Advanced Skills Challenge Certificate
(Welsh Baccalaureate)
Principal Moderators' Report

January 2018

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:

https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en

Administration

Entries

- Centres are expected to withdraw candidates who do not submit any work for a component.
-

Controlled Assessment

- Centres are reminded there are set controls for certain tasks within the Challenge and that these **must** be adhered to otherwise the centre results will be in jeopardy.

Submitting Marks

- Centres are reminded that when entering marks that 'A' should be entered for a candidate who does not submit any work for assessment.
- Centres are reminded that only if work is submitted for assessment but is found to not be worthy of a mark should '0' be used.

Submitting Work to Moderator

- Centres are advised to check that the total marks on the assessment sheet correspond with the marks input on IAMIS as there were a number of disparities.
- Where marks have been adjusted as a result of a Centre's internal verification procedures, this mark should be entered and not that of the assessor and corrected on assessment sheet.
- The Challenge assessment sheets must be signed appropriately by the assessor. The Individual Project assessment sheet must be signed appropriately by both assessor and candidate. Signatures may be done electronically.
- Centres are reminded that the 'Time Sheet and Candidate Declaration' must be used for all candidates entered for the three Challenges and signed by the candidate, this may be done electronically. The hours recorded should clearly identify how many hours are spent on each task of the assessment, this does included the 30 hours for carrying out the Community activity. Teaching and learning hours should **not** be included.
- Centres should always include a copy of the Challenge Briefs that candidates in the sample have used for assessment. If the same brief has been used by all then only one copy is required.

Submitting Work using e-submission

- When using this system centres must ensure candidates work is labelled clearly in a zipped folder. Each candidate should take responsibility for organising their own folder. They should not include a large number of documents for a single task, they should combine these in a logical order demonstrating their digital skills which is included in the assessment.
- Centres must ensure that all the required evidence is uploaded. This includes the Challenge assessment sheets for each candidate

Internal Moderation procedures

- It is most important that centres have a thorough internal moderation process in place. In this series there was an increased number of centres where assessor adjustments to marks had to be made. If there is a clear lack of consistency across assessors within a centre in future series the whole cohort will be requested.

Individual Project

This third series of the Individual Project was a small cohort but still contained a broad range of topics. Very few artefacts were submitted. There were no instances of candidates comparing Wales with another region/country.

- Progress continues to be made in the quality of the Projects submitted in this series. LO1 and LO2 are strengths of the majority of the Projects seen. LO3 continues to improve. LO4 remains a key area for development across the majority of centres. LO5 and LO6 are continue to be strengths for most candidates and are generally securely assessed. LO7 has improved with an increasing use of evidence and summative and formative conclusions being drawn. LO8 remains variable in quality and some centres need to review their guidance.
- The quality of some Projects must be commended. The variety and individuality of the topics covered demonstrates an authenticity in the interest and commitment of the candidates.
- Some centres and candidates are missing the opportunity to utilise the artefact approach to allow skills to be demonstrated.

Learning Outcome 1
Identify the focus and scope of an Individual Project

- This was generally very well done. The vast majority of candidates presented clear aims and objectives that were linked to their topic. Most numbered their aims, enabling them to refer back to each aim in turn in their conclusions. Objectives were often presented under each aim and generally were successfully linked to each specific aim.
- Less successful candidates did not explicitly link aims and objectives and so the logical structure of their Project was less clear. A very small number of weaker candidates presented indistinguishable aims and objectives or repeated/reworded the aims in the objectives. Action verbs were used across the cohort, although some candidates did not appear to have fully considered which action verb was best suited to the aim/objective.
- There were very few instances of candidates including elements of the rationale or evaluation of sources in the sections for aims and objectives. This is an improvement of what was noted in the report for Summer 2017.
- Logical, appropriate and realistic aims and objectives set up the strongest and most effective Projects. It is worth noting that the more complex aims and objectives do not always lead to the most successful outcomes for the candidates. Centres appear to have taken note of advice to give sufficient feedback and guidance to candidates on the importance of the aims and objectives.
- Introductions did occasionally refer to issues better placed in the rationale. Most clearly referenced links to interests and careers and candidates had clearly been allowed to follow their interest; as evidenced by their introductions and the variety of topics submitted. Overall, this criterion was generally successfully fulfilled.
- A very small number of candidates did not frame their title as a question or hypothesis, thereby missing the opportunity to have a clear and explicit focus to their Project.

