Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2019

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

WIT06: Using Multimedia Software
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 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

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

General Comments

The work of the students was, on the whole, well organised and it was easy to find the Coursework Authentication Sheet (CAS) for each student and the e-record form for each student.

It was regrettable that in a small number of instances there were clerical errors on the e-record form when the total mark recorded did not correspond with the total of the marks submitted.

Most centre assessors had provided comments to indicate why the mark awarded for each task had been given, although in some instances the comments were brief or only repeated the wording of the assessment criteria rather than commenting on why it was felt that the mark submitted was appropriate.

Most centres are using the correct naming conventions for the e-portfolios submitted.

Strand A

Students had usually produced a functional specification that was relevant to the mark band that was being claimed. More able students had fully described the purpose of the multimedia product, explained clearly what it must do and specified success criteria that could be measured. If the success criteria could not be measured, a mark in mark band 3 was not appropriate.

Strand B

The level of detail in the design document did not always correspond with the mark band awarded by the assessor. In many cases the plans were detailed in nature, as required for mark band 2, rather than comprehensive in nature, as required for mark band 3. The characteristics of a comprehensive design are listed on the assessment grid.

A comprehensive design document will contain sufficient detail to allow another person to easily create the multimedia product from the information given, with the end product having a close correlation to that envisaged by the designer.

The design will show evidence of improvements as a result of prototyping the multimedia product.

Strand C

In the majority of the products seen, these could be run without access to the software used to create the multimedia product.

The marks awarded need to reflect the extent to which the product meets the functional requirements of the specification, how easy the product is to use and how well the product communicates the content with the end-user. Students who worked on real products for real clients tended to perform better in this strand.

The 'getting started with...' user guides were usually appropriate for the product and assessed in the correct mark band.

Some assessors did not provide much, if any, information relating to the assessment of the standard ways of working, as outlined in section 6.15 of the unit specification.

Strand D

Evidence of testing was limited in the work of some students as the testing was superficial in nature, whereas other students had carried out thorough testing. All aspects of the design need to be considered for thorough testing in mark band 3. Most students had included supporting evidence of tests carried out, and evidence of re-testing when modifications had to be made to the product.

Evidence relating to feedback from test users was minimal in the work of some students.

Strand E

Students need to ensure that the evaluation considers the feedback from others, rather than a generic review of the multimedia product created. In most portfolios the students had evaluated the multimedia product against the product specification, although in some cases the evaluations were too descriptive in nature for the marks given.

Enhancements to the product were sometimes limited in nature and included little supporting evidence to explain how these would benefit the multimedia product.

Students frequently gave minimal consideration to identifying areas of improvement relating to their own performance taking into account their current skill level.

In only a small number of e-record forms was there a comment relating to the Quality of Written Communication, which is assessed in this task.