edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report June 2009

Principal Learning

Information Technology
Level 3

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

June 2009

Publications Code DP021614

Contents

1.	Level 3 Introduction	4
2.	Level 3 Unit 1 Report	5
3.	Level 3 Unit 2 Report	7
4.	Level 3 Unit 3 Report	9
5.	Level 3 Unit 4 Report	11
6.	Level 3 Unit 5 Report	13
7.	Level 3 Unit 6 Report	15
8.	Level 3 Unit 7 Report	17
9.	Statistics	19

Principal Learning Information Technology

Level 3 Introduction

Most of the work submitted by centres for the June 09 series was found to be reasonably accurately assessed but unfortunately the assessment of some learners was found to be lenient, resulting in some of the sample not being in agreement with Edexcel standards.

The majority of centres were using the Tutor Support assignments from Edexcel. The assignments were applied to different contexts depending on the organisations available near centres or consortia. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating the students, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.

In terms of administration, work was well presented and organised but not all centres realised that they had to send both the highest and lowest scoring pieces of work.

Centres are also advised to review Annex E for guidelines on controlled assessments.

Most centres did not provide the appropriate evidence for Marking Grid B. Centres should address this in future series by providing detailed witness statements and/or annotated photographs.

Level 3 Unit 1 The Potential of Technology

General comments

Marking was sometimes over generous in crediting the role of legacy systems and emerging technologies in achieving organisational objectives. Some learners had discussed what legacy systems and emerging technologies were but failed to identify and give a full explanation of the role of legacy systems and emerging technologies in each organisation. Some centres had awarded marks in Mark Band 3 that were not appropriate. Centres should note that work in this Mark Band must have a full explanation of the role that legacy systems and emerging technologies play in helping organisations achieve their goals, illustrated with relevant examples from three different sectors.

Learning Outcome 1

Some elements of the legacy system hardware, software and data compatibility issues were discussed. The role of emerging technologies was also sometimes confused. Centres are advised to review closely the quantitative requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification for examples of emerging technologies, such as:

- mashups
- location-aware applications
- virtualisation
- nanotechnology
- RFID
- VoIP
- social software.

It is important to consider emerging technologies where real examples can be studied, rather than thinking about theoretical or future technologies.

Learning Outcomes 2 and 3

In general these Learning Outcomes were well met with learners giving several relevant and current examples of technology used by organisations and individuals and providing some explanation as to how they were being used to innovate. Some learners showed a good technical understanding of how organisations use technology to innovate.

However, learners did not fully assess the impact of the innovations. More discussion is required on how organisations and individuals innovate through and with technology, focusing on the requirements of the 'what you need to cover' and 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification, for example:

- to improve competitiveness e.g. web presence, online ordering, improved communication, automation, product miniaturisation
- to improve service e.g. customer relationship management, online ordering, webinars, forums
- to reduce carbon footprint e.g. hibernation when not in use, double-sided printing, automated building management

Some learners did not identify the impact of the innovations on individuals and how they innovate through and with technology. On the whole it was felt that learners commented on factors affecting success or failure, but often didn't develop this into considering the impact on competitiveness and service.

Of the lower scoring learners, greater depth of description may have resulted in improved marks.

Learning Outcomes 4 and 5

Similarly the marking of these Learning Outcomes was over generous. Whilst many learners had produced some good work and had presented some recommendations for some innovative technology-enabled solutions, most learners had not fully assessed the benefits and risks. The role of emerging technologies was sometimes confused.

Learners that achieved Mark Band 3 presented a set of recommendations for innovative technology-enabled solutions for two contrasting organisations, fully assessing benefits and risks.

The specification requires a number of recommendations to be made, relative to the appropriate Mark Band. For example, to achieve full marks in Mark Band 1, the learners must have presented at least three recommendations for both organisations, for Mark Band 2 a set of recommendations, and for Mark Band 3 a set of well-reasoned recommendations.

It was found that most learners had not fully assessed the possible role of the new technology as outlined in the 'what you need to cover' section of the unit specification, i.e. that it underpins specific business processes, safeguards business continuity, drives performance improvements and facilitates decision making. Learners did not fully assess the possible objectives of the new technology for example to increase sales/revenue, to improve service and to gain a competitive advantage.

These Learning Outcomes are about recommending innovative technology-enabled solutions for two contrasting organisations, identifying both benefits and risks. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating learners, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.