4

Learning Outcome 2
Select and plan research methods, resources and materials

- The majority of candidates presented their rationale in a distinct section and were clear on their methodology, offering some justification for their choices. Evaluation of credibility of sources was evident in many of the rationales, which is appropriate. As noted in the Summer 2017 report, reference to primary and secondary methods chosen should be present. It was a common trend for candidates to focus more on secondary or primary. Very few managed to offer an appropriate balance of coverage of both types of methodology. To achieve a mark in the top band, it is expected that candidates will justify and explain the sampling technique chosen for their primary research; this could include the variables selected for investigation and correlations they may expect to find. Centres are advised to guide candidates to adequately cover both types of methodology.
- Presenting an artefact based Project provides an ideal platform for justifying choices of materials/techniques to be used. The small number of artefacts submitted tended to be at either end of the spectrum in meeting this criterion; very strong or considerably weaker.

Learning Outcome 3
Select, collate, reference and assess the credibility of information and numerical data

- The complexity of sources and appropriateness of selection for this cohort was generally very good. There were only a very small number of overlong and generalised bibliographies. Candidates chose a variety of referencing techniques, increasingly a recognised referencing method. Centres should continue to encourage such an approach. There were very few examples where candidates relied solely on a bibliography – progress has clearly been made in this area. There remains some reliance of newspapers as sources, however, when used their credibility was frequently discussed as part of the process. Wikipedia has all but disappeared.
- Whilst questionnaires were frequently an appropriate primary method of data collection, the sample selection was not. A suitable sample, including relevant variables to be analysed would result in much more robust and useful data for candidates to analyse, rather than a sample of their peers. Simplistic and irrelevant data can impact on attainment for LO3, LO4 and LO6. Centres should be clear in their guidance to candidates that a sample size of 50 or more is accepted as statistically significant.
- The assessment of credibility of sources was generally successfully done. The strongest candidates did so in the body of the Project, as an element of their analysis and discussion of viewpoints. Others provided some evaluation I their rationale. A small number used an annotated bibliography. Whilst this approach is acceptable, it would be expected for the top candidates to access band 3 that they would incorporate evaluation within their analysis, with reference to key terms including currency, validity, bias, comprehensive etc.

Learning Outcome 4
Analyse the numerical data and display using digital techniques

- There was a trend for this criterion to be the most generously rewarded by assessors. It was consistently the weakest outcome for candidates and remains an area for development in the vast majority of centres.
- At Advanced level it is expected graphs will be clearly labelled and units indicated. Primary data rarely provided sufficiently complex data for high level analysis. It is recommended that centres guide candidates towards using complex secondary data for manipulation and analysis. The most successful candidates created their own graphs from available secondary data to analyse the most relevant information for their Project.

5

- Centres also need to be aware that stand alone calculations do not merit top band marks. The criterion demands "effective interpretation of numerical data"; irrelevant mathematical calculations to not provide this.
- Artefacts provide an ideal prospect to demonstrate relevant numeracy skills but the small number of artefacts submitted missed this opportunity.
- Centres are strongly advised to refer to the Skills Challenge Certificate Delivery Handbook and exemplar material available on the WJEC website.

Learning Outcome 5
Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints

- This outcome remains the most consistently assessed and was fairly rewarded. Centres are secure in their understanding of the requirements of this learning outcome and the standards expected at Advanced level. Although a small cohort, there were notably fewer descriptive style Projects. Information was generally successfully synthesised and analysed. This appears to stem from the genuine interest and enthusiasm candidates had for their chosen topic.
- One aspect of the criterion centres should focus on developing is the inclusion of a variety of viewpoints, as referred to in all bands for LO5. This was overlooked to a certain extent even by some strong candidates and so impacted on their attainment. The availability and credibility of a variety of viewpoints should be considered when selecting an appropriate topic and focus for the Project.

Learning Outcome 6
Produce and present an outcome

- The most popular format for presenting Individual Projects remains the written format. LO6 was generally securely assessed throughout the cohort. There remain a few issues of overly long Projects, which will impact of attainment as candidates have not successfully and effectively used complex skills in adhering to the word count and communicating meaning. Centres are advised to strongly reinforce the recommended word count to candidates – a maximum of 5,000 words is given in the guidance. Some very good candidates went significantly over this limit and so limiting their ability to achieve top band marks.
- As with all learning outcomes, it is important all strands of the criterion are addressed and that assessor comments appropriately to indicate where and why achievement has been rewarded.

