



General Certificate of Education

**Applied Information and
Communication Technology
8751, 8753, 8756, 8759**

IT08 Project Management

Report on the Examination

2010 examination – June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

Unit 8: Project Management (IT08)

Generally, where projects undertaken had real clients, candidates produced better portfolios. It was evident that many candidates had used real clients for their portfolio work and were often able to access higher marks than those who had not.

Action plans and monitoring of tasks showing durations in hours were evident in many candidate portfolios.

This Unit introduces candidates to the skills, techniques and tools involved in managing a project (or part of it) and working as part of a project team. A broad spectrum of projects had been carried out, from party planning, to setting up websites and organising trips. The emphasis of assessment is on the processes that occur whilst carrying out the project rather than the end product itself, which allows for some projects not coming to fruition until after the end of the unit of work. In these cases no end product was evident apart from the results of the planning phase. This was perfectly acceptable.

AO1 assesses the candidate's acquisition of new skills during the project and whether they were pro-active in their acquisition; their use of new software or software functions during the project; their use of project management tools and standard ways of working.

In some portfolios although it was highlighted that the software or software functions were new to the candidate they had not described how they had used them in their own work and so were unable to gain the higher marks.

Most candidates sampled had a good grasp of what it means to work in a team, on a project, and had obviously done so. A few projects were unsuitable where, for example, a whole team had worked on a simple task, but most candidates did show evidence of undertaking real, appropriate projects.

Unfortunately there was some evidence that, in some instances, candidates had been taught "to the mark grid" and though they were producing evidence of skills/knowledge gained or used in the project, had no real understanding of their relevance to the individual candidate's role/tasks. This was also the case for giving support to team members, where there was too much emphasis on "teaching something" rather than passing on relevant and necessary skills to a fellow team member, who would then use those skills in the project. Where candidates had achieved high marks they had usually given support to a team member on a relevant skill and included an authenticated record of the support given, complemented by signed feedback from the other team members and/or teacher. Although some portfolios showed pre- and post-project skills audits as evidence of recording improvements in skills, many candidates failed to record their progress in acquiring skills at all and therefore should not be awarded the higher marks.

Many candidates had used a variety of project management tools. For example there were some good uses of Facebook, as well as distribution lists for emails, tracking of changes made to documents held in areas with shared access, series' of related agendas and minutes and well monitored Gantt charts. However, many candidates had failed to gain the higher marks because they had not described or shown how they had used these tools effectively, appropriately and consistently in their aspect of the project.

When providing evidence of adherence to standard ways of working, some candidates did not provide even minimal evidence of backing up their work and using appropriate file names, even though many of those students had shown some evidence of using standard ways of working

appropriate to group work. Adherence to both personal and group work standard ways of working should be seen in order for the higher marks to be awarded.

Most candidates showed that effective communication had taken place but only the better candidates showed that they had acted upon communication from other team members. A good source of evidence for this was provided by some candidates whose meeting minutes showed action points for team members that had been followed up at the next meeting.

Although most candidates described their role and tasks in the project in detail, some candidates, especially where teams were too large, had problems in describing exactly what they were going to deliver and their role as a team member.

Many candidates had produced good evidence of their own personal involvement in problem solving, but sometimes they failed to show how they had responded to unexpected events, solely concentrating on the plan for unexpected events.

Not all candidates provided detailed evidence of the ICT they planned to use in their own part of the project (in the future tense) and some failed to then show evidence of how and where the ICT had actually been used.

In A03 a few better portfolios showed good enough evidence for three marks on each of rows 5 and 6, where candidates should explain their existing skills and knowledge prior to commencing the project, and how they have used these in carrying out their tasks and role in the project. Many candidates did not achieve high marks on these rows because they described their pre-existing skills and knowledge but did not then show how they had used these whilst working on the project (in the past tense).

In A04 better candidates gained high marks for clearly showing how their projects and their part in the project were to be assessed. They did this by providing some objectives and evaluation criteria for the team in respect of the overall project, and themselves in respect of their own individual role/tasks in the project. These candidates then provided a plan of how they would assess their success or failure by explaining how these would be measured for example by test plans for projects, user/client questionnaires and peer feedback. Some better candidates gave clear accounts of the actions taken by other team members and themselves during the project through diaries/logs.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.