- Objectives: e.g. to increase sales/revenue, to improve service, to gain a competitive advantage
- Opportunities: e.g. new markets, new or improved products/services, cost reduction, outsourcing
- Risks: e.g. costs, over-expansion, staffing issues (expertise, redundancy, resentment)

The learners that used a SWOT analysis to identify the benefits achieved a higher grade. Centres might wish to employ methods such as a SWOT analysis or De Bono's 'Thinking Hats' techniques in order to get learners to assess success factors and the impact on competiveness and service.

Overall the work was placed in the lower/middle range of Mark Band 2 for all of the Learning Outcome. Centre assessors should focus closely on the 'what you need to cover', 'guidance for allocating marks' and the Marking Grids section of the unit specification for further guidance.

Level 3 Unit 2 Understanding Organisations

General comments

This was the first sitting of this examined unit. A pre-release was issued one month before the exam giving background information that related to the case study, a Canadian fast food organisation known as Tim Hortons, which was to be used in the exam.

The exam was 90 minutes long and the pre-release was made available in the exam paper. The exam comprised eight questions commencing with short answer questions initially and progressing to longer answers for the final two questions. All questions related to the case study and covered aspects from all the Learning Outcomes in the specification for this unit.

Most learners attempted all the questions with only a few learners omitting a question or substantial section of a question. The quality of answers varied with many good quality answers, especially to the discussion questions at the end of the paper. However, it was apparent that some learners were ill-prepared and were only able to answer questions with broad statements or generalisations.

The intention of the pre-release was to familiarise learners with the case study that would be used in the exam and it was the expectation that learners would refer back to the case study information during the exam when forming their answers. It appears that many learners did not make good use of the case study information during the exam, with learners apparently overlooking relevant information that they might have used.

Overall, for the first examination of this unit, the responses given offered much encouragement for future papers with learners achieving the full range of marks on all the questions with the exception of the final question, where the maximum mark was not achieved.

It is hoped that with better preparation, and learners making better use of the pre-release information during the exam, there will be a marked improvement in performance in the next exam session.

Questions 1 and 2

These related directly to the pre-release and many learners had evidently studied the case study carefully and prepared appropriately. There was, however, a disappointing number of learners who had apparently made limited use of the pre-release in preparing for the exam and consequently did not score as highly here. The questions covered the areas of business ownership and management in Question 1 and market research in Question 2. It had been expected that learners would focus on the technology that would enable effective market research but generally the answers had a broader, business-orientated approach.

Questions 3 and 4

These assessed both knowledge and application of knowledge. Some learners with a good understanding of SWOT analysis and data flow diagrams gained full marks on the relevant questions that tested knowledge but did less well when asked to apply this knowledge to devising a data flow diagram, with few learners using the data flow conventions exemplified in the preceding question. Knowledge of specific IT terminology, listed in the specification, was weak.

Questions 5 and 6

These proved to be the least popular questions and the ones where learners performed least well. It was disappointing that, given that figures for profitability had been included in the pre-release, few learners were able to correctly answer questions based on these figures. Other aspects of these two questions were better answered, especially the question on economic environment.

Questions 6(d), 7 and 8

These asked the learners to write at greater length and these questions were answered well by some learners, though, as mentioned above, some learners could bring no specific knowledge to these questions and as a result produced vague generalisations as an answer.

In Question 6(d) learners were asked to discuss the potential value of customer data collected by a loyalty card and this question had a large number of very good answers.

Question 7 required learners to comment on the secure handling of data. The question elicited some good answers but also quite a few where learners focused only on the issue of storing data while offering little comment on the collecting and sending of data.

Question 8 also had a strong imbalance in responses with many good answers on how technology could be used to monitor staff attendance but much less detail on training and performance monitoring.

In both Questions 7 and 8 weaker learners showed poor understanding of the topics, putting forward spurious arguments. The very best learners, however, produced insightful answers with good balance and evidence of a sound grasp of the issues involved.

Level 3 Unit 3 Professional Development

General comments

Most of the work submitted by centres was found to be reasonably accurately assessed but unfortunately the assessment of some learners was found to be lenient resulting in the sample not being in agreement with Edexcel standards.

Learning Outcomes 1 and 3

The marking for Learning Outcome 1 was generally in line with Edexcel standards. Learners had produced some appropriate business-related communications for a range of common business situations; leaflet, magazine article, presentation and questionnaire using some appropriate language and style but with limited awareness of audience and purpose. This limited the marks to the top of Mark Band 2. To fully achieve Mark Band 3 each learner should produce a set of different communications media; electronic such as websites, blogs, emails, text messaging, information points; print such as newspapers, magazines, reports, brochures, posters; voice such as telephone, face-to-face, radio, podcast so that they can be discussed with the rest of the group.

Learning Outcome 2

The marking for this Learning Outcome was in some cases over generous as learners did not fully consider the range of differing personal styles and behaviour in the team or assess their impact on teamwork.

All learners lost valuable marks in this section as they did not clearly consider the team's personal styles and behaviour. Some assessed the impact on teamwork and attempted to explain how behaviour was adapted to suit different roles and situations but for Mark Band 3 learners must have demonstrated sound awareness of the issues, clearly illustrated with well-chosen examples.

Learning Outcomes 3, 4, 5 and 6

The marking for this Learning Outcome was in some cases over generous. The learners' proposal was not always clear or sufficiently evidenced and the legal constraints were not clearly considered.

Whilst many learners had produced a spreadsheet model they were was not to the required standard and did not provide the required alternative solution. The required standard is an appropriate level spreadsheet model with complex mathematical concepts to explore and understand business dynamics. The model should have at least Level 2 IT Functional Skills functionality.

Learning Outcome 7

The marking for this Learning Outcome was generally in line with Edexcel standards. Learners submitted a team plan, made notes throughout the team activity to monitor progress and comment on team discussions, decisions made and their individual contribution to teamwork. During the initial meetings to agree objectives, learners should allocate roles and plan a schedule. Some learners showed good practise by submitting a Gantt chart and making notes of team activities, team discussions, decisions made and individual contribution to teamwork.

Learning Outcomes 2 and 8

The marking for these Learning Outcomes was generally in line with Edexcel standards. The learners that achieved higher marks made evaluative comments on some aspects of the project, their own personal performance and clearly responded to feedback from others. They also made comments on what went well, what went badly and the effectiveness of the team, highlighting some areas for improvement, including contribution to teamwork.

Most learners that achieved a higher mark made an attempt to evaluate their own personal performance by identifying strengths, weaknesses, contribution to team effort, interaction with others, and the overall effectiveness of the team and made a clear response to feedback from others.

Some learners had used a blog effectively to reflect on their own personal performance.

Marking Grid B

Most centres did not provide the appropriate evidence for Marking Grid B. Centres should address this in future series by providing detailed witness statements and/or annotated photographs.

Level 3 Unit 4 Creating Technology Services

General comments

It was evident from the work seen that learners had enjoyed the task set and had worked hard to produce an excellent database system.

Most of the work submitted was found to be reasonably accurately assessed.

The majority of centres were using the sample assignments from Edexcel. The assignments were applied to different contexts depending on the organisations available near centres or consortia. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating the students, which was shown in some of the database systems produced.

Learning Outcome 1

Learners that investigated a live database were awarded higher marks than learners that investigated online databases as they were able to fully interrogate the role of the system, reviewing tasks performed, identifying inputs and outputs, data processing, data structures and relationships. They were also able to fully evaluate the systems' interaction, compatibility of components and identify how the systems linked, sharing and transferring data. Most of the learners discussed some security requirements such as passwords and firewalls that were used to keep data secure.

Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 (Functional Specification and Structure)

The functional specification was sometimes brief but covered most of the requirements. A normalised database was designed, including data handling procedures such as queries and data input forms, and most learners had produced evidence of the normalisation process.

Most learners had produced macros to customise and improve the efficiency of the solution and evidence of the macro programme coding was also provided. Learners that achieved a higher Mark Band had implemented some user interface program code to add further enhancements to the system.

The testing for functionality was generally weak and learners that achieved a higher Mark Band developed a test plan and used out of tolerance data for testing purposes.

Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 (User Interface)

Learners are required to develop an HCI for the database that meets all of the specified requirements, including an effective user-friendly interface that aids accurate data entry, and reports that present information effectively. The majority of the HCI was clear, with a user-friendly main menu and use of drop-down boxes to aid accurate data entry. Output reports were seen to be clear, with some customisation data filter, field names and layout.

The testing section of these Learning Outcomes was weak as the system was tested for functionality with little use of extreme data. Learners that achieved the higher Mark Band had developed a test plan and carried out thorough testing for functionality and performance.

Learning Outcome 4

The marks awarded for this Learning Outcome was in some cases over generous. Some learners produced a leaflet and others a report. In general the functions and functionality of the system was poorly documented, this in turn demonstrated little awareness of user needs. In the lower Mark Bands it was difficult to follow, did not fully demonstrate how to use the system and was hampered by poor formatting.

