

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2011

Entry Level Certificate
Design & Technology 8910

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our ELC line on 0844 576 0031, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

June 2011

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

This title has been running for many years now and the level of work matches the pre-GCSE titles so it is easy for centres to run ELC and GCSE courses concurrently. The Board set tasks have been re-written to match the 2011 specifications in each focus area (Food, Graphics, RMT, Systems and Control and Textiles). The tasks in the re-written document (available online from Edexcel www.edexcel.com >subjects > design and technology > entry level certificate) that match those suggested for GCSE are marked with a *.

Coursework Design and Make Task Paper 1

The work from centres generally covered the assessment criteria for the level awarded by the teacher examiner. There were a few exceptions to this where the moderator awarded either higher or lower levels though this was rare this year. It is important to read the assessment criteria to ensure that candidates can hit each statement accurately through the work they are guided to complete.

Better quality work was seen from centres where worksheets had been prepared for candidates to use in advance of them completing a task. These varied from quite carefully guided work sheets with either cut out words or diagrams for candidates to complete to sheets with titles and simple guidance as to what to include on those sheets. At the other end of the scale some centres had given candidates a brief to work to and there appeared to be little guidance as to what to include or in what order to complete work in; these pieces of work were time consuming and difficult to moderate as a result. It is important therefore for centres to guide candidates through the task to ensure a good chance of success.

There were a number of common issues that arose during moderation that need to be addressed. The evidence should match the assessment criteria particularly in sections 2 and 5. If there is work from more than one focus area or taught by more than one teacher then it is vital that the work is standardised. Finally there should be photographic evidence with some indication of scale showing the completed realisation of the project. There should also be some evidence of work as it is completed to show working safely and give some indication of select and use tools and equipment. Some centres need to look carefully to ensure the work sent for moderation hits all the assessment criteria. There was some very good evidence that could so easily be assessed at level 3 that was awarded a level 2 by the teacher. The reverse of this was also seen from some centres; little regard appears to have been given to the content of the portfolio and an award of level 3 claimed even though it was clearly not at that level.

The OPTEMS should be completed and the top copy sent to Hellaby by the date at the top; the second copy should be sent with the coursework to be moderated to the moderator by the date at the top the green copy is for centres to keep. Please ensure there is some form of identification sent with work as it is difficult to identify a centre with no register or compliment slip. If there is no OPTEMS then a register with levels awarded should accompany the work.

There should be a Coursework Authentication Sheet with each piece of work sent for moderation and completed by the candidate and the teacher.

The work should also have a copy from the specification (pages 15, 16 or 17) of the Record Sheet. This should be annotated with the page number of where evidence can be found as a minimum. Some centres provide full notes with this which aids moderation greatly. Most work should be

evidenced in the portfolio and only one or two areas should be teacher evidenced, this may be particularly effective at Level 1.

The next three sections give brief details of the evidence presented for moderation at each level. There is some amplification of the types of evidence the moderator is expecting and what is not acceptable. It is not exhaustive neither is it the sole method of providing that evidence.

Level 1 Award

Gather Information: It is adequate for the teacher to provide some information for candidates to select to use in their project. There should be a selection, not the same for every candidate as this could suggest that the candidates have not been fully involved in the work. Neither does there need to be masses of information, just one nor two pieces selected that the candidate can use to help their project. There should be some written work to go with this evidence to justify it in the project; this could be a teacher produced question and answer sheet or a cut and paste sheet for the candidate to use.

Develop ideas and solutions: There was often just one idea to solve the task. This is adequate at this level but there could be a simple sentence saying how the idea is going to solve the original task.

Use written and graphical techniques: Drawing, written statements and teacher prepared work sheets were in evidence here. The more organised centres where teacher work sheets were developed enabled candidates to achieve this more easily.

Produce and use simple schedules: This area is most often discussed either individually or as a group but needs some written evidence by the candidate about decisions made.

Select and use tools and equipment: This was often evidenced by teacher observation which is acceptable at this level. The finished product was included here in the form of photographic evidence.

Test and evaluate the product: This was the least successful part of the project at this level. There was some written comment here and some centres again used a simple question sheet to prompt candidates to make comment about how successful their project was in answering the original task.

Level 2 Award

Gather Information: The candidates often produced lots of printout materials from the internet which was not used in any way to help inform the project. This information should help to provide some points that can be written for a short specification. Where a specification was found it was usually on a pre-prepared work sheet with either statements started to be completed or questions to be answered by the candidate.

Develop ideas and solutions: The written description and drawings that were produced here were usually of the final idea with very few showing a small range of ideas. There was some excellent detailed work from some centres using a wide range of presentation techniques. Again some guidance here helped the candidate by having pre-prepared sheets for completion by adding drawings, recipes and notes.

Use written and graphical techniques: There was often a simple drawing or selection of recipes included that the candidate had selected to include. Presentation varied greatly with many relying on the use of a computer to word process to aid presentation. Some centres used mood boards to help give candidates a range of ideas for them to develop.

Produce and use simple schedules: Here the evidence was often teacher observed and at this level it is expected that there is some evidence in the portfolio. The best evidence seen was either a simple time line or a block diagram of some events or the whole making process. Prepared work sheets aided candidates here where they were made available.

Select and use tools and equipment: Candidates should have some idea of which tools and equipment to select for common tasks and the easiest way to provide this is by photographic evidence which is what most centres provided. The project must be complete at this level.

Test and evaluate the product: there were some good evaluations of the products made seen at this level. There should be some evidence of evaluation at this level.

Level 3 Award

Gather Information: There was a good range of evidence seen where candidates had selected research and had gathered information from questionnaires to write a short specification. Some centres again included a lot of printed matter that was not used in the project. The specification should have some points that can be tested in the evaluation e.g. be able to be eaten without cutlery or be able to be fixed to a flat surface or a tree.

Develop ideas and solutions: There were a number of relevant ideas seen from some centres which used a range of presentation techniques including CAD. The description, recipe or drawings do not need to be too complicated; they need to convey the general ideas of what could answer the original task. There should be some reference to which solution will be used and why it has been selected e.g. it has been tested against the specification. The production of the project in industrial terms is tackled by some centres and it tends to be 'this is how a biscuit is produced in bulk.' What would be better would be some discussion of setting up a simple production line with a group of candidates to cut, drill, clean up and assemble a bird box; the possibility of making things more accurately using a jig rather than measuring and marking to cut the sides to length or something similar.

Use written and graphical techniques: A full range of presentation methods and testing of production methods is seen from centres. The use of hand written as well as computer aided work is evident too. I would expect that most candidates can produce their own work even if aided by a support worker or a TA.

Produce and use simple schedules: Story boards, timelines as well as block diagrams were seen as part of planning for making. Some form of planning for making should be expected at this level, some centres do not have a great deal of evidence of this in the work of candidates.

Select and use tools and equipment: The quality of the finished projects seen were more than suitable for GCSE which is good. Some centres rely here on teacher observation as evidence for the selection of tools and equipment. There should be some evidence that candidates have selected tools and equipment for use in most of the project. This is easiest through the use of photographic evidence. A work sheet with some narrative of a process using technical vocabulary would also help here.

Test and evaluate the product: The first part of testing the product is to compare it against the specification. This is the case with most centres; there is also good evidence of user testing especially in Food Technology. I would expect some element of subjective evaluation such as 'I used my time well' or 'my project was completed well and I like it'. There is an expectation of some evaluative comment at this level.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481
Email publication.orders@edexcel.com
June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

