operational planning required for deploying an update to a customer's software. The waterfall method has little relevance as it is a development methodology. Candidates understood risk in the context of the question but were less clear on ways of mitigating them.