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

June 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

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Administration

Entries and Controlled Assessment

- Centres are expected to withdraw candidates who do not submit any work for a component.
- Centres are reminded there are set controls for certain tasks within the Challenges 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 and if work is submitted for assessment but is found to not be worthy of a mark should '0' be used.
- 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.

Submitting Work

- 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 moderation procedures, this mark should be entered and not that of the assessor and a corrected assessment sheet should be included not the one showing assessor marks.
- 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 each of 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.
- Centres must ensure that all the required evidence is uploaded. This includes the signed assessment sheet for each candidate, and Time Sheet and Candidate Declaration.
- As more components are now submitted using e-Submission, centres are reminded to check that they use the correct key codes for the correct component.
- If work is scanned please try to ensure it is the correct way up.

Individual Project

This fourth series of the Individual Project was a large cohort and contained an extremely broad range of topics. Very few artefacts are being submitted, this is a lost opportunity especially for the more creative candidates.

There were many examples of excellent work, and Welsh medium centres in particular produced some outstanding examples of Individual Projects. Many centres continue to move forward and have responded well to the advice and guidance given by moderators. There remain areas for further development but progress in most is positive.

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

- Generally, aims and objectives were a strength of the work seen. The majority of centres clearly guide candidates to number their aims, have an appropriate number and link the objectives directly to each aim in turn. A minority of candidates did not clearly distinguish their aims and objectives and some included aspects of the rationale into this section. Candidates need to realise that overly ambitious aims and objectives are problematic in actually producing a successful Individual Project. Aims need to be realistic and logical to produce a coherent Individual Project; for example, there were still some that sought to measure the effect of the media.
- Most titles were framed as a question which helps support a focused Individual Project enabling clear conclusions to be drawn.
- Topics were clearly linked in the majority of cases to career/future education paths and were very much individual choices. The variety was impressive, although some centres need to ensure candidates do tackle a subject area that allows enough scope and challenge for advanced level.

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

- The rationale should explain and justify choices of research methods. Some candidates were still unclear on this. Reference should be made to specific sources and their credibility, a number were too generic. A balanced coverage of both primary and secondary methods was achieved by most candidates.
- The most successful rationale's referred to specific sources and detailed methods to be used aim by aim. Evaluating the credibility of sources should be included in the justification of choices.
- There were several examples where candidates had written in the past tense with generic comments on "use of the internet". Questionnaires were occasionally used with no consideration of a suitable sample for the line of enquiry. Often other forms of primary research would have been more suitable.

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

- A good range of relevant, complex sources was utilised by the majority of candidates. It was reassuring to see the long lists of erroneous sources only in a minority of cases.
- Some centres used an annotated bibliography which is acceptable to ensure candidates to focus on the requirements of this criterion. However, the strongest candidates evaluated their sources as part of their discussion of the issues under investigation in the main body of the Project.
- Candidates need to be aware that they should be evaluating a number of sources for a variety of issues including, validity, reliability, comprehensiveness and currency. Commenting on the same aspect for each source will not score highly.
- Referencing should be present throughout the Project and a bibliography included. Those candidates who produced artefacts also need to include primary and secondary sources. Some utilised a questionnaire to gauge opinions, others used evaluation of materials.

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

- This learning outcome was invariably the weakest of all for most candidates and is an area for development for the majority of centres. There was too often an over reliance on primary data to demonstrate skills. Primary data only offers a limited opportunity to demonstrate high level skills and the manipulation and analysis of secondary data should be used to challenge more able candidates. This was a missed opportunity in many centres.
- Analysis of primary data could be made more challenging by including two or more variable in the graphs produced. Mathematical calculations that have no context for the research do not scorer highly such as the use of Spearman's Rank, whether suitable or not.
- Basic skills in labelling axes etc. was too often missing. Centres are reminded that one aspect of this learning outcome is the presentation. There was an improvement in the use of more complex graphs such as displaying trend lines on scatter diagrams and line graphs and comparing different data sets.
- The interpretation of the analysis must link back to the aims otherwise it is not demonstrating any relevance to the research.
- Those candidates who produced and artefact often missed the opportunity to detail their calculations in making the actual piece.

