edexcel

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2013

Principal Learning

Engineering
Level 2 Controlled Assessments

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 2013
Publications Code DP035807

Contents

Introduction

As in previous series it was pleasing to see that advice given, via moderation reports, has been adopted by the majority of centres. Work seen was generally of good quality and addressed the unit specifications. Assessment of student work was largely accurate and fair. Assignment briefs were generally fit for purpose.

Centre administration showed an improvement over previous series. OPTEMS/EDI were included with samples. The majority of centres included front sheets which were correctly filled in with centre number, student number, student signatures etc. as well as information on where to find work within the student portfolios. Highest and lowest achieving student work was generally included in the sample and the majority of centres submitted samples before the deadline date.

The moderation process was greatly helped where student work was annotated to indicate where and which Mark Bands have been allocated along with the number of marks awarded.

As in previous series' centres must ensure they allocate marks in accordance with the Marking Grid and gain further clarification of mark allocation from the 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification. There is a great deal of useful information supplied with the unit specifications about delivery methods and assessment – please encourage assessors to use this information as it will greatly help when designing assessment strategies.

Evidence presented for Marking Grid B was variable. Good centres were able to provide evidence in the form of annotated photographs, detailed and individualised observation records - as well as signed student work.

Unit EG201_01
Exploring the Engineering World

General comments
Standards appear to be similar with previous series in terms of student work and assessment.

Two sectors had been chosen by the majority of students, and the basic function of products from these areas was identified. A wide range of sectors was chosen and included aeronautical, automotive, electrical and mechanical engineering. Job roles were investigated and there was some good work based around visits and real jobs. Three centuries' achievements were identified but Employment Rights and Responsibilities were generally weak and concentrated on Health and Safety Act only.

Standard of assessment
The standard of assessment was generally good and accurate but a little lenient in some cases.

Assignment briefs, where provided, were fit for purpose. Good centres provided good portfolios which were clearly laid out with annotated work and had well written assignment briefs.

A large proportion of the work seen was internet based – this is not surprising given the type of evidence being asked for but the work should be referenced if quotes are used instead of the students own words.

Most centres provided students with a good breakdown of the assessment focus for each LO – this helped to direct each student to each mark band.

Administration
This continued to improve. The samples of work were generally well organised and structured which enabled students to access most learning outcomes.

Learning Outcome 1
Most students had chosen two sectors. Students marks were fairly allocated but more depth of explanations would have improved the marks and accessed the higher bands. Students should choose their sectors then explore products or services and describe function and operation of those products and services.

Good centres had provided their students with clear guidance and this was reflected in the evidence provided by the student.

Learning Outcome 2
Most students had identified four job opportunities but these were sometimes were quite generic and lacked depth. Descriptions of the Engineering Council were much improved on the previous series - although in some cases it could have been expanded. There was also improved evidence of qualifications required and progression opportunities. There was also evidence of some commentary on progression opportunities and evaluation of the reasons for professional registration. This area was well covered by most students.

At the higher mark bands, descriptions of the Engineering Council were much more detailed and included descriptions of the ECs roles and also some comment on professional institutions such as the IEE etc. The job descriptions were thorough and included qualifications required as well as progression routes.

Learning Outcome 3

Most students had covered developments from three centuries, with comments on current technology which was very good. MB1 marks were covered well with the social and economic factors improved from the previous series.
At the highest mark band the work submitted sometimes lacked a clear understanding of how engineering developments had directly led to socio-economic improvements but again there was some very good work that met the requirements fully.

It is important for centres to ensure that the achievements considered by students are in-fact major engineering feats and inventions and not trivia.

Learning Outcome 4

There was some improvement in this Learning Outcome, main responsibilities of employees and what employers can undertake to encourage them to work was covered better than in previous series. Many students had correctly identified rights and responsibilities of employers and employees, but this was more general and with no direct link to engineering. Students should also be able to link the responsibilities of employers to legislation. More in-depth comments on rights and responsibilities and employer encouragement would give further access to the higher mark bands. Discussion of employment legislation was weak and mainly included discussion of Health and Safety.

Unit EG202_01
Investigating Engineering Design

General comments
The overall standard of performance was similar to that of previous series. There was a wide variation in marks between centres which understood the principles of delivery and assessment and those who appeared to have little knowledge of how to apply the marking grid or follow the 'guidance for allocating marks'; worrying given that this was the ninth examination series. Most centres provided students with tasks which were accessible to the full range of student ability.

