

**UNIT 8 Managing ICT Projects**  
**Commentary on Assessment of Student 6958\_Sampleb**  
**Edexcel Inset Training 07-08**

<b>Assessment criteria – Unit 8:– strand a)</b>		
<b>Mark Band 1</b>	<b>Mark Band 2</b>	<b>Mark Band 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An outline project proposal that:</li> <li>• provides <b>some</b> information, but <b>not sufficient on its own</b> for senior management to make an informed decision</li> <li>• shows <b>limited</b> awareness of audience and purpose</li> <li>• Plus, a project definition document that <b>defines</b> the scope of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>well-researched, detailed</b> project proposal that:</li> <li>• provides <b>sufficient</b> information for senior management to make an informed decision</li> <li>• <b>considers</b> the impact of the proposal on others</li> <li>• is <b>clearly communicated</b>, demonstrating sound awareness of audience and purpose.</li> <li>• Plus, a project definition document that <b>fully defines</b> the scope of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A well-researched, comprehensive project proposal that:</li> <li>• provides <b>all</b> the information need for senior management to make an informed decision</li> <li>• <b>carefully considers</b> the impact of the proposal on others</li> <li>• is <b>well-argued</b> and <b>clearly communicated</b>, demonstrating sound awareness of audience and purpose</li> <li>• Plus, a project definition document that <b>fully defines</b> the scope of the project and <b>identifies clear and measurable objectives</b>.</li> </ul>
<b>(0 – 3)</b>	<b>(4 – 5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> The candidate has muddled the evidence required for this unit. There should be a Product Proposal presented to client which addresses 8.3 and 8.2 of the unit specification. The Definition of Scope should be a separate document which addresses 8.4. There are 2 documents but not presented correctly. The risks are covered, stakeholders mentioned and these relate to 8.2. Some reference to made to the impact on the staff but this is minimal. The deadline is given as 30 March. 8.3 is addressed. 8.4 has not been fully addressed. The key success criteria is not clearly specified. The project roadmap is not fully addressed and there are no interim review points mentioned. By nor presenting the evidence correctly, the candidate has limited achievement in this strand. There are not two separate documents and not all aspects covered. This restricts the evidence to mark band 1. The documents are not presented in a format for the client to view which means that not all marks in this mark band are accessed.</p> <p><b>Mark Awarded:</b> 2</p>		
<b>Assessment criteria – Unit 8:– strand b)</b>		
<b>Mark Band 1</b>	<b>Mark Band 2</b>	<b>Mark Band 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>outline</b> project plan – produced at the start of the project – that:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>detailed</b> project plan – produced at the start of the project – that:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <b>comprehensive</b> project plan – produced at the start of the project – that:</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>divides the project into a number of phases, though these may not be entirely logical</li> <li>identifies <b>some</b> of the main activities to be carried out in each phase</li> <li>allocates time and resources to each activity, although these may not be entirely realistic</li> <li>identifies <b>some</b> potential risks</li> <li>Evidence that <b>some limited use</b> was made of the plan to monitor and communicate progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>divides the project into a number of logical phases</li> <li>identifies <b>most</b> of the main activities to be carried out during each phase</li> <li>allocates a <b>realistic</b> amount of time and resources to most activities</li> <li>identifies and assesses <b>some</b> potential risks</li> <li>uses graphical representation appropriately.</li> <li>Evidence that the plan was used throughout the project to monitor and communicate progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>divides the project into a number of logical phases</li> <li>identifies <b>all</b> of the main activities to be carried out during each phase</li> <li>allocates a <b>realistic</b> amount of time and resources to every activity, <b>taking into account dependencies</b> between them</li> <li>identifies and accurately assesses potential risks</li> <li><b>uses graphical representation effectively</b> to give an 'at a glance' overview of the project.</li> <li>Evidence that the plan was used <b>effectively</b> throughout the project to monitor and communicate progress and <b>identify potential problems</b> and that <b>contingency measures</b> were taken when necessary to keep the project on track.</li> </ul>
<p><b>(0 — 6)</b></p>	<p><b>(7 — 9)</b></p>	<p><b>(10 — 12)</b></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b> There is an initial project plan dated 03.01.07 which is not complete. Not all the tasks are listed and there appears to be a page missing with the final few weeks of the project. The plan has been produced using project management software which is a requirement of the unit. The plan on 16.01.07 gives all details including the page that appeared to be missing in the first chart. This plan gives a handover of 23 March which is one week prior to the date mentioned in strand a. There is an indication of communication with the client and tested with stakeholders.. The project is divided into phases but there are no interim, no reference to risks. The plan is more a list of work to be carried out for unit 10 rather than a plan managing a project. The plan has been updated on a number of occasions throughout the plan period which is good practice. The candidate would have strengthened this evidence if more explanation had been given for each version. The lack of indication of any risks in the plan means that the evidence cannot address all the mark band 1.</p> <p><b>Mark Awarded:</b> 5</p>		