Learners that received a higher Mark Band presented clear operating information that had a content page, index and a troubleshooting section, was easy to follow, fully demonstrated how to use the system and had an astute awareness of user needs.

Learning Outcome 5

The marks awarded for this Learning Outcome were in some cases over generous. Most learners had carried out system testing making some use of extreme or out of tolerance data. Some awareness of user needs was present, although some examples were generic. The learners had made use of feedback to identify some errors and possible improvements, and created a brief implementation schedule.

Learners that achieved Mark Band 3 reviewed the system using acceptance testing and observation, making full use of the feedback to identify errors, and made enhancements to the system. The feedback was then prioritised and used to produce a workable implementation schedule, which demonstrated sound awareness of user needs.

Level 3 Unit 5 Managing Technology Systems

General comments

The majority of centres were using the sample Tutor Support Materials. The assignments were applied to different contexts depending on the organisations available near centres or consortia.

This was a disappointing unit overall although the work produced was assessed accurately and in line with Edexcel standards. Some portfolios were better organised than others, with some pages featuring scribbled handwritten notes. Evidence for each Learning Outcome was found throughout the portfolios. For the sake of clarity centres might wish in future to clearly divide portfolios into sections for each Learning Outcome.

It was felt that in some cases in this unit there was a lack of detail to the technical skills required at this level.

It was pleasing to see that evidence of a testing plan required for Marking Grid B was supplied along with that for Marking Grid A. Detailed witness statements were also supplied by some centres.

Learning Outcomes 2 and 3

Most learners did not achieve high marks on this Learning Outcome. Many had provided a project overview but no outline plan for implementation or system change, showing limited awareness of purpose. There was also little evidence that learners had applied any principles of change management or taken any steps to safeguard business continuity. To be awarded Mark Band 3 the learners must produce a workable plan that focuses on technical details of a new computer network, should respond to the new business requirements, and should show sound awareness of purpose in the report. The few learners that received higher marks had applied the principles of change management to fully safeguard business continuity in the network upgrade, including planning, procedures and people management. It was felt that all learners could have added further detail to their plans for disaster recovery, and considered business continuity more.

Learning Outcome 4

Learners that did well in this section provided a full risk assessment that identified several types of problems in technology systems and gave an indication of the risks involved. However, learners that only scored in the lower Mark Band had identified actual problems when testing the system but had not assessed the impact of these problems. The learners that achieved a higher mark had carried out a risk assessment and fully assessed the impact of several types of problem in technology systems, such as software bugs, viruses and/or user errors. They had produced a user guide that explained the risks involved and provided comprehensive advice on how to handle the problem in each case, as well as fully assessing the impact on the user, the business and the system. They had also identified the seriousness of the problem and the knock-on effects, for example cost and data security.

Learning Outcome 6

Learners that received a higher mark produced technical support information that identified elements such as security, maintenance procedures, capacity planning, backup and recovery procedures, and demonstrated a good awareness of audience needs. Learners that achieved lower marks produced some guidance on how to check network component functionality but otherwise failed to provide technical support

information. Learners tended to focus on what should be done, rather than providing support information on how to perform each task. It would benefit learners' work if, when presenting technical support information, they address the reader directly, rather than using phrases such as "here, I am…". In some cases it was felt that there was a slight lack of detail to the technical support information. It was also felt that the technical support advice, although relatively detailed in some cases, was fairly generic and sometimes a little limited in scope by presenting a screenshot without clearly exploring the options available. Centres might wish to consider other medium for technical support documentation.

Marking Grid B

Most centres did not provide the appropriate evidence for Marking Grid B. Centres should address this in future series by providing detailed witness statements and/or annotated photographs.

Learning Outcome 1

A detailed witness statement was supplied by some centres that identified how the learners had configured a small-scale. Learners that achieved a higher mark also produced a test plan that evidenced functionality testing to ensure that the network works as intended, and most required that network resources are accessible.

Learning Outcome 5

No work was seen at Mark Band 3. Learners should identify a range of problems in a technology system, analyse them, make appropriate corrections, and log them. Some learners had produced a Problem Log that detailed and logged the problems clearly.
Some learners had produced a suitable technical support information leaflet for managing the availability and security of technology system.

