

Moderators' Report/  
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel Entry Level  
Certificate in Design & Technology  
(8911)

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2014

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

**8911**

## **Entry Level Certificate in Design & Technology**

### **Introduction**

There was some very good work seen for moderation in this, the first year of assessment for this particular unit. Many centres appeared to find the assessment process relatively easy to complete and most were accurate in the assessment of work to the criteria. This may be due in some part to the similarities between this Entry Level Certificate with the GCSE D&T suite.

Most centres sent work for moderation by the coursework deadline in the middle of May with the most popular focus areas being Food and RMT. The themes set for GCSE D&T apply to this title and although one or two centres had some doubt as to whether the work submitted was acceptable, the themes are sufficiently broad that this posed no problem for moderation. It should be noted that these themes are subject to review and change so centres are advised to check the relevant webpage of the Pearson Edexcel website for updates to the themes.

The level awarded by the Teacher Examiners was generally accurate to the Level Assessment Criteria, but care must be taken to guide students to ensure they hit the relevant Level Descriptors. This issue requires particular attention for the Level 3 Award. The photographic evidence of making and the final product varied from a single picture of the final outcome to a full photographic diary of making in progress; the latter being far more helpful to the moderation process than a single picture. It should be noted that the photographs on the Candidate Assessment Booklet (CAB) should be a close-up of the outcome with some degree of scale and the student name or number included.

Annotation varied from the inclusion of page numbers to a description of the work carried out by the student and justification for the level award. Although page numbering is the minimum requirement some commentary is helpful, this is particularly necessary if there are no photographs of making in progress. Here the Assessor Witness Statement is vital to give the Moderator a good indication of the competence of Making Skills and the Quality of Final Manufacture. The signature of the Assessor is required on both the Assessor Witness Statement and the Student Declaration sheets.

### **Entry 1**

#### **1. Investigate**

##### **Analysing the Brief**

At this level the brief is expected to be given to the student and some record by the student of areas that need to be looked into to help inform the designing of a solution to the brief is all that is required here. This can be on paper or recorded using a Dictaphone where the students may have discussed things as a group.

Work seen for this section was generally a written statement, where centres had prepared a template for students to use, the assessment was easily met.

### **Research**

The research can be prepared by the teacher here and the student can select the most appropriate work to include in their portfolio. Lots of work downloaded from the internet is not suitable or informative. Looking at existing products with some comment on looks or materials used is most appropriate. Some centres had products for students to disassemble which is very helpful and informs the design work later on.

### **Specification**

At this level a simple description of what the product may look like and how it might work are the requirements. This was generally presented as a simple list of things that the product should do, again a teacher prepared template gave students the best access to completing this section.

## **2. Design**

### **Initial Ideas**

Some simple drawings of the final outcome or the presentation of a dish or recipe was the most common evidence seen for this assessment. Some centres presented work with dimensions on or descriptions of what they liked or disliked about the outcome. Where discussion takes place some note in the Annotation column of the CAB is helpful, some centres merely mentioned that this was discussed but not actual helpful detail was included.

### **Review**

At this level comment on the actual initial idea is acceptable but there should be some attempt to say why it has been chosen. This was lacking in the evidence seen.

### **Develop**

A simple model of the outcome or a practice of one component was used here to good effect. There does not necessarily need to be any change to the detail, just sufficient to show that the student has considered how the outcome production will be executed. A drawing of the final outcome or a final copy of the ingredients and methods used was the most common evidence here even though it was the initial idea drawing.

## **3. Make.**

### **Production Plan**

The best work here was again seen from centres that had prepared a template. This gives some structure for the student to work to and makes them think about how they intend to carry out making their proposal. This can be as simple as students cutting and pasting statements into an order so that there is some check to ensure the correct order is going to work.

The whole product need not be the subject of this plan, it could be one aspect of the making that is planned by the student.

### **Making Skills**

Using tools and equipment to achieve the best outcome is the main activity here and students could show this through a simple photographic diary with some limited comment about the subject of the picture or a particular safety point. At this level it is important for the Assessor Witness Statement to be clear and accurate.

### **Quality of Final Outcome**

Likewise the Assessor Witness Statement is important here to assist moderation. Some close-up photograph of the finished product was seen from most centres.

## **4. Test and Evaluate**

### **Test and Evaluate Final Outcome**

Testing at this level is usually seen as the product in use and a simple statement of how well it works or does not work is common.

### **Suggest Improvements**

This was generally lacking in most work for this level. Here again where it was done well was with the aid of a prepared template.

## **Entry**

### **1. Investigate**

#### **Analysing the Brief**

Some points about form, function and materials is required at this level and was again written by the student. The use of a spider diagram was seen, which is acceptable, but may need some amplification with a final statement.

#### **Research**

Looking at materials and ingredients was most common here with some look at existing products included. Care with targeting and guiding the student into what to include here is vital so that there is not a mass of too much information. Some centres had prepared the material for research for the students but again care must be taken so as to avoid all the portfolios having exactly the same content.

#### **Specification**

The requirement here is a short series of statements in the form of a specification for part of or the whole outcome proposal. Prepared templates help the student to focus here and there was some excellent evidence of that from some centre.

## **2. Design**

### **Initial Ideas**

A minimum of two, preferably three, initial ideas is expected here and most students presented some good ideas with some detail of material, ingredients and components included. Some students used CAD packages with good results.

### **Review**

The review compared the ideas against the specification points and this is an area that is lacking in sufficient detail. Try to avoid allowing students to include this on the ideas sheet as this can lead to the same evidence of assessment being used twice. There should be a clear statement of which idea is to be developed and some evidence of discussion as to why and how it will be developed.

### **Develop**

Here too a model of the final idea that helps development was seen from the better work, and again it may not necessarily be of the whole product. There were some changes to the initial design, even if they were cosmetic at this level. A final design proposal was also included.

## **3. Make**

### **Production Plan**

A sequence of production was usually in the form of a list of processes which helped to inform the correct order of production. Some centres tried to include quality control here too.

### **Making Skills**

Some selection of and using tools and equipment to achieve the outcome allowed students to show their making skill and again a simple photographic diary with some comment about the subject of the picture was in evidence. Here too at this level it is important for the Assessor Witness Statement to be clear and accurate, particularly if there is no photographic evidence of making in progress.

### **Quality of Final Outcome**

Most projects had a complete outcome that functioned as intended.

## **4. Test and Evaluate**

### **Test and Evaluate Final Outcome**

There was some evaluation included but it tended to be limited to more subjective comment. Where a template was used to guide students a better outcome was achieved for this section

### **Suggest Improvements**

Very limited response to this section at this level.

## **Entry 3**

### **1. Investigate**

#### **Analysing the Brief**

Here the work was generally in the form of a spider diagram with some comments to highlight some of the points. Looking at the environment that the product would be in was evident in a few cases.

#### **Research**

Some good disassembly was seen from some of the better portfolios at this level. Research tended to be mainly limited to materials and tools that could be used, as well as similar products already available.

#### **Specification**

The best specifications were in the form of a table with a point covering each of the headings from the CAB. These also had some comment as to how they could be measured in a third column. Descriptive specifications were not too successful in meeting the assessment.

### **2. Design**

#### **Initial Ideas**

A range is three or more ideas containing annotated sketches or recipes. Some justification of details was also included in the work from some centres. There was some excellent use of CAD to draw and render 3D views.

#### **Review**

Some use of user feedback on ideas was evident in some portfolios but generally the review consisted of comparison of the idea against the specification.

#### **Develop**

The development of ideas at this level mainly consisted of some cosmetic changes and minor improvements. Some good modelling both using CAD and 3D models was photographed and included in this section. In Food the criteria asks for a drawing of the final plan with some ingredients, techniques and methods explained - this however, was not in evidence across all the work seen. There was some work where there was not a final drawing of the proposed product in RMT and Graphics.

### **3. Make**

#### **Production Plan**

Some centres used a flow chart to cover the production plan; this should include feedback to show quality control too. The quality control should also contain what measures will be completed to test the quality of the stage of production, this was missing from many of the portfolios seen.

### **Making Skills**

Products at this level were generally of good quality and complete working outcomes. Some centres had some work of outstanding skill and this was supported with a good photographic record.

### **Quality of Final Outcome**

The finishing of some of the products was to a high standard that could be seen from detailed photographs. Where centres presented unclear photographic evidence then the annotation on the CAB is important for the moderator to agree the level assessed.

## **4. Test and Evaluate**

### **Test and Evaluate Final Outcome**

Where there was a clear specification with some testable points, students produced some good points in their evaluations. There was some testing carried out on the finished products and this was recorded by the student. This led to the next section to suggest improvements.

### **Suggest Improvements**

Some work was seen where students had modification for the outcome if they were to make the product again. This was not the norm though with many centres missing this section of the portfolio.