<b>Assessment criteria – Unit 8:– strand c)</b>		
<b>Mark Band 1</b>	<b>Mark Band 2</b>	<b>Mark Band 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the project, the learner:</li> <li>• communicates with stakeholders – both formally and informally – but <b>needs frequent prompting</b></li> <li>• provides <b>some</b> accurate information, but only <b>on request</b></li> <li>• <b>needs support</b> to organise, run and record the outcomes of formal project meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the project, the learner:</li> <li>• communicates <b>appropriately</b> with stakeholders – both formally and informally – making some use of feedback received</li> <li>• provides accurate information, with <b>only occasional prompting</b></li> <li>• <b>independently</b> organises, runs and record the outcomes of formal project meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the project, the learner:</li> <li>• communicates <b>effectively</b> with stakeholders – both formally and informally – making <b>good use</b> of feedback received.</li> <li>• provides accurate, detailed and up-to-date information, <b>without needing to be prompted</b></li> <li>• <b>independently</b> organises, runs and records the outcomes of formal project meetings <b>confidently</b> and <b>professionally</b></li> <li>• <b>actively drives the project forward</b>, adopting a proactive approach to project management, anticipating problems and taking appropriate corrective action when necessary.</li> </ul>
<b>(0 — 10)</b>	<b>(11 — 15)</b>	<b>(16 — 20)</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> This evidence for this strand is poorly presented and does not reflect the evidence expected from an A2 candidate addressing the higher mark bands. There is not a folder which contains a series of proper minutes of formal meetings for the interim reviews with stakeholders. The evidence is more suited to a lot of informal contact with stakeholders. However, there is evidence of formal meetings with Governors and the Client, 3 January, 15 and 25 January. There are informal meetings with stakeholders, eg 16 Feb, 27 Feb, 10 March. There is a handover meeting with the client on 23 March which relates to the date in the plan and is within the timescale detailed by the client. There is no end of project review meeting. There is no proper progress report as the diary of contact does not really evidence contact with stakeholders properly. There is no senior manager, only a client. The unit specification has not been properly considered. The evidence does not access all the marks in mark band 1.</p> <p><b>Mark Awarded:</b> 7</p>		

<b>Assessment criteria – Unit 8:– strand d)</b>		
<b>Mark Band 1</b>	<b>Mark Band 2</b>	<b>Mark Band 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A software product produced in accordance with the project plan that meets <b>some</b> of the objectives specified in the project definition, with <b>some</b> deliverables meeting the agreed quality criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A software product produced in accordance with the project plan that meets <b>most</b> of the objectives specified in the project definition and is <b>delivered on time</b>, with <b>most</b> deliverables meeting the agreed quality criteria.</li> <li>Throughout the development of the product there is <b>some</b> correlation between what the plan indicates should be happening and what is actually happening.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A software product produced in accordance with the project plan that meets <b>all</b> of the objectives specified in the project definition and is <b>delivered on time</b>, with <b>all</b> deliverables meeting the agreed quality criteria.</li> <li>Throughout the development of the product there is a <b>close</b> correlation between what the plan indicates should be happening and what is actually happening.</li> </ul>
<b>(0 – 5)</b>	<b>(6 – 8)</b>	<b>(9 – 10)</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> There is evidence that a software product was produced in accordance with the plan and delivered on time. The plans for strand b and the evidence for strand c, including feedback from the client via a letter, indicates that this was the case. The evidence for strand c is not well presented and makes no reference to the plans and the progress relating to these. This prevents the evidence reaching mark band 2 but there is sufficient evidence to address mark band 1.</p> <p><b>Mark Awarded:</b> 5</p>		

<b>Assessment criteria – Unit 8:– strand e)</b>		
<b>Mark Band 1</b>	<b>Mark Band 2</b>	<b>Mark Band 3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>evaluation - taking account</b> of feedback from the end-of-project review meeting – <b>commenting on</b>:</li> <li>• the success of the project</li> <li>• the effectiveness of the project management methods used</li> <li>• their own performance as a project manager.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An <b>evaluation - using</b> feedback from the end-of-project review meeting – <b>assessing</b>:</li> <li>• the success of the project</li> <li>• the effectiveness of the project management methods used, <b>identifying</b> key lessons learnt</li> <li>• <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> of their own performance as a project manager.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <b>critical evaluation - making extensive use of</b> feedback from the end-of-project review meeting – <b>analysing</b>:</li> <li>• the success of the project, measured against the objectives specified in the project definition document</li> <li>• the effectiveness of the project management methods used, <b>exploring</b> key lessons learnt and <b>justifying actions taken/decision made</b></li> <li>• strengths and weaknesses of their own performance as a project manager, identifying <b>areas for improvement</b>.</li> </ul>
<b>(0 — 6)</b>	<b>(7 — 9)</b>	<b>(10 — 12)</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> This strand is not addressed as the candidate has not held an End of Project Review Meeting to obtain the feedback needed to write the evaluation and match it against the strand.</p> <p><b>Mark Awarded:</b> 0</p>		
<p><b>Total marks</b>      <b>19 /60</b></p>		
<p><b>Overall Comment</b> - The candidate has produced the same evidence for parts of units 8 and 10 as explained on the Home Page. The evidence is different for the 2 units and should be adapted to relate to the relevant strands for each unit. The candidate appears to have concentrated on unit 10 and not appreciated the requirements for unit 8 with the result that the assessment criteria has not been properly addressed.</p>		