



Pearson

Moderator's Report Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level
In Information and Communication
Technology (WIT02) Paper 1

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 2018

Publications Code WIT02_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General comments

Much of the work seen was appropriate and gave the students good opportunities to meet the requirements of the specification. Work was seen that covered the full range of available marks.

The aim is to produce a portfolio of work that reflects the digital economy and how it works today.

Many students produced an index page which helped navigation though, this was not needed. Others simply presented each strand as a single or series of PDFs.

Many centres provided work with an *.accdb* format which is not acceptable. Using this format prejudiced what students could achieve.

Most assessors made appropriate comments on the e-record sheets which were helpful, and showed how the marks were awarded, this often helps the Moderator to agree the marks awarded by the centre. However, in some cases these were minimal, whilst in others the comments made did not reflect the marks awarded.

Strand A: Transactional websites

Centres are reminded to use the specification to teach the topics required for this strand. At times, there was evidence of students spending a lot of time describing the theory of transactional websites, which is part of the assessment. Some learners looked at several transactional websites and compared them. Again, this was not part of the assessment criteria and meant marks awarded could not be agreed.

High performing students produced very detailed descriptions of all the elements of a transactional website with some very good examples.

Work that achieved high marks evaluated the features of the website in situ.

High level work showed sensible improvements to the website based on objective reasoning rather than subjective opinion. Most gave justifications about how this would help customers and the business.

There were times, however, in this strand that students did not fully evaluate their work, and was marked too generously.

It should be noted that the Quality of Written Communication should be taken into consideration in this strand and it is expected that the assessor comments on this in the e-record.

Strand B: Back-Office Processes

This strand is about how back-office processes occur leading up to, and following, an online process. The strand requires diagrams with information flow only. The diagrams must be created by the student. There were a few instances where textual explanations were provided, which does not yield any marks.

The diagrams do not have to be related to the transactional website chosen in Strand A.

Most candidates provided more than one diagram. Those who were in Mark Band 1 lacked detail about what information was flowing, but were still able to access marks.

Higher marks were awarded where students showed a full range of processes, for example, payments and delivery with clear details of what information was flowing, or where a Yes / No decision was needed and its impact.

Overall this strand was well addressed and well-assessed.

Strand C: Security

In the main this strand held minimal issues. Most students were aware of the three elements and assessment was, on the whole, accurate.

As with Strand A, there were sometimes issues with marks being awarded at the top of Mark Band 2 when there was no evaluation of the effectiveness of the security measures. In these instances the work tended to be descriptive rather than evaluative.

Strand D: The database

In general, the marks were too generous, often a complete mark band adrift and this put pressure on tolerance.

A few centres created a database without reference to a given dataset. Datasets are provided by Pearson and one of these is to be used. Without a large dataset trends cannot be elicited nor can meaningful information be collected. This prevents access to marks in the higher marks bands.

There were many instances where a 1:M relationship was not shown. Without that relationship students are limited to marks in Mark Band 1 only.

Some students related the database to the website, which is not a requirement.

Some students sent an *.accdb* file which is not an acceptable format. Higher performing students showed good understanding and evidence of testing, combined with complex queries which yielded useful

information that a business could use to make strategic marketing decisions. Collecting information does not fulfil the requirements of the higher mark bands.

It is evident that a lot of time was spent showing pages of evidence of how data were imported when the requirement of screenshots of correct data in correct tables should be demonstrated. Similarly, a lot of effort was made in showing every step of creating a query when the need was for the query to be seen in design view, run, then the results shown, possibly interpreted.

Strand E: Evaluation

This strand was not well addressed and, in general, assessment was too generous.

In the most cases, students did not evaluate the performance of the database or their own performance but described what they had done to achieve the database and how they had used their time efficiently. This would suggest that centre guidance is needed to inform students on the purpose of the evaluation.

Students stated they had received feedback but did not provide direct evidence of it.

In most cases, the evaluation had been placed inside the e-book, which is not correct, it should be a separate document.

General Administration

The sample should be sent to the Moderator on a single CD for each unit, the CD should contain all the students in the sample, the work of the highest and lowest scoring students should also be included as extras if not already in the sample selected.

In a few cases, the e-record and Centre Authentication Sheet was not included. This delays the moderation process whilst the Moderator chases centres for these documents.

In some cases, centres gave more marks to a strand than were available, the mark on the e-record differed from that on the website, and the addition of marks on the e-record was incorrect.

The centre assessor should use the e-record as an opportunity to help the Moderator find the evidence required to agree the marks given.