Learning Outcome 7
Make judgements and draw conclusions

- The majority of candidates now present their conclusions aim by aim and also offer an overall conclusion answering the initial question directly. Increasingly, the conclusions are evidence based. Overall, this is an improving element of the Project and centres are to be commended on the guidance given to candidates. The strongest candidates also drew summative conclusions throughout the body of their work.
- The quality of the initial aims and objectives is reflected in the conclusions; vague or overly ambitious aims restrict the opportunity to reach evidence based, robust conclusions.
- Most candidates offered an abstract – not all successfully. It is worth noting this sits outside of the word count. It should be presented before the introduction as a short summary of the work and the results found. A minority of candidates confused the abstract and introduction and more guidance is needed in this area.
- Where an artefact is presented, the conclusions are based on the the fitness for purpose of the artefact. This emphasises the need for carefully constructed aims or conclusions become disassociated from the process.

Learning Outcome 8
Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project

- The responses to this learning outcome were varied. Many centres had given clear guidance to candidates that the focus must be on their performance. However, not all candidates referred to the required skills during their self-evaluation. A number used the sub headings of planning, implementation and completion in their self-evaluation. These do not encourage appropriate focus on the skills used in the Skills Challenge Certificate and how they were demonstrated/developed during the project management of the Individual Project.
- The skills that need to be reviewed include, creatively, critical thinking, problem solving. Using the legacy sub-heading does not support attainment for this criterion.
- There were a few outstanding examples of self-evaluation that give detailed justification of the comments. A decreasing, but persistent, number of candidates fell into evaluation of sources.
- The self-evaluation is outside the word count, should be placed in the appendix and so enables candidates to go into as much detail as is required.

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The fourth cohort of entries for the Advanced Enterprise and Employability Challenge has exhibited candidate responses that demonstrate high levels of proficiency against each of the Learning Outcomes. In this series, there were many examples of effective use of digital techniques including social media. Candidates were able to create blogs, web pages and design innovative apps along with making effective use of online surveys.

- There were some excellent examples of candidate work including innovation ventures that were highly comprehensive and demonstrated the ability to generate and analyse original ideas. Many candidates were able appropriately interpret skills audits and provide genuine insight into their own personal effectiveness and how this could be related to their two selected career pathways. Many candidates were also able to draw this information together and present it effectively, thereby showcasing their skills of digital literacy.

- Nevertheless, there were a number of innovation ventures that encompassed ideas in response to a brief, which were highly simplistic, unoriginal and not commensurate with Advanced level standards. In particular, ideas relating to selling cupcakes, smoothies and stationery, for example, are more suited to National and Foundation level, unless there is something innovative regarding the product/service itself, promotion, placement or manufacture of the product/service. Furthermore, the Advanced Enterprise and Employability Challenge requires the generation of an innovation proposal. This is not the same as setting up a business. Indeed, using a business plan template should be discouraged. The innovation venture should allow candidates the opportunity to generate original and creative ideas and the process undertaken in order to select the most appropriate idea. Often this is overlooked by candidates; especially those who have been encouraged to utilise a business plan template.

- The Challenge encompasses 4 tasks; but these must be addressed in conjunction with guidance from the Delivery Handbook as well as ensuring each candidate has a copy of the assessment matrix – (page 22 of the Advanced Welsh Baccalaureate Specification) to ensure that there is appropriate and effective coverage of each component which feeds into each respective Learning Outcome. The use of Secure Assess was seen as positive feature in this series. Nearly all Centres uploaded the required evidence in an organised fashion.

- Each Learning Outcome will now be considered.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

- Page 22 of the Advanced Skills Challenge Certificate Delivery Handbook details what this skill entails. Creativity and innovation can be demonstrated in each of the tasks within the brief. For Task 1, creativity and innovation could be demonstrated in how the pen portrait is developed and presented. There was often evidence of undertaking skills audits in candidate work, but this is not required. Candidates do not need to include their audits in the evidence presented. It is the skill of bringing together the evidence from the audits into an A4 one sided document concerned with 'self-promotion' - (i.e., a pen portrait) that is required. Therefore, candidates could be encouraged to use more digital literacy techniques in making their pen portraits stand out. Candidates are also encouraged to consider what information they include in their pen portraits that will be most likely to support self-promotion. In some cases, content was either irrelevant or counter to the notion of self-promotion. They could also demonstrate their use of social media by sharing their pen portrait electronically. Nevertheless, in some examples, candidates produced high quality pen portraits.

