



Pearson  
Edexcel

# Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

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

WIT04: Managing ICT Projects  
Paper 01

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2019

Publications Code WIT04\_01\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General Comments

It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates took into account the clear instructions in the examination paper with regards to the ordering of evidence and the printouts required. It is understandable that some candidates may need to produce more than the minimum prints required in activity 3 but the best advice, as shown by many candidates, is keep to the task specified and keep it simple.

## Administration

On the whole administration is sound but there are some candidates losing one or two standard ways of working marks in the paper by not assembling the tasks in the correct order or, where they are in the correct order, attaching them to the answer booklet incorrectly. When the examiner opens the booklet they should be greeted with activity 1 facing toward them ready to mark; this is not always the case ie when the examiner opens the booklet they are faced with the back of the activity 6 or the work hole punched in the right-hand corner as opposed to left. This adds to the time taken to mark an examination paper. Very few candidates do not ensure their name, centre number etc is present on every print though it does still occur.

## Activity 1

It was pleasing to see that many candidates correctly ordered the processes, managing to achieve all marks for this activity. There was no logical pattern when candidates did not order the processes correctly and, at times, their placing appeared to be random.

## Activity 2

On the whole this question was well answered.

A lot of candidates managed to pick up all the marks for Part A with tables for schools, students, leaders and walks and registrations. However, at times, candidates seemed to try to force the solution to involve only the use of four tables when, quite clearly, normalisation to third normal form would be violated.

For Part B most candidates picked up the marks for the single primary keys, with many achieving the composite key mark too. However, there are still instances of candidates not enforcing referential integrity and using too many fields within a composite key when the extra fields are not required to ensure each record is unique. The majority of candidates achieved the mark for using correct data types.

Part C wanted candidates to format the postcode. There is no need for candidate to format dates etc and this will not attract marks. Most candidates also achieved a mark for using a suitable presence check, however, there are still candidates applying a presence check to primary keys which is not required and will not attract a mark. Some candidates achieved the mark for using a table lookup on a foreign key. Where the

mark was not achieved it tended to be because the candidate had not used it on a foreign key or had not ensured limit to list was set to yes. Evidence for this must come from design view and not datasheet view.

Part D if marks were lost here it was generally down to either the use of incorrect tables or not ensuring the number of records could be clearly seen.

### **Activity 3**

Activity 3 is all about the **design view** aspects of building the forms and generating the processes. Candidates should be discouraged from including screenshots showing the system in use as that is explicitly tested in Activity 4 and can detract from the evidence required in Activity 3.

Where activity 3 had been attempted all candidates built the walk most achieved Part A marks for building the form, generating the ID and customising the form for ease of use.

It was really nice to see the number of different methods of approaching the validation of the form in Part B. Many candidates gained all four marks in this section. Some chose to validate aspects on the form itself e.g. making sure the walk was on a Sunday and making sure the difficulty and distance were not out of range. Most, who had attempted to ensure the walk date could not be duplicated, did this within VBA code or macros. There were many methods of saving the walk data; append queries, SQL code etc. When marks were lost it was usually down to the examiner not being able to determine the record would save. For example, candidates using an autonumber but not providing evidence here to show this, candidates using the save method in code but not showing how the generated number for WalkID would be assigned to the primary key or candidates truncating the append query so that all of the information could not be seen. The examiner must be confident the value of the new primary key would be appended to the table. The evidence in terms of generating walk registrations was mixed. Some candidates did not attempt this at all while others produced excellent evidence using different methods. Some used SQL some used append queries etc.

The majority of candidates did create the search form in Part C though many did not follow the design that was given and lost marks due to this. They were expected to ensure the form appeared as it was shown. It was also expected that candidates would ensure the search fields would default to wildcards (\*) on the form if no data was entered. Some candidates chose to append a wildcard onto the criteria they used in the query in (i). This was not what was required. (iv) clearly gave instructions that the 'text box' itself should default to a wildcard (\*). Most candidates provided good evidence for the subform refreshing. In terms of the query for updating the attendance for the student selected, where evidence has been included it generally attracted the marks.

Overall, it was nice to see how well this activity was attempted and the many different methods of achieving what was required. The only downside really is that some candidates do not realise that if they want the marks on offer they must ensure the examiner can clearly see the evidence. It is worthwhile asking themselves the question – *'if I did not know how this had been done, would I be able to work it out from the screenshots I*

*have provided?* - This does not mean lots of annotations/screenshots have to be present. Indeed, we try to guide the candidates into the screenshots we want. However, if what we have asked for does not fully show what they have done they should include more. They should ask themselves *"have I included all of my queries, have I included evidence of every part of formulae used, are my query columns wide enough, are my screenshots clear to see"* etc.

#### **Activity 4**

Overall, the candidates did well on this activity with many achieving full marks.

Part A was generally well evidenced in terms of the details input and the saving of the new walk record with many candidates achieving the marks available for this. However, the screenprint for showing the new registration records was not so good. Some candidates did not seem to realise they needed to show the **new** registration records i.e. for the walk they had just generated, showing any ten records instead.

Parts B to E were very well evidenced with many candidates achieving full marks.

Part F was generally attempted some very good, full mark results. However, marks were lost due to the school name not defaulting to a wildcard, the subform showing incorrect results or more than one record for the same student rather than the record for this particular walk or attendance for all students shown on the subform was updated to 'no' rather than for student 57.

#### **Activity 5**

This activity was well attempted with Parts A and B being very well evidenced on the whole. However, many candidates did not follow the design given in part C resulting in the loss of part C marks.

#### **Activity 6**

It was very nice to see that the majority of candidates had taken note of what was asked of them in the examination paper and carefully ensured their evaluation reflected this with some excellent, well thought out evaluations raising some very good points about future functionality. However, others still see it as an opportunity to talk about how well they have completed the examination questions or give a running commentary of what they did to build it.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom