Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2013

GCE Applied ICT (6958) Paper 01 - Managing ICT Projects

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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

General Comments

There were a large number of e-portfolios moderated this series with a range of marks represented. Some of the e-portfolios had been assessed too generously with weaknesses in the evidence of managing the project and a clear handover with feedback on the management of the project which feeds into the evaluation.

There are still a significant number of centres that are assessing too generously and should ensure familiarity with the teaching and learning strategies within the specification along with comments within this report. In addition centres are able to seek further guidance and clarification through the Ask the Expert service.

Comments on strand a

Most centres are assessing this strand correctly. Few candidates are producing work to support mark band 3 which requires clear and measurable objectives to be included within the documents. In order to support other aspects of the unit stakeholders need to be identified and described and there should be a clear project handover date suggested at this stage.

There was better evidence of project risks and the impact of the project on personnel and practices.

Comments on strand b

Again there were instances when MS Project file formats were the only evidence included of the project plans. This is not an acceptable file format which resulted in no or low marks being available for this strand.

Some candidates produced a series of different plans with tasks 'ticked' as completed but no explanation to confirm whether these were completed on time or if any problems had occurred that resulted in them using any planned contingency time. Such evidence only addresses marks in mark band 1.   In order to achieve marks in the higher mark bands progress against the plan needs to be communicated. This is most commonly achieved in progress reports or within the meeting minutes.

There was better evidence of risks being identified and categorised according to impact or likelihood of occurring which is needed to achieve marks at the top of mark band 2 and above.

Comments on strand c

It was evidence from this series that candidates are holding a series of meetings during the project life cycle. However the meetings tended to still focus on the development of the product and the client remains to be the main stakeholder involved. Better evidence was produced when separate

meetings were held with the senior manager so that discussion could focus on project management and progress against the plan.

A few centres appear to have the whole cohort attending each meeting although it was not clear what the role as stakeholders many of the attendees played. Each project manager should be arranging their own individual meetings in order to manage the project correctly and independently. There were some instances of templates being provided for the meeting documentation which is not appropriate for candidates that are working at the top of mark band 2 and above.

The quality of the documentation produced varied with some candidates recording the information in a script like format rather than summarising the discussion and recording the actions needed by different stakeholders.

In addition to the minuted meetings there should also be some sort of progress reports or project log produced which can be used to reflect on the progress made, identifying any problems that have taken place and how these were handled and an indication of what the next steps in the project would be.

Informal communication should also be recorded which could be anything from a telephone log to emails or SMS and peer review feedback on the product.

There was still significant number of candidates who did not appreciate the role of the handover or end of project review meeting. This meeting needs to include feedback from a range of stakeholders on the way that the project was managed so that this can be used within the evaluation as well as confirming that the project was competed on time.

Comments on strand d

There is better understanding of this strand. Generally the evidence for this strand is provided by evidence presented for strand b and c along with the completed product rather than separate evidence. The inclusion of progress reports or project logs supports this. There is a requirement for the product to be completed and on time, as confirmed at the handover meeting, in order to access marks in the higher mark bands.

Comments on strand e

This strand was frequently assessed too generously. Many candidates had produced detailed evaluations which covered the three required aspects namely; the success of the project; effectiveness of project management methods and their own performance as a project manager. However in many instances the feedback gained and used from the end of project review meeting did not justify awarding marks in the higher mark bands. Other evaluations focussed too much on the product and the skills needed to develop this which is irrelevant to this unit.

It is important to realise that feedback is needed on the management of the project and this should be documented so that the candidate can use this to contribute to the evaluation.

Quality of Written Communication is assessed this strand and should be commented on in the e-sheet.

Comments on Administrative Procedures

Most centres submitted the CDs by the deadline. Generally the work had been well organised and the evidence was easy to access.

Most centres named the eportfolios with the correct naming conventions but many did not do so for the naming of the esheets.   Most centres provided candidate authentication in the form of individual sheets scanned on to the CD or provided hard copy format of these.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwant to/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx