

Moderator's Report

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Engineering (6932)
Paper 01
The role of the Engineer

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6932_01_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Unit 6932: The Role of the Engineer

Most centres ensured that the samples were available for moderation by the required deadline. Most samples were complete with OPTEMs form, authentication statements and Marks Record Sheets. Most centres are using the document provided for recording the marks, with a small number either developing their own or using a copy of the page from the specification. Many of the Mark Record Sheets were detailed, and identified where the evidence was located and provided supporting commentary for the marks awarded.

The link between centre and engineer was visible across most samples. More candidates showed evidence of working with an engineer, or gathered the research from a number of visits, rather than a single visit or a presentation, although this was still seen.

Assessment Criterion (a)

The role of the engineer was generally well described by the candidates. This was a good start to the investigation. A range of activities were generally identified and described with some justification evidence. There was some strong links to the Quality Control activities and production management such as supervision of other workers. The previous history and curriculum vitae of the engineer was not seen as much, which was an improvement on previous series as it served no useful purpose to the current role.

Assessment Criterion (b)

Commonly used technologies were evident in the sample. This included general manufacturing systems such as CAM and CNC, linked to an appropriate Cad system such as SolidWorks or AutoCAD. The descriptions of these were normally good and there was some clear links to the product, although not always. Candidates should remember to always link the technology to the engineer or product and then develop the importance of this and the justification to achieve the higher Mark band grades. Some candidates included basic equipment such as drilling machines and grinders although fewer than in previous series.

Assessment Criterion (c)

A number of candidates considered only legislation or standards rather than both for this section. May listed these without a clear link to the Mark Band requirement such as how they have influence the manufacture or design of the product. Some candidates were awarded Mark Band 3 appropriately here, although there was some awarding where compliance had not been considered, nor the consequence and how the engineer ensured that the standards would be met. Some centres also awarded high marks where candidates had only considered legislation, overlooking standards. These were generous and some reduction in marking was applied.

Assessment Criterion (d)

There were some common links to Health and Safety standards across the samples. Candidates included RIDOR, PUWER, COSHH and risk assessments, referencing appropriate documents, with some examples of the use of these included. . When awarding Mark Band 3, assessors are reminded to check that the consideration for how the engineer ensures the standards were met has been addressed. This was often overlooked and marking did not reflect the quality of evidence.

Assessment Criterion (e)

Only a small number of candidates evaluated the sections of the report which is an improvement from previous series. There were some good evaluations evident, although many were through personal judgements, limiting the marking to the middle band here. Some candidates obtained data, either from testing or from the engineer and considered this when making a judgement on the product or service. As in previous series, there were some products that were complex and difficult to evaluate given their time proven developments.

QWC

Centres included comments on the awarding of QWC and rewarded the candidates appropriately. Many specialist terms were seen and the awarding for grammar and punctuation was of a consistent standard across the samples.

Assessment Criterion (f)

The engineer and product or service will influence the quality of the evidence for this part of the report. Candidates did suggest some modifications following the evaluation and these were often signposted to show the link. There were common themes, as in the linked unit to solar power and wind turbines in an attempt to make the plant more efficient or more environmentally friendly. Some candidates supported their modifications with a diagram to show how they would be achieved; these were a useful addition to the evidence.