Generally students that did well were from centres which had structured activities against the learning outcomes rather than giving free reign to the production of over complex and improbable ideas. Assessors had taken note of comments made in E9's produce for earlier series.

Students who produced good design proposals seemed to be those who had been given design briefs relating to a straightforward, focused requirement which could be translated into a clear, structured specification.

Standard of assessment
Assignment briefs were not always included with the evidence portfolios and this made the process of moderation more complex and time consuming. A number of moderators raised serious concerns about the lack of annotation of student scripts and the difficulty of confirming assessor marks. In a number of cases the moderator was forced to carry out a marking exercise- particularly when a centre had presented a global 'best fit mark' for each learning outcome.

Most centres used the full range of marks for all assessment criteria. Those that did not went wrong in two ways:
LO2.1- not providing students with a design brief so that they chose their own product/system which in most cases was inappropriate (for example re-design a mobile phone) and offering little scope for development; some students did not understand the difference between a design brief and a PDS and often went straight into a design specification (LO2.2) so missing out on evidence for LO2.1.
L04- There was limited access to band 2 when students were not prompted to present mathematical or scientific calculations.

Some centres seemed to fall down with this unit because they did not providing a suitable design brief i.e. one that had development possibilities appropriate for a level 2 student. They also struggled by not linking the LO's through the unit (from design brief, to PDS, to 3 designs, to justifying one and then presenting a solution).

Some centres, operating as a consortium, followed recommended assessment good practice by having their domain assessor carry out internal standardisation.

Learning Outcome 1
Most students presented good evidence for the practical part of this learning outcome. Many portfolios followed best practice with photographs and written description supported by observation records. An error that some assessors made was to award marks for the dismantling/reassembling of the product (mark band 1) when there was no real hard evidence for the moderator to reassess. For example, just an observation record but with no other written or photographic evidence presented by the student. This unit has a single marking grid and the guidance given in the specification (page 161, bullet point 10) makes clear what evidence to present.

A significant number of students did not understand the proper meanings of 'function' and 'mode of operation'. For example, the function of a car is to get from A to B in reasonable comfort, safety and time. Its mode of operation is the conversion of chemical energy into kinetic energy through the burning of fuel and the movement of mechanical parts.

Learning Outcome 2
Both strands of this learning outcome were covered reasonably well when students were given a sensible design brief by their assessor; they were able to identify the physical constraints and convert them into a design specification. Identification of performance requirements and reliability indicators presented more of a challenge. Many students were unable to access LO2.2 mark band 3 because they did not take account of economic and manufacturing considerations e.g. cost of materials, deciding on the most appropriate manufacturing processes based on production quantities.

Learning Outcome 3
Three design proposals which take account of own and other's ideas are required for this learning outcome. Students who did well were those who produced design ideas which had significant variations. Weaker performance came from those who proposed simple variations between their design proposals; for example colour and surface texture variations. A small number of centres allowed their students to develop ideas which did not have much engineering content, for example, a table lamp with the emphasis on colour and aesthetics but lacking detail about the electrical components, safety and construction. Many students fell down when trying to justifying their choice of a design to develop. A good number of students used a matrix comparison chart but in many cases this was unhelpful because the comparison parameters had no valid marking scale. For example, using a marking scale of 1 to 10 for each parameter but not saying what the numbers meant. Others used simplistic tick boxes. The best responses were those where the student used free writing supported by simple sketches in order to convey their thoughts about the three designs.

Learning Outcome 4
Most students achieved mark band 1 which is to prepare and submit a design solution. Some assessors fell into the trap of wrongly giving credit for work which was just a re-presentation of one of the LO3 design proposals, with little or no additional annotation and description. An error noted by moderators was assessors not guiding students to present a design log and mathematical/scientific calculations for mark band 2. Another common error was to award full marks for LO4 mark band 3 for a verbal presentation and a written

report which was simply a print out of the slides used e.g. PowerPoint. Some students presented very good evidence for this learning outcome.

Unit EG203_01
Engineering Applications of Computers

General comments

The overall standard of performance was similar to that of previous series. There was a wide variation in marks between centres that understood the principles of delivery and assessment and those who appeared to have little knowledge of how to apply the marking grid or follow the 'guidance for allocating marks'; worrying given that this was the ninth examination series). Most centres provided students with tasks that were accessible to the full range of student ability.