8

- Task 2 provides candidates with the opportunity to showcase their creativity and innovation skills in generating, analysing and evaluating ideas and coming up with appropriate and effective responses. In some cases, evidence did not demonstrate how candidates had analysed various ideas and selected one to proceed with. Some candidates had simply stated one idea and their innovation proposal was based on how this idea was to be operationalised. This should be an area for centres to focus on. Centres should discourage candidates from using business plan templates. This Challenge is not about setting up business; rather it is about coming up with an innovative response to a brief.
- There are many ways ideas generation and selection can be undertaken with examples such as blue sky thinking, spider diagrams, decision matrices and SWOT analyses which were seen in this series; however candidates should be encouraged to select their own methods. In addition, candidates should also be encouraged to display the findings of their innovation venture creatively, which could also support digital literacy in using electronic methods to present findings. Some candidate responses did this extremely effectively and were able to score highly for their digital literacy skills. Some innovation ventures were highly effective and could have been created and developed by professional bodies which was highly encouraging.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understanding Personal Effectiveness

- Generally, candidates were able to perform well against this Learning Outcome.
- Personal effectiveness involves auditing and development consideration, management of own role and responsibilities and evaluating personal effectiveness which can be demonstrated throughout the Challenge. In Task 2, attention needs to be given in ensuring that candidates are able to explicitly demonstrate that they have been successful in their time management, utilising appropriate behaviour, skills and working relationships. This should not be regarded as an implicit assumption if candidates respond to the brief. Sources of evidence seen in this series included action plans and photographs, but a variety of methods can be utilised. In some responses, candidates included a self-reflection in the form of a log in terms of how well they managed their time or worked with their peers, which was a valuable method in evidencing personal effectiveness.
- In Task 3, candidates are required to plan out a journey which will get them to their required destination. This is termed a 'Destination Passport'. Therefore, candidates should identify 2 options and the CV, letter of application, UCAS personal statement, job adverts etc. are intended to be relevant to those selected options. Candidates are expected to describe the skills, qualifications and attributes of their selected destinations and consider their current skills set, identify gaps and consider how they may address them. These skills should be in relation to the skills required in their chosen destinations, and not simply analysis against a generic set of skills. This point was lacking in some of the evidence presented. The Destination Passport should be a focused activity and not a number of files that contain CVs, job adverts, applications and generic skills analyses; instead, these documents should be entirely relevant to the 2 options described at the start of this task.
- Task 4 involves undertaking a Personal Refection Presentation in terms of the skills utilised throughout the Challenge. It requires candidates to reflect on the skills, qualities and attributes they demonstrated through the Challenge, giving clear examples. In some cases, candidates reflected on skills they had used in their place of employment or elsewhere. Or, they reflected on the outcomes generated in response to the tasks, as opposed to the skills developed in responding to the Challenge. However, the focus is specifically intended to be a reflection based on undertaking the Challenge. This reflection will also provide a naturally occurring opportunity to demonstrate digital literacy skills. In some cases, evidence was lacking in response to Task 4. Candidates should also include any supporting evidence that they have used in carrying out this task.

Learning Outcome 3 – Be able to apply Numeracy

- Page 22 of the Advanced Skills Challenge Certificate Delivery Handbook gives examples of the types of topics candidates can engage with in order to demonstrate numeracy at advanced level. Scenarios can be found in Welsh Baccalaureate materials at www.wjecservices.co.uk . Achieving higher band scores will be achieved by the complexity of the cost analysis undertaken. In addition, LO3 Numeracy achievement of Band 2 and Band 3 on the Enterprise and Employability assessment matrix: (Page 22 of the Welsh Baccalaureate Advanced Specification) depends on solving a variety of problems. For example, commercialisation of an innovative product (Task 2) and a personal cost-analysis (Task 3).
- Most candidates demonstrated some skills of numeracy as part of Task 2 and Task 3. However, complexity was often lacking in relation to both tasks. Some candidates had accessed an online cost calculator in relation to university costs and mortgage calculations. This did not allow candidates to demonstrate their skills of numeracy as the online calculator did this for them. In addition, some candidates had listed the price of food items at various supermarkets. Again, this does not demonstrate skills of numeracy. It is also very simplistic for advanced level standards and should be avoided unless another layer of sophistication is added. In addition, the assessment matrix requires candidates to analyse and interpret numerical results. In many responses in this series, an analysis and interpretation of the results following the application of numerical techniques and methods was missing. In some cases candidates had undertaken some fairly sophisticated calculations involving formulae, percentages, averages and standard deviation but why they had selected these techniques and how it contributed to their personal finance considerations was absent. This should be a focus for Centres before future moderation opportunities. Furthermore, some candidates had completed workbooks as evidence of their ability to apply numeracy. This must be avoided as candidates themselves should select appropriate numerical techniques to apply.
- Nevertheless, there were some responses that used a variety of techniques to suit their purpose. The use of excel is strongly recommended as this will allow candidates to demonstrate their ability to construct formulas in carrying out calculations and also supports skills of digital literacy.

Learning Outcome 4 – Be able to apply Digital Literacy

- In this series, many candidates were able to perform well against this Learning Outcome.
- Digital literacy can be considered as having three elements. Firstly, the organisation, storage, management, sharing and protection of electronic information. Secondly, the ability to use digital techniques to present information, including numerical data, tables, graphs and diagrams along with the manipulation and creation of data and information. Thirdly the application of tools that create, share or exchange information or support collaboration and learning. The use of social media should be evident within the Challenge.
- In order to achieve higher grade bandings, candidates should be aiming to produce well-structured responses to each task which also demonstrate appropriate presentation techniques including effective use of tables, graphs and diagrams. Some candidate responses lacked features such as, but not restricted to, headings, side headings, page numbers, inconsistent use of fonts and diagrams/graphs that lacked keys.
- In some cases, candidates are still uploading multiple files for each task. This should be avoided for future submissions.

Learning Outcome 5 – Be able to participate in an Enterprise and Employability Challenge

- It was pleasing to see that most candidates clearly engaged in this Challenge and produced effective outcomes. Some candidate work was exemplary; particularly with regard to Task 2, where some of the evidence presented was akin to that of a professional standard.

Global Citizenship Challenge

It is pleasing to see a continued pattern of consistently appropriate and high quality responses to the Advanced Global Citizenship Challenge.

- Centres must ensure that all Challenge Briefs are either those supplied by the WJEC or have been approved by the Regional Support Officer. This will avoid the potential problem of candidates choosing to focus on unsuitable topics which are either not appropriate or limit the scope of the Challenge.

- Centres must be aware of the ability level of the learner and the complexity of the global issue. Where candidates selected a topic which was particularly complex, they sometimes struggled to fully access the Learning Outcomes. Similarly, an issue which was fairly simplistic disadvantaged the more able candidates who could not present complex concepts and perspectives. Centres should be encouraged to differentiate topics to ensure enthusiasm and access for all levels of candidates, whilst being mindful of appropriate boundaries.

- Centres were more secure in their use of the assessment grids and Learning Outcomes were correctly assessed holistically across all three tasks.

Strengths

- Overall, centres have prepared candidates thoroughly and appropriately and the wide range of challenge briefs demonstrated a broad view of global issues.

- Candidates' enthusiasm for engaging in the world around them was evident and it was clear that candidates had been encouraged to consider complex and important issues from a wide range of perspectives.

- It was pleasing to see a greater understanding from candidates that they were developing skills as well as knowledge of the global issue and this was reflected in their Personal Review.

Areas for Development

- Centres should refer closely to the Delivery Handbook and published exemplars to ensure that candidates clearly understand the approach they should take in completing the assessment. The Personal Standpoint requires learners to identify and select information from suitable secondary sources, critically evaluating their credibility. There should be a *presentation of the learner's own opinion* on the global issue, having considered other viewpoints. The candidate's contribution to the Global Choices Conference should focus on a *proposed solution to the problem*. Preparatory work should look at a number of proposed solutions *in detail* before selecting the option (with justification for the choice). Where centres were not clear about the purpose and format of the three tasks, attainment was limited by muddled reasoning, lack of coverage of a relevant Learning Outcome and duplication of ideas.

- Whilst many had developed the academic skill of critically evaluating sources, there is still work to be done in this area, which will be complimented by their work on the Individual Project.
- Although many candidates promoted innovative and effective solutions to important global concerns, there is clearly scope for more creativity and original thinking in this area.

- Candidates should be reminded that not all issues will cover all of the PESTLE factors; there were some rather 'strained' attempts to cover all the factors and the limit of the word count meant that they then missed opportunities for more fruitful discussion. Furthermore, centres are reminded of the word limit; significantly exceeding the 1000 word limit (not including quotations) penalised candidates in LO1 and LO3. Centres should also ensure that Candidates include a word count and a bibliography but it is not necessary to include sources.