Level 3 Unit 6 Multimedia and Digital Projects

General comments

The majority of centres were using the sample assignments from Edexcel. The assignments were applied to different contexts, depending on the organisations available near centres or consortia. The organisations chosen in some cases seemed to have limited scope for motivating the students, which was evident in some of the evaluative work produced.

Some centres provided work that was well presented and organised on the disc provided, including all documentation.

When describing uses of multimedia, some learners tended to include a preamble which defined what examples of multimedia were. This was deemed to be unnecessary and learners would be better off concentrating on the examples used by the businesses and organisations.

Multimedia products were variable in quality. Video was often unedited and many virtual tours were simply a linear set of slides or pages. There were some innovative examples, such as a maze game, that were impressive and clearly engaging for the students. Websites varied greatly in quality and functionality; testing of these should be thorough to ensure that they function correctly as well as meet audience needs.

In evaluation, many learners did not refer to the feedback given by their peers and in some cases the evaluation was all that was presented.

Learning Outcome 1

Most learners discussed some aspects of multimedia that were not entirely relevant, such as NTSC video, which is the US standard as opposed to the UK PAL standard. In most cases a wide range of purposes were identified but learners explained how the digital media could be created rather than describing the use and the purpose in sufficient detail. Various descriptions of hardware and software were included which weren't strictly necessary.

Learners that received a higher mark for this Learning Outcome described different types of media such as video, audio, still and moving images, animation, and simulations for a variety of purposes such as entertainment and leisure, education and training, marketing, virtual reality, publishing and customer services. Those learners also produced a full description of the type of media and the use for a particular purpose.

Learning Outcomes 2,3 and 4 (Website)

Marking of the multimedia products and websites was considered to be a little generous. It was felt that the audience profile was not clearly defined, and in some cases the websites themselves didn't function as required or were unfinished. The Moderators noted that the interactive maze was an innovative and interesting use of multimedia.

It was felt that most of the virtual tours presented did not provide a great deal of interactivity and were more representative of slideshows than true virtual tours. The websites did not always meet business requirements. Testing of functionality, usability, performance, readability and accessibility was found to be weak.

Learners that were awarded higher marks identified all key business requirements and had drawn up a clear audience profile. They also produced detailed up-front design documentation for a website that meets most of the business requirements and gives a clear picture of what is intended.

The effective multimedia assets adhered to legal requirements. These assets also supported the business purpose. For example, a website marketing a band or song would be expected to include video clips and audio. The quality of the assets assists in making the judgement over the appropriateness or effectiveness of them.
Learners that achieved higher marks tested for functionality, usability, performance, readability and accessibility, and demonstrated astute awareness of audience and purpose.
Learners that did not achieve high marks in this Learning Outcome did not clearly refer to audience needs and in some cases produced websites that were simply a linear set of slides or pages.

Learning Outcomes 2,3 and 5 (Multimedia Product)
Marking was in some cases over generous. It was felt that most of the multimedia products presented did not provide a great deal of interactivity; some were more representative of slideshows than true virtual tours. Learners that achieved a higher mark identified all key business requirements and had drawn up a clear audience profile that identified age, gender, culture, race, class and business interests. They also tended to produce detailed upfront design documentation that met most of the business requirements and gave a clear picture of what is intended.
Examples of documentation seen was computer game – scripting, flowchart, level structure diagram; virtual tour – structure diagram, storyboard, scripting; e-learning package – storyboard, scripting, structure diagrams.
Learners that achieved a higher mark tested for functionality, usability, performance, readability, accessibility, and demonstrated an astute awareness of audience and purpose.
Evidence for this section could be combined with the informational website, and therefore could be linked to the business purpose of the website, but separate design should also be evident.

Learning Outcome 6
Awareness of audience needs was limited in some cases. Learners that achieved a higher mark demonstrated an awareness of audience needs by fully evaluating each of their products, giving a sensible assessment of their fitness for audience and purpose, and made some sensible suggestions for improvement in each case by noting how each improvement would enhance the product. For example, an additional level might be added to a game because the audience completed it very quickly in testing; sound effects might be added to virtual tours to increase interactivity; adding a sitemap to a website or adding an index to an e-book would improve usability; optimising images or compressing video clips would enhance performance.
In some cases learners spent a lot of time commenting on feedback from others while creating limited evidence of evaluation of their work from such comments.

Level 3 Unit 7 Making Projects Successful

General comments

This was the first sitting of this examined unit. The pre-release was issued one month before the exam, giving background information that related to Section A (Web Masters - a website design and creation company) and Section B (the Environment Agency's 'Fishing Rod Licence' project). The exam was 90 minutes long and the pre-release was also made available in the exam paper.