For some centres it was apparent that the student did not fully understand the meaning of the action verbs presented in the marking grid, for example justify and appraise; this restricted their access to mark band 3. This unit must be assessed under controlled conditions but it is perfectly acceptable for the assessor to remind students of the generic meanings of these verbs and the format of evidence required.

Most centres provided students with tasks that were accessible to the full range of student ability. An example of a good choice of topic for LO2 (solve a given problem) was to design a simple component using a CAD system and to follow up with CNC machining. The finished product could then be checked for dimensional accuracy – some centres linked this learning outcome to Unit 6 (Application of manufacturing techniques in engineering) LO3- set up and use CNC equipment. An example of a poor choice of topic was when the solution only involved working on-screen with a computer - difficult to award marks for safe working.

Standard of assessment

Most centres were accurate and consistent in applying the marking criteria. Those that did not mark accurately were over-generous but consistent. A common error was to award full marks for LO2 mark band 1 when there was no observation record or witness statement to support setting up and using equipment, and students had not provided photographs or proper written description. Practical tasks which are moderated must be supported with hard evidence which a moderator can reassess (see detail presented about this in the 'assessment guidance' section of the unit specification). Some assessors were over generous with LO2 mark band 3 and gave marks for generic justifications for using computers rather than reasons linked specifically to the problem that the student had solved. For example, some students said they used computer based equipment because it was easy to use, reliable and fast in operation- this should attract no marks.

Assessors also wrongly awarded for LO4 mark band 3 by giving full marks for really detailed descriptions of computers being used in maintenance/diagnostic situations but containing no evidence that the student had gathered data, interpreted it and proposing a course of action.

Most centres used the full range of marks for all assessment criteria. Those that did not went wrong in three ways:

LO2 - asking students to carry out an activity which would not allow them easy access to marks for safe working e.g. giving them a CAD exercise. When this did happen the moderator did allow the marks if the student had proved that they could start up the software, set up folders and close down software and the computer in a properly controlled, sensible way of working. Some students could not be awarded the five marks for choosing and setting up an appropriate piece of computer based equipment because the centre had done this for them.

LO3- mark band 1- some students put wasted effort into describing the internal architecture and operation of a microprocessor. The focus of the unit should be on computers/microprocessors being used as control devices, i.e. a 'black box' approach. Mark band 3- students not being guided to applying a microprocessor system to another product.

LO4- by not providing students with the means to generate and interpret computer generated diagnostic data. Many centres took students into vehicle workshops and let them investigate engine diagnostics. Good descriptions were presented but students did not then go on to interpret actual data.
Assignment briefs were not always included with the evidence portfolios and this made the process of moderation more complex and time consuming. A number of moderators raised serious concerns about the lack of annotation of student scripts and the difficulty of confirming assessor marks. In a significant number of cases the moderator was forced to carry out a marking exercise- particularly when a centre had presented a global 'best fit mark' for each learning outcome. An increasing number of centres, operating as a consortium, carried out internal standardisation where more than one assessor was involved.

Learning Outcome 1
There was generally good evidence about the application of computers in process control and manufacturing but for many students comparisons and evaluations were rather weak so restricting access to the higher mark bands.

A significant number of students did not fully appreciate the meaning of the key words 'compare' and 'evaluate'. All found an example of process control and a manufacturing application, many describing them in detail and gaining full marks for mark band 1. Evidence for band 2 was not so robust and many students had difficulty with mark band 3. There was good evidence presented for highly automated food processing systems; some students wasted effort by describing in too much detail the process rather than focusing on the control of the process.

Learning Outcome 2
It was evident across many centres that the students had used a computer-based system to solve a given problem. Access to the higher marks bands can be achieved by further demonstrating safe use (which was not always evident), and justifying the decision to use that particular equipment in order to come to a solution. Centres that gave students access to equipment such as a small bench robotic arm or sorting conveyor generally achieved much better results.

Justifications and appraisals for mark band 3 were in many cases rather weak because students presented generic justifications rather than reasons linked specifically to the problem that they had solved.

Learning Outcome 3

In many cases the descriptions about the applications of microprocessors was fairly limited and the examples of products not always suitable, for example mobile phones, computers and gaming systems. Students that described applications such as washing machines and microwaves, which do have clearly defined peripheral components, did much better. Access to further marks can be gained by describing more clearly two systems, identifying the component parts of the system and suggesting how such a system might have another application- this proved difficult for some students. Most students correctly adopted a 'black box' approach to this learning outcome, focusing on the control aspects of a microprocessor rather than the internal architecture of the microprocessor.

Learning Outcome 4

Most students described two maintenance systems but in a number of cases there was little evidence about the type of fault diagnostic data that could be obtained or how it might be interpreted and used. This would have given access to the higher mark bands. Students did understand that maintenance operations in an engineering context are the only ones that can attract marks for this learning outcome; it was pleasing to see that they did not fall into the trap of considering non-engineering type maintenance- for example maintaining stock levels on the shelves of a supermarket. Mark band 3 proved to be a challenge with many assessors giving full marks when there was no real evidence of interpreting computer generated data- for example, identifying fault codes from a car engine test, checking against the manufacturer's data base and then proposing a course of action.

Unit EG204_1A
Producing Engineering Solutions

General comments
The scripts received from centres were generally neatly organised with clear references indicating each learning outcome. The annotation of marks within scripts was helpful for moderators to understand where marks were awarded for each band in the LO.

The performance for LO1 was mostly good. Most students were able to identify H&S procedures. Access to the higher marks for describing responsibilities for self and others was a little patchy. The risk assessment was carried out well with many centres adopting a standard approach.

LO2 was well done. The majority of students had adopted a tabular approach to the plan and the better students had populated each box with a lot of information and whilst the poorer students had less information, it did help them score well.

LO3 could be better approached by allowing students to describe how they prepared materials and then backed up by Observation Records and Photographs.

LO4 was well done by those students who attempted it. Again there were sections that addressed specific points that are identified in the guidelines. The work was good and scored marks at each of the levels.

Standard of assessment
The standard of assessment was generally good throughout. Clearly assessors have read the guidelines from previous series and applied them well.
It was good to see the inclusion of assignment briefs.

Administration
This appeared to be a little better than previously.
The samples of work were generally well organised and structured which enabled students to access most learning outcomes.

Learning Outcome 1
In general students identified Health & safety procedures but not necessarily standards which limited the marks awarded. In most cases students were able to state why a risk assessment was necessary. The responsibility of self and others was in some cases weak as in the last series. Risk assessments were carried out to a good standard with most students identifying hazards and control measures.

Learning Outcome 2
Most students were able to produce a plan showing processes, materials and tools and in some cases timescales. Access to the higher mark bands was generally better than previously with justifications of the sequence of the plan, and by making a review and evaluation (along with improvements).

Learning Outcome 3
This was attempted by most students. However, as in previous series this was perhaps the most poorly attempted LO for many centres. There was little evidence of identifying and selecting materials relevant to the plan. The preparation of the materials was only really evident from the photos in some cases, and not at all in others. It is also required to justify why the materials were used. By considering these items students could access the higher mark bands.

Learning Outcome 5
There was limited evidence by some students of being able to identify inspection techniques and only on the plan in some cases. There was a lack of review of the techniques used, or suggestions for improvements. Considering the latter would give access to the full range of mark bands.

Learning Outcome 4 (Marking Grid B)
It was good to see that some centres provided observation records to support the evidence - which included photographs.

Unit EG205_1A
Electrical and Electronic Circuits and Systems

General comments
There is a wealth of guidance supplied with this unit and it is pleasing that the majority of centres are following that guidance. The majority of student work was of good quality and presented in a very clear and logical format. It is pleasing to see that students have consistently performed well in this unit.
The sample of work was generally very well organised and structured, which enabled students to access most of the learning outcomes. Mark record sheets and the scripts were not generally well annotated with evidence for each assessment criterion that had been awarded.

Standard of assessment
Generally teacher assessment was accurate.
LO1 was well executed by students with the majority scoring well.
LO2 is straight forward and was generally handled well by centres but tasks to allow access to the higher bands was variable.
Generally the LO3 descriptive work was tackled well by centres and students.

Administration
This appeared to be a little better than previously.
The samples of work were generally well organised and structured which enabled students to access most learning outcomes.