- Centres must ensure that it is clear which approach the candidate has taken (eg speech, conference paper with Q&A etc). Where the latter approach has been used, further evidence of the questions posed and the responses must be included. This could be assessor observation notes or a video recording; the 500 word paper is not sufficient. In some instances, it was not clear what type of contribution was being made and/ or responses were too brief or underdeveloped to access the upper bands. Whilst the majority of centres adopted the correct approach to Task 1, there is still a level of uncertainty about Task 2 as some candidates reproduced their Personal Standpoint as a Power point or evaluated solutions within the conference contribution.

- In some centres, the Personal Reflection task appeared rushed and lowered the overall quality of the candidates' work. In other instances, Candidates reflected on skills developed in other challenges such as Enterprise & Employability. Centres should be reminded that LO3 is assessed across all three tasks and lapses in accuracy here will limit attainment.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

- Candidates were able to select complex and relevant secondary sources and write their Personal Standpoint with confidence, incorporating a range of PESTLE factors.

- To further develop critical thinking, the teaching and learning programme must develop leaners' skills in evaluating the credibility of sources. Sources should also be correctly referenced as this is academic best practice as well as evidencing the candidate's skill at selecting appropriate sources. It should not be a separate section or annotated bibliography and must be included in the word count.

- The assessment of problem solving skills was mainly focused on the evaluation of the chosen solutions. Supporting evidence to demonstrate this decision making should include detailed justification of choices to ensure that this element can be rewarded.

Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

- Where candidates were clear about the distinction between Task 1 and Task 2, there was clear evidence of creativity and innovation. The most successful approach was seen when learners generated a range of innovative solutions which were supported by sufficient detail. This detail often demonstrated that they had really thought through the proposed solution and led to a more detailed and critical evaluation of its strengths and weaknesses.

- When candidates proposed solutions in Task 1 and considered different viewpoints in Task 2, they lacked the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to come up with solutions on their own and evaluate their potential success. This severely hampered their attainment.

- Overall, Candidates should be encouraged to develop their innovation and creativity skills further. As Centres have become more familiar with the challenge, it has been possible to see a 'tapering off' in terms of solutions, inventiveness and resourcefulness.

Learning Outcome 3 – Be able to apply Literacy

- Overall, Candidates produced high quality work and were able to communicate fluently and accurately. Personal Standpoints demonstrated excellent analysis and synthesis and went on to present compulsive evidence to agree with the opinion expressed.

- Where candidates had simply reworded their Personal Standpoint or produced a stilted summary of possible solutions, it was more difficult to reward for this Learning Outcome. It is not possible to reward this LO in Task 2 where the contribution was simple power points with images but no speaking notes.

- Centres are reminded not to over-reward lengthy responses, regardless of accuracy. The complexity of the sources used for Task 1 was often a deciding factor in distinguishing between Bands 2 and 3.

- Centres must be aware that literacy is assessed across all three tasks and candidates must therefore take care over the accuracy and clarity of their work throughout the Challenge.

- Again, in their Personal Review, candidates did not reflect in detail on their development of this skill and this is to be considered for future cohorts.

Learning Outcome 4 – Understand issues involved in a Global Citizenship Challenge

- It was quite clear that candidates had understood the Challenge and genuinely engaged with the issue, demonstrating a desire to do something about it.

- Approaching the tasks in accordance with the requirements of the Specification and Delivery Handbook, was fundamental in ensuring Candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding and reach their potential mark.

Community Challenge

The fourth cohort of entries for the Advanced Community Challenge has been pleasing and candidates are demonstrating some high levels of Personal Effectiveness.

- In this series, there was a greater variety of Challenge Briefs and it was evident that candidates had gained valuable experiences helping them understand what it means to be an effective and responsible member of a community.

- Candidates achieved the higher bands when choosing a community activity relevant to their studies and future career choices, as they could clearly identify the purpose and benefit of the activity within the community, which resulted in stronger planning and implementation.

- A significant number of centres who allowed candidates autonomy to select activities of interest to them, enabling pupils to develop their own personal skills and transferring them to others in the community. However in some centres it was evident that the activities had already been planned by the centre or organisation, therefore not allowing the candidates to access the higher bands.

- Good practice was seen in centres where learners engaged with younger pupils becoming Young Leaders in a variety of sports and curriculum areas such as Literacy, Numeracy and Digital Literacy. However, centres are to be reminded that **assisting** teachers in their preferred subject areas restricted the learners and did not provide enough opportunity to demonstrate planning and organisation and personal effectiveness skills, which limited the learners' experiences and overall success.

- Many centres sent the candidates' work electronically to the moderator. If sending work electronically centres must ensure that the work is labelled clearly with the Centre name and number within the USB/CD not just written on a post-it as this can get lost. Each candidate should have an Individual file labelled with the Candidate's name and number.

- Some centres are to be commended on their assessor annotation to justify the marks awarded but it was observed that this was not practised by all.

Areas for development

- Candidate should be provided with suitable Challenge Briefs that are of interest to them and in particular allow them to make their own decisions in what activities they will do, thus allowing the candidates to plan and organise purposeful activities and produce detailed and effective outcomes.

- For future series, centres must ensure that all Challenge Briefs are either those approved by WJEC available on the website or have been agreed by the Regional Support Officer. Centres must also ensure that the Challenge Briefs are suitable for Advanced learners and enable pupils to make the progression from Key Stage 4.

- Candidates should not have access to the exemplar materials placed on the WJEC secure website. These exemplars should be used for internal moderation purposes only. Centres are to be reminded that the Community Activity Proposal is a controlled assessment task between 4-6 hours. The controlled assessment must be carried out following procedures in the Centre Code of Practice and the Administrative Handbook. Once a task from the Challenge has begun, no lessons or guidance can be provided other than that stipulated in the Challenge Brief controls.

- If candidates choose to partake in the Supporting a Charity Brief, a programme of activities must be planned and organised by the individual/team and evidence of the 30 hours submitted.

- As noted in the Advanced Skills Challenge Delivery Handbook page 12 'The Confirmation Statement must provide testimony and validation of the learner's 30 hours of active and purposeful participation in completing the community activity'.

- Unfortunately not all candidates produced evidence for all three tasks: a Community Activity Proposal, a Confirmation Statement and a Personal Reflection Presentation. This resulted in a restriction of marks awarded. Centres should ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to complete all three tasks.

- Copies of skills audits are not required it is how the candidates analyse the results that is needed to consider how the skills will be used, improved and developed during the community activity.

- The analysed skills audits included must be appropriate, candidates need to conduct an assessment of their skills and areas needed for development identified in these audits to clearly set their own personal targets and priorities.

- Supporting evidence needs to be more comprehensive to enable candidates to hit the higher assessment grade bands. All evidence should be clearly labelled and annotated where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to gather as much supporting evidence as possible to support their community activity participation record.

- Confirmation statements should be well annotated and informative.

- Personal reflections need to be at least ten minutes long and candidates should submit evidence to support this. The inclusion of in-depth speaker notes or recordings would help moderators see this input more clearly

17

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Planning and Organising

- Generally there was clear structure to the Proposals, with research into the community groups and potential impacts on the community being particularly strong.

- Candidates' work provided a realistic level of detail and the ability to provide justifications for decisions based on their chosen proposals. Candidates should be encouraged to research thoroughly into similar activities in order to strengthen their justification to carry out the chosen activity.

- In some cases, learners in a cohort used the same sub-headings in their work, which they followed rigidly. Centres are to be reminded that Task 1 is to be completed under controlled assessment and therefore candidates' work should not follow the same format. The candidates should be encouraged to write less prescriptively, which is appropriate at this level.

- Candidates' aims and objectives were generally relevant and appropriate. But in some cases aims and objectives were not always clear or realistic. A clear understanding of aims and objectives should be a focus in the teaching and learning programme. If a candidate can be accurate and realistic with their aims and objectives this will then provide a clear structure and guide for the remainder of the planning and organisation of the Community Activity Proposal.

- The planning of the activities still lack details in some cases and is an area to be developed. Candidates should be encouraged to use Gantt charts and other digital programs such as a project management tool. It is essential for the next series that candidates have the opportunity to discuss in detail their planning of the activities especially when working as a group. Candidates should be encouraged to set personal SMART targets when planning the activity.

- The Personal Reflections have improved this series but in some cases candidates did not always reflect on the planning and organisation skill and how it had been applied during the activity. This was more evident when the activity chosen was inappropriate for a level 3 learner.

- It was evident that candidates still require support with reflection, as many tended to describe as opposed to providing evaluative comments. This should be a feature of the teaching and learning programme prior to the controlled assessment, with candidates being taught to refer specifically to the planning and organisation process to address this Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

- Most of the candidates demonstrated a realistic ability to use skills audits and analyse the results. Where this was done particularly well, candidates made clear links between the proposal and an explanation of how their personal skills would make an impact upon the final Challenge.

- Centres are to be reminded that the skills audit should be analysed in Task 1 before deciding on an appropriate community activity. Generally, candidates' skills audits lacked the detail and analysis to access band 3. Where this was gone well candidates analysed more than one skills audit.

18

- Where candidates achieved the higher bands more than one skills audit was done and analysed effectively and SMART targets were set by candidates linked to the community activity.

- Copies of skills audits are not required it is how candidate analyse the results that is needed and consider how the identified skills can be used, improved and developed during the community activity.

- A number of centres encouraged the use of the WJEC exemplar skills audit which are relevant for KS4. It is imperative that the skills audits are appropriate for the level 3 learner enabling them to achieve band 3 is Personal Effectiveness.

- Not all candidates provided clear visual evidence of them being personally effective in carrying out the activities. It is essential that all candidates produce a variety of evidence of carrying out the activity to access the higher bands.

- Many successful candidates included annotated pictures, videos, pupil voice questionnaires, diaries as supporting evidence. When sending evidence it should include a sample of evidence collated and annotated effectively. Some confirmation statements were missing from candidates' work. Confirmation statements are required by all candidates and are essential for assessment. The confirmation statement should include comments on how the learner has performed; this may be done by a member of staff or someone in the community in which the learner has worked. The Confirmation Statement must also provide testimony and validation of the learner's 30 hours of active and purposeful participation in completing the community activity.

- Some candidates were able to provide basic reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of their own personal effectiveness but very often when working as a team did not reflect on team skills. This is clearly an area for development for future submissions.

- It is appreciated that candidates find the nature of reflection a difficult concept but in order to achieve the higher mark bands, candidates are required to produce a detailed reflection of the development and application of skills both personally and within the team. Where this was done well candidates annotated photographs and discussed good and bad sessions during their activities, whilst recommending areas for further improvement.

- In order for candidates to access higher mark bands they must provide clear evidence of their Personal Reflection Presentation. This can be in the form of speaker's notes or speech cards which support a Powerpoint.

- As stated previously in LO1, the Personal Reflections are still weak. Although most candidates referenced their personal effectiveness in their Reflection, this was generally basic with limiting descriptive accounts. Good practice was seen where candidates evidenced changes to the activity plan, whilst carrying out the activity. This is an area for further development in most centres.

- Some candidates were able to provide basic reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of their own personal effectiveness but very often when working as a team did not reflect on team skills. This is clearly an area for development for future submissions. It is appreciated that candidates find the nature of reflection a difficult concept but in order to achieve the higher mark bands, candidates are required to produce a detailed reflection of the development and application of skills both personally and within the team.

- Where this was done well candidates annotated photographs and discussed good and bad sessions during their activities, whilst recommending areas for further improvement. All this evidence should be included in the personal reflection presentation.

Learning Outcome 3 – Be able to participate in a Community Challenge

- Generally, proposals completed by all learners were credible. Unfortunately in some cases candidates are still being misguided by the centre, partaking in community activities that were inappropriate for the level of the learners.

- Centres are to be reminded that learners are to plan and organise activities, **assisting** in KS3 lessons is not appropriate. However Planning and Organising mentoring sessions in KS3 classes / lunch time and after school clubs, monitoring pupils development have been very successful in some centres.

- It was evident that most candidates had understood the Challenge and successfully participated in community activities. However the lack of evidence is still an issue in most cases. Candidates are encouraged to gather as much supporting evidence as possible to support their community activity, collating a sample of their evidence effectively.

- In many cases the Confirmation Statement was the only evidence provided and not all Community Confirmation Statements were fully completed with notes supporting the level of contribution to the Challenge. All centres should focus on improving this area to demonstrate the candidates' participation and the impact and outcomes of their work.

- Generally, the personal reflection presentations were weak and therefore candidates were unable to achieve the top grades in band 3. This is an area for all centres to improve. Where candidates had spent 30 hours over a longer period of time, the evidence collated was appropriate, allowing candidates to reflect and adapt activities throughout evaluating the success of the activity and their own performance. In many cases Powerpoint presentations were produced with limited detail or lacking evaluative approaches and content.

- Some good practice was seen by centres submitted videos of the presentations and supporting evidence by assessors this aiding the moderation process. Centres are reminded that the Reflection Presentation should be of at least 10 minutes and Task 3 should include a copy of the presentation with speakers' notes.