Learning Outcome 5
Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints

- Generally, this was a strength of the work seen with secure synthesis. The majority of candidates are able to combine a variety of information and viewpoints and also include their own opinions.
- A small number of weaker candidates did cut and paste secondary material and then comment on it; they did not score highly as this is not an appropriate approach for advanced level.
- For the artefact option this learning outcome is demonstrated in making judgements and decisions from the research gathered which inform the design of the artefact.

Learning Outcome 6
Produce and present an outcome

- Presentation generally was of a high standard and there were fewer examples of overly long Individual Projects that can result in candidates being penalised. The word limit is 3,000 - 5,000 for a written dissertation and any work significantly over this limit is not meeting the requirements.
- Centres are reminded that for the written option that literacy and digital literacy skills are being assessed in this learning outcome. For the artefact option the standard of the production of the final artefact is being assessed.

Learning Outcome 7
Make judgements and draw conclusions

- The most successful candidates presented their conclusions aim by aim and also offered an overall conclusions addressing their research question directly. Making judgements through the Project also ensures a high mark for this learning outcome.
- The strongest conclusions were evidence based rather than assertive in tone and based on the evidence presented. A small number of candidates introduced new evidence into their conclusions. Clear and logical aims and objectives support focused and logical conclusions.
- Those who designed an artefact offered judgements throughout and the conclusion included the fitness for purpose of the artefact. The best examples included a questionnaire to gain opinions on the fitness for purpose.
- The use of abstracts was variable, with many candidates producing appropriate abstracts at the beginning of the Project. Many, however, used the sub-heading of abstract but the content was a mix of LO1 and LO2.

Learning Outcome 8
Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project

- The focus on this section for a number of centres was inappropriate and based on the legacy specification – including the evaluation of sources. Such an approach disadvantaged candidates.
- The focus should now be on the performance of the candidate in producing the Individual Project, **not all Challenges**, and specifically on the seven skill areas including, Creativity and Innovation, Digital Literacy, numeracy etc.
- There were also plenty of examples of very detailed and reflective self-evaluations with clear justifications for comments.

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

This summer's 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 Innovation Venture responses that were creative and imaginative. Candidates were also able to display effective digital literacy skills in labelling their files appropriately and ensuring that there were a manageable number of files submitted, which is regarded as a significant improvement when compared to earlier series.

- 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 keyrings, 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. In addition, some candidates are still stating their idea without considering other ideas that they have come up with, and the process in selecting an idea to proceed with.
- 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.
- Additionally, it appears that templates are also being used for the Destination Plan including the personal financial consideration. Again, this must be discourages it stifles candidates' ability to demonstrate their own Digital Literacy and Numeracy skills.
- 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.

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.
- 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 many 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. Candidates should also be encouraged not to simply undertake large scale cut and pasting of adverts, for example. Also, as mentioned early, templates must be discouraged.

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, L03 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. Interpretation of their numerical calculations is an area which Centres should focus on. 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, the combining of these files demonstrates a higher level of this skill.

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 generally produced effective outcomes. However, there are a number of centres that need to re-evaluate the Challenge Briefs they are using and allow the candidates greater scope in carrying out Innovation Ventures that are appropriate to them.

Global Citizenship Challenge

This series demonstrated an even higher degree of consistency and quality in terms of responses to the Advanced Global Citizenship Challenge.

- 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.
- Anomalies in assessment and instances of centres having marks adjusted were more prevalent where there were multiple assessors or where the qualification had been delivered as part of a discrete course. In these instances, it is vital that standardisation takes place *before* assessment and that Internal Moderation identifies any discrepancies so as not to penalise candidates. This would also address the (rarer) instances where candidates had been given incorrect guidance on how to complete the tasks.
- 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 candidates 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.
- 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 PowerPoint 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 candidates 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.

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 PowerPoints 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 fifth cohort of entries for the Advanced Community Challenge has been pleasing. Progress continues to be made in the quality of the Community Activity Proposals submitted and the activities participated in by the candidates'. In the majority of candidates' work Personal Effectiveness (L02) and the participation in the Community Challenge (LO3) are a strength. However, as has been identified previously, the candidates' Planning and Organisational skills (L01) continue to be the weaker skill in this Challenge. Most candidates chose to approach the Challenge as an individual. When carried out as a team the outcome was not always as successful. Centres must address the size of the team in future series' as it is stated in the specification as 3 to 6 members. Although the activity itself is carried out as a team, centres are reminded that the majority of evidence will be completed individually.

- A variety of Challenge Briefs were seen 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.
- More Centres are allowing candidates' autonomy to select activities of interest to them or relevant to their studies and future career choices. The candidates could clearly identify the purpose and benefit of the activity within the community, which resulted in stronger planning and implementation. It also enabled candidates to develop their own personal skills and transferring them to others in the community. This enabled the candidates to access the higher bands.
- Good practice was seen in the Centres where candidates engaged with younger candidates becoming Young Leaders in a variety of sports and curriculum areas such as Literacy, Numeracy and Digital Literacy. This was done really well when candidates were given the opportunity to plan and organise specific activities for a target group of individuals.
- There was an improvement seen in candidates' personal reflections. Good practice was seen by Centres including presentation confirmation statements with effective annotation.
- Most candidates completed 30hrs of community participation and collected a variety of evidence. This enabled candidates to reflect on good and bad sessions as well as discuss the overall outcome of the community activity referring to their original aims and objectives effectively.
- 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. Work was annotated electronically by some centres others produced centre assessment sheets.
- It is evident that many Centres are not carrying out the controls required for Task 1 – Community Activity Proposal. This was evident in the length and detail of the tasks submitted by many candidates this series. 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 WJEC. Once a task from the Challenge has begun, no lessons or guidance can be provided other than that stipulated in the specified controls.
- There are still unsuitable Challenge Briefs being used which do not allow the candidates scope to gain higher mark bands.
- 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 level candidates and enable them to make progression from Key Stage 4.
  - Copies of skills audits are not required, it is the analysis of the results that is needed to consider how the skills will be used, improved and developed during the community activity.

Centres must also ensure that the skills audits used are suitable for a level 3 candidates and appropriate for the Challenge.

- The Supporting a Charity or Organisation Brief is being used by some candidates and in most cases not allowing the candidates to achieve the higher bands. Working in a charity shop as a volunteer is not acceptable. If candidates choose to partake in this Brief, a **programme of activities** must be planned and organised by the individual/team and evidence of the 30 hours submitted.
- Centres are to be reminded that **assisting** teachers in their preferred subject areas restricted the candidates and did not provide enough opportunity to demonstrate planning and organisation and personal effectiveness skills, which limited the candidates' experiences and overall success.
- Confirmation statements were missing from some candidates' work. 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'.
- Confirmation statements are still being sent to moderators with no comments. To aid the moderation process, confirmation statements should be well annotated and informative.
- Unfortunately some candidates did not produce 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 before submitting.
- The standard of the evidence produced by candidates has improved this series with many candidates collating a variety of evidence and annotating effectively. However this is still and area for improvement in some Centres. 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 a variety of evidence to support their community activity participation record and collate the evidence effectively. Large amounts of evidence is not required to be sent to the moderator.
- Personal reflection presentations have greatly improved. However Centres are to be reminded that they need to be at least ten minutes long and candidates should submit evidence to support this. All candidates should include in-depth speaker notes and a teacher confirmation would be helpful.

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, candidates 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 lacks detail in some cases and is an area to be developed. Candidates should be encouraged to use Gantt charts and other digital programs as a project management tool. It is essential 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 as well as team targets.
- 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 proved difficult when candidates had not been given the opportunity to plan and organise the activity themselves.
- 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 in carrying out the activity.
- 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 done well candidates analysed more than one skills audit. Where candidates achieved the higher bands more than one skills audit was completed and analysed effectively and SMART targets were set by candidates linked to the community activity.
- 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 students 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. The use of a diary or log can be helpful.
- 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 PPT.
- As stated previously in LO1, the Personal Reflections are still an area for development. 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.

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

- Generally, proposals completed by all candidates were credible, identifying benefit to the community. Unfortunately in some cases candidates are still being misguided by the centre, partaking in community activities that were inappropriate for the level of the candidates.
- 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 some cases .Candidates are encouraged to gather as much supporting evidence as possible to support their community activity, collating a sample of their evidence effectively. Evidence can also be used in the personal reflections to support their evaluation of LO1 and L02.
- In this series it was evident that some candidates had not completed the 30 hours required. Centres are also to be reminded that the 30 hours must be over a minimum of 4 weeks and logged on their time sheet. Work experience placement is not acceptable as the candidate will be told what to do and not allowed to plan and organise what they do.
- 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. Good practice was seen by some centres including presentation confirmation statements with assessor comments.

Advanced Welsh Baccalaureate Report Summer 2018/ht