



Pearson

Moderator's Report Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level
In Information and Communication
Technology (WIT07) 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 WIT07_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. The work seen covered the full range of marks available.

The aim is to produce a portfolio of work that reflects the students ability to create a spreadsheet to meet an agreed purpose, together with user and technical documentation to support this.

The cohort for this qualification was very small, so trends can be difficult to elicit. However, the centre is advised to check the GCE Applied comparable unit (6961) for exemplar materials.

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

Most assessors made appropriate comments on the e-record sheets which were helpful and showed how the marks were awarded. This helps the Moderator to agree the marks awarded by the centre.

Many students combined this unit with Unit 5 (WIT05). On occasion, this did not work well as the evidence can be confusing.

Strand A: Functional specification

Overall, this strand was well addressed and assessed.

Most students fully described the problem to be solved and how they would go about it. The majority of students were in mark bands 2 and 3.

There are 4 marks available on this strand and most students collected at least 3.

Strand B: Design

This strand is about the design of the finished spreadsheet. Prototypes are needed and this progress needs to be evidenced. For higher mark bands there needs to be evidence of feedback, and actions from that feedback.

This strand was often linked with Unit 5 (WIT05) to generate the feedback. Where this was done well it ensured the higher mark bands were accessed.

Overall, this strand was well addressed and well-assessed.

There are 16 marks available on this strand and most students collected marks in Mark Band 2.

Strand C: Complex working spreadsheet

This strand requires a fully functional spreadsheet, together with technical documentation showing how and why it works.

Evidence for this strand was variable. Some were assessed accurately and matched the ability of the student. However, some spreadsheets did not work and had been assessed too generously. Others were not complex enough for marks above Mark Band 1.

The documentation was also variable with work achieving the higher mark band, but others not evidenced at all. It was in this strand that some students got confused with what was presented for Unit 5 (WIT05) and what was needed for this unit.

Overall, this strand was inconsistently addressed and assessed. Problem areas were generally in Mark Band 2.

There are 18 marks available on this strand. Whilst some work was clearly worth of marks in Mark Band 3, other work was not enough to justify the marks awarded for Mark Band 2.

Strand D: Testing

This strand requires formative and summative testing. It links with Strand B.

The evidence must be clear and not 'assumed' on the basis that the spreadsheet works.

As with Strand C, the documentation was variable with work achieving the higher mark band, but others not evidenced at all.

Overall, this strand was inconsistently addressed and assessed. Marks were awarded when no testing was evidenced.

There are 8 marks available on this strand. The Mark Band 3 work was clearly and justifiably awarded the correct marks but the award of marks in the other mark bands was incorrect.

Evaluation:

This strand was not well addressed. Some students did not attempt the evaluation, whilst others did not fully understand what was needed and some of the work was more akin to Strand E from Unit 2 (WIT02).

The main problems surrounded:

- the effectiveness of the solution and any shortcomings
- current skills levels and enhancements.

There are 12 marks available on this strand. Most of the work provided was too generously assessed, usually one mark band too high. The descriptors are very clear for this strand and there are 3 discrete elements to it. It was addressing these that the work fell short.

The work seen evidenced that the students had done the main body of work, and the evaluation was an add-on. However, with 12 marks available it represents 20% of the final total and should be better addressed.

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.

All of the administration elements were fully in order for this series.