The questions covered aspects from all the Learning Outcomes in the unit specification and constituted a mix of recall, application and discussion questions.

Most learners attempted all the questions with only a few learners omitting a question or substantial section of a question. The quality of answers varied with many good quality answers. However it was apparent that some learners were ill-prepared and were only able to answer questions with broad statements or generalisations.

The intention of the pre-release was to familiarise learners with the case studies that would be used in the exam and it was the expectation that learners would refer back to the case study information during the exam when forming their answers. It appears that many learners did not make good use of the case study information during the exam, with learners apparently overlooking relevant information that they might have used.

Overall for the first examination of this unit the answers given offered much encouragement for future papers with learners achieving the full range of marks on all the questions. It is hoped that with better preparation, and learners making better use of the pre-release for both sections, there will be a marked improvement in performance in the next exam session.

Section A

Question 1 related to the definition of scope, objectives and benefits of the project. Most learners were able to identify the aims of the project but were unclear as to the benefits that the project would bring to the company.

Learners that achieved full marks to Question 2(a) related directly to the planning stages of the Web Masters project. There was, however, a disappointing number of learners who had apparently made limited use of the pre-release in preparing for the exam and consequently their responses to this question were weak.

Responses to Question 2(b) were disappointingly weak with most learners demonstrating limited knowledge of Project Management software. It is strongly recommended that learners have the opportunity to use and become familiar with Project Management software.

Performance on Question 3, on the process of risk assessment, was weak with most learners showing little or no knowledge of the process. Learners lost valuable marks for this question.

Question 4 gave learners the opportunity to achieve fourteen marks and assessed both knowledge and application of knowledge. The question asked the learners to fill in the data missing from a Pert chart; this question had a mixed response. Learners need to be aware of industry standard approaches to project planning as identified in the unit specification: Gantt charts, Pert charts, run charts and cause and effect charts.

Question 5 on how changing external factors could have implications for the Web Masters project was poorly answered. Most learners were unable to apply the concepts of project planning when interpreting and reviewing plans. Examples could include use of contingency time, new risks involved when changing the plan, changes to budget and resources.
Question 6 asked the learners to describe two benefits of undertaking a review after each phase of the project has been carried out. Learners that achieved full marks in this question clearly related the answer to the case study.
Question 7 asked the learners to describe two suitable success criteria for the project. Again, learners that achieved full marks in this question clearly related the answer to the case study.

Section B

Centres are reminded that this section is worth 30% of the marks and learners should be given ample opportunity to interpret the case study in relation to the specification.
Question 8(a) asked the learners to identify three objectives of the project. Many learners had evidently studied the case study carefully and prepared appropriately. There was, however, a disappointing number of learners who had apparently made limited use of the pre-release and provided theoretical answers and therefore did not achieve the full marks.
Question 8(b) asked the learners to explain why each stakeholder had an interest in the success of the project. Learners that didn't achieve high marks on this question were often unable to identify why stakeholders had an interest in the project.
Question 9 assessed both knowledge and application of knowledge and asked learners to summarise the activities carried out in each stage of the project management. Learners that did not receive the full nine marks provided a theoretical overview and had not related the answers to the Fishing Rod Licence project.
Question 10 focused on the key factors in the success of the project and the benefits realised for this and future projects. Learners were often unable to identify and evaluate the key factors in the success of the project (budget, timescale, communication, objectives, estimations of time) and explain the reasons for success (clear understanding of client's requirements and deliverables; submitting a realistic bid at the outset; keeping within budget; appropriate resources (human, money, materials); delivering within timeframe) and consequently lost valuable marks for this question.

Statistics

Level 3 Unit 1 The Potential of Technology

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	52	46	40	34	28	22
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 2 Understanding Organisations

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	80	71	62	53	44	35
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 3 Professional Development

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	77	68	59	50	41	33
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 4 Creating Technology Solutions

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	79	70	61	52	43	35
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 5 Managing Technology Systems

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	45	39	33	28	23
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 6 Multimedia and Digital Projects

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	52	45	39	33	27	21
Points Score	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Level 3 Unit 7 Making Projects Successful

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	81	72	63	54	45	36
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Notes

Centres are reminded that this is the first summer examination for this new specification and that boundaries may change in the following series

Maximum Mark (raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the Mark Scheme or Marking Grids.

Raw boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a learner to qualify for a given grade.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code DP021614 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH