



Pearson

Moderator's Report Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In Information and Communication Technology
(WIT05) 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 WIT05_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General Comments

The work of the students was, on the whole, well organised and it was easy to find the Coursework Authentication Sheet (CAS) for each student and the e-record form for each student.

It was regrettable that in a small number of instances there were clerical errors on the e-record form when the total mark recorded did not correspond with the total of the marks submitted.

Most centre assessors had provided comments to indicate why the mark awarded for each task had been given, although, in some instances the comments were brief or only repeated the wording of the assessment criteria rather than commenting on why it was assessed that the mark submitted was appropriate.

Most centres are using the correct naming conventions for the e-portfolios submitted.

Strand A

Students usually produced a project proposal that was relevant to the mark band that was being claimed. More able students had carefully considered the impact of the proposal on other people and included a project proposal that included effective communication of the content.

In this examination series there evidence that some students had given careful consideration to the objectives that could be measured in terms of success criteria.

Strand B

The level of detail in the project plan determined the mark band for this strand. More able students had divided the project into a number of logical phases and clearly identified the main activities and risks within each phase and considered contingency measures throughout the project, rather than just at the end of the project. Students had, on the whole, allocated a realistic amount of time to each activity and many students clearly illustrated the dependencies within the project plan.

Students only need to plan the project to be undertaken. There is no requirement to include planning of the portfolio within the project plan.

Strand C

Assessment of this strand tended to be lenient in the work of some students. The strand requires evidence of formal and informal communication during the project with many students omitting to evidence informal communication.

Some students tended to focus on evidencing development of the product during the meetings without fully evidencing the management of the project.

Strand D

The focus of this strand is about the creation of the product through following the project plan. In some instances, the assessors appeared to awarded the marks for the quality of the product rather than considering the objectives in the project definition and the quality criteria identified in Strand A.

Strand E

Students need to ensure that the evaluation considers the feedback obtained at the end-of-project review meeting, rather than a generic review of the project undertaken. In most portfolios the students had evaluated the success of the project against the objectives of the project. Although, in some cases the evaluations were too descriptive in nature. Greater detail regarding the project management methods used was required, to secure a mark in Mark Band 3, than was seen in many of the portfolios.

Students frequently gave little consideration to weaknesses of their own performance as a Project Manager as a result of feedback from the end-of-project review meeting.

In only a small number of e-record forms was there a comment relating to the Quality of Written Communication, which is assessed in this task.