Learning Outcome 1
Students were asked to demonstrate safe working practices and the calculation of electronic components. There was good range of calculations provided by the students clearly showing how to work out the value of current through to fuses. In the better centres students had provided detailed descriptions of safety procedures and then backed that up with observations signed by assessors and students (as well as photographs of students using safety equipment).

Learning Outcome 2
This was met by most students. Identification of components tended to be in the form of a chart and/or photographs. MB2 and 3 was not so well achieved by students. Centres sometimes failed to provide suitable circuits and there should be some use of manufacturer data sheets or suppliers catalogues.

Learning Outcome 3
Generally students received good marks. There was high quality work produced by students evidenced with annotated photographs. The descriptions though lacked detail with the function of each component being poorly explained.

Learning Outcomes 3 and 4 (Marking Grid B)
It is noted that some centres provided observation records to support the evidence (which included photographs). It appears that many statements did not properly support evidence being presented for the higher Mark Bands and this would have been an issue if Marking Grid B evidence were subject to moderation.

Unit EG206_1A
Application of Manufacturing Techniques in Engineering

General comments
The overall standard of performance was similar to that of previous series. There was a wide variation in marks between centres which understood the principles of delivery and assessment and those who appeared to have little knowledge of how to apply the marking grid or follow the 'guidance for allocating marks'; worrying given that this was the ninth examination series. There were a significant number of cases where it was apparent that the student did not fully understand the meaning of the action verbs presented in the marking grid, for example justify and analyse. This unit must be assessed under controlled conditions but it is perfectly acceptable for the assessor to remind students of the generic meanings of these verbs and the format of evidence required.

Standard of assessment
Most centres were accurate and consistent in applying the marking criteria. Those that were over-generous tended to do this for LO1- particularly awarding from mark band 3 when there was no evidence of analysing own contribution to the team, recognising strengths and weaknesses and improving performance- something which can only be done after the other learning outcomes have been completed. In some cases the evidence was too general and not specifically related to own role in the team. Most centres used the full range of marks for all assessment criteria.

Assignment briefs were not always included with the evidence portfolios and this made the process of moderation more complex and time consuming. A number of moderators raised serious concerns about the lack of annotation of student scripts and the difficulty of confirming assessor marks. In a significant number of cases the moderator was forced to carry out a marking exercise- particularly when a centre had presented a global 'best fit mark' for each learning outcome. It is pleasing to note that an increasing number of centres, operating as a consortium, are carrying out internal standardisation between assessors or with a domain assessor.

Learning Outcome 1
Most students were able to provide a very brief description of their role in the team, and had identified limited strengths and weaknesses. Some also suggested ways in which their performance could be improved but a fuller explanation is required if the higher bands are to be achieved. Most students presented good focused evidence for this learning outcome; students that were less successful were those who presented generic descriptions of team working and Belbin theory. They could identify the types of person to be found in a team, for example, an implementer, describe the job role but not link to themselves or a colleague. In many cases accessing mark band 3 was poorly done because the student did not present a holistic view of how they performed across the whole unit.

Learning Outcome 2.1
Some students had identified several pieces of production information and there was some evidence of interpretation. In some cases it was not evident that they had identified the four pieces required and a little more detail was required to gain further marks. Some students described in a generic way the production information that can be found in drawings and documentation; what they should have done was focus on a given engineered product so producing a link between learning outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. There were a number of instances of excellent correct interpretation so gaining marks from band 3.

Learning Outcome 2.2
Many students correctly understood the difference between a plan and a schedule; however, others were unable to distinguish between the two. Most students were able to produce a plan, which had details of the process and timings. Some students did not understand how to specify or use milestones. Justifying the sequence of operations and schedule (where presented) tended to be weak and this restricted the number of marks which could be awarded from band 3.

Learning Outcome 4
Three quality control (QC) techniques are required, one of which must be statistical and this is quite challenging for a level 2 student. Although some data had been analysed it was unclear how this data had been obtained and what the analysis meant. For access to the higher mark bands, students also need to analyse the results against the specification, and comment about the production process. Some comment about production was evident in a few cases, although this had only weak links to quality control.

A good number of students realised that by using relatively simple ‘yes’/‘no’ tests, for example recording dimensional data and checking compliance with a drawing, they could get into mark band 2. Some students wasted effort by describing the operating principles of the measuring equipment used, including images, instead of homing on the taking of measurements, recording data and analysing it.

Unit EG207_1A
Applications of Maintenance Techniques in Engineering

General comments

The overall standard of performance was similar to that of previous series. There was a wide variation in marks between centres that understood the principles of delivery and assessment and those who appeared to have little knowledge of how to apply the marking grid or follow the 'guidance for allocating marks'; worrying given that this was the ninth examination series. Most centres provided students with tasks that were accessible to the full range of student ability.

There were a significant number of cases where it was apparent that the student did not fully understand the meaning of the action verbs presented in the marking grid, for example explain and justify. This unit must be assessed under controlled conditions but it is perfectly acceptable for the assessor to remind students of the generic meanings of these verbs and the format of evidence required.

Most centres provided students with tasks that were accessible to the full range of student ability. It was noticed that students performed better in LO1.1 when centres asked them to describe and explain maintenance types with greater contrast rather than asking them to investigate similar maintenance systems. For LO4 some students just wrote generic descriptions of what the risks might be in an engineering situation, or presented lists of issues without suggesting of ways in which risks could be managed.

Standard of assessment

Many centres were accurate and consistent in applying the marking criteria; some were unable to use the full range of marks for all assessment criteria because many students presented weak evidence for mark band 3 across all learning outcomes. Some assessors incorrectly gave full marks for LO4 mark band 3. Usually this was where a student had produced a detailed and impressive looking risk assessment but had failed to make proper reference to health and safety regulations and warning signs.

Assignment briefs were not always included with the evidence portfolios and this made the process of moderation more complex and time consuming. A number of moderators raised serious concerns about the lack of annotation of student scripts and the difficulty of confirming assessor marks. In a number of cases the moderator was forced to carry out a marking exercise- particularly when a centre had presented a global 'best fit mark' for each learning outcome.
It is pleasing to note that an increasing number of centres, operating as a consortium, are carrying out internal standardisation between assessors or with a domain assessor.

Learning Outcome 1.1
Most students had identified two types of maintenance techniques, but these were not always relevant or appropriate; they must be ones that are set in an engineering/manufacturing context. Access to the higher mark bands requires a statement on the appropriateness of the particular technique, and some justification; many students failed to do this.

Learning Outcome 1.2
This learning outcome requires the analysis of data to evaluate trends and to calculate reliability indicators. For mark band 2 the calculation is 'Mean Time to Failure (MTTF)' but students were given credit if they calculated 'Mean Time between Failure (MTBF)' because the process is essentially the same. This is a difficult learning outcome to address because of the requirement to present an evaluation for mark band one. It was pleasing to see that in this examination series students were doing better than in previous ones when presenting evidence for mark band 1 and particularly for band 3.

Learning Outcome 2.2
This learning outcome requires the student to produce a maintenance plan that includes timescales, tools, safety procedures etc. The maintenance plan produced by many students failed to address all of these points and they were unable to access marks in the higher bands.

Some students confused maintenance schedule with maintenance procedure. A schedule would be the servicing booklet for a car- what needs to be done at particular mileage intervals e.g. changing engine oil and replacing filters. A maintenance procedure is the sequence of tasks to be followed: use documentation to identify replacement parts, source correct replacement parts and tools, 'lock off' engine start, drain oil, etc.

Learning Outcome 3.1
For this learning outcome students are required to describe and justify the implications of poor maintenance- what happens if equipment is not properly maintained; this could be lack of maintenance or poor maintenance routines. Many students presented reasonable evidence for mark bands 1 and 2 but mark band 3 proved difficult when trying to explain and justify a way of reducing the impact of improper maintenance, for example in the case of breakdown having access to standby equipment while the faulty equipment is repaired. In a manufacturing environment this would allow production to continue so preventing loss of revenue; costs of standby (i.e. a spare) in comparison to the loss of revenue caused by a breakdown should be alluded to.

Learning Outcome 3.2
Many students achieved full marks for mark band 1 as it was just a case of presenting a list of spare parts for a given maintenance task. Mark band 2 was also reasonably well done. To achieve mark band 3 the student must identify spare parts and calculate the required stock levels; this can be linked to MTTF (LO1.2) - this defeated many students.

Learning Outcome 4

Most students produced a risk assessment but access to the higher mark bands was limited because they did not properly consider health and safety legislation, discuss PPE and its correct storage, or consider warning signs. There were some very good, tabulated risk assessments based on the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) recommended format.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE