



**KS4 National/Foundation 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

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

## 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.
- Centres should ensure that they follow robust internal standardisation and moderation procedures for each moderation series, to avoid adjustment of marks due to inconsistencies across internal assessors.

## Submitting Work to Moderator

- A minority of centres failed to adhere to deadlines, it is unacceptable and could compromise the moderation process.
- Centres are advised to check that the total marks on the front 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.
- The Challenge assessment sheets must be signed appropriately by the assessor, this 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 include the 10 hours for carrying out the Community activity. Teaching and learning hours should not be included.
- The Individual Project assessment sheet must be signed appropriately by both assessor and candidate, this may be done electronically.
- Centres must ensure that appropriate Challenge Briefs are issued to candidates.
- 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.

# Individual Project

There were a significant number of entries submitted for this series, with summer being the preferred series for the submission of the Individual Project component of the Skills Challenge Certificate.

This series was the first for work to be submitted using the e-submission method. It was appreciated that centres may have experienced some difficulty in adapting to a new way of working, which will hopefully be resolved for future submissions. Where moderators encountered difficulties in gaining full access to work, centres were responsive and supportive in assisting to resolve issues.

The majority of centres were secure in their choice of topics, centres appear far more knowledgeable on what constitutes an effective title. The most effective Projects emerged from centres who gave autonomy to candidates over topics which clearly motivated candidates throughout their completion. In contrast, there still remained a minority of centres who had not guided candidates to the same extent. Some titles were rather ambitious and difficult to address within the perimeters of the advised word count within the specification.

Projects centred on career choices were still apparent this series. Centres are reminded that consideration of 'future career pathways' is not an appropriate context of study for the Project. Regional Support Officers have been requested to support centres where this type of Project has been apparent.

Some centres encourage the completion of artefacts, which clearly allowed learners who were not confident in formal extended writing skills to access marks on the assessment grid. Examples of successful artefacts included: films; websites; recipes with accompanying 'dishes'.

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

Introductions were generally well written and allowed candidates to set the context and purpose of the Project. There was evidence of improvement in the standard of aim and objective writing - candidates generally utilised the correct actions verb to indicate how they would fulfil their Project. However, this was inconsistent amongst centres and still some candidates referred to research methods ("create a questionnaire"; "carry out secondary research"), or wrote an extensive list of tasks instead. This often meant that candidates were generously assessed and a mark discrepancy occurred here, between the centre and moderator.

The aims and objectives form an integral part of the Project, and the success of the overall Project is usually determined by successfully forming realistic aims and objectives. It is therefore advised that centres spend some time on the teaching and learning of this Learning Outcome. Centres are reminded to refer to the Delivery Handbook available from WJEC to support the writing of aims and objectives.

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

There was further improvement in the completion of rationales, which allowed candidates the opportunity to be able to explain how they intended to meet their objectives by referring to their chosen research methods. However, this was inconsistent across centres. Candidates had improved for this series in attempting to make more specific links to aims/objectives and the research that would be chosen to fulfil them, however the justification for those choices was still a little weak and an area for improvement.

Some centres employed the use of action plans, which candidates had clearly taken some time over. A reminder that whilst action plans may be useful to candidates in terms of their time-keeping, they rarely contribute any additional marks to the assessment of either Learning Outcome 1 or 2.

Some candidates used this Learning Outcome as an effective way to consider the credibility of sources, which further strengthened rationales.

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

Candidates were able to select a wide range of sources to include in their Projects, some of which were complex and comprehensive, allowing candidates to produce some sophisticated Projects. Referencing skills were not always effective, which made it difficult for moderators to ascertain where information had been obtained from. It would be appreciated if centres could remind candidates of the importance of citing their sources, to allow them to be duly awarded for including their sources. In addition, identifying sources assists to eradicate any potential queries over plagiarism issues.

Similarly, a Bibliography should be included, so that the moderator can identify the type and range of sources that have been utilised in the completion of the Project.

In relation to primary information, candidates typically opted to use questionnaires, which allowed candidates to collect numerical data. Centres must ensure that questionnaires are checked prior to being distributed to the public. Some questions were deemed intrusive in nature, relating to sensitive subjects, such as abortion and sexual abuse. This clearly has the potential to offend respondents and the ethical aspects of primary research should be considered by candidates. Candidates must also ensure that the questions they are posing are relevant to the title of their Project, as on occasions some questions were deemed irrelevant. Please ensure that a single copy of the questionnaire is included with the Project so that the moderator is able to consider the standard of the questions posed.

Some candidates made absolutely no reference to the credibility of sources throughout their Projects, which impacted on their ability to move out of the lower Bands – the rationale is an appropriate place to evidence this, as is the main body, conclusion and evaluation.

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

The majority of candidates relied on the data that was obtained through their questionnaires to fulfil this Learning Outcome, although analysis of the findings was generally basic. To achieve higher bands, candidates need to demonstrate a greater level of analysis of their findings.

Furthermore, candidates need to take more care in how they display their findings. The charts that were selected by candidates were not always fit for purpose and graphs were frequently missing titles and appropriate labelling.

Some candidates employed the use of infographics to provide them with secondary data. This was effective, as it allowed candidates a visual tool, which supported them to be able to discuss findings. Infographics also contributed to the overall aesthetics of the Project and also contributed to Learning Outcome 6.

A minority of centres included all of their data analysis in the appendix of their Projects. Presumably this was a strategy to exceed the permitted word-count. A reminder that data analysis forms an integral part of the Project and therefore must be included in the main body and effectively synthesised with research, otherwise candidates may potentially lose marks. Candidates are at risk of losing considerable marks if essential information is ‘bolted on’ in the appendix.

## **Learning Outcome 5 Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints**

Candidates were able to organise and synthesise their primary and secondary findings appropriately and to some extent provide some detailed analysis on those findings. As work was not always referenced effectively, it was sometimes difficult to identify the origin of the source. As noted above, there was a minority of candidates who included relevant sections within the appendix, that would have been better placed within the main body to further evidence the skill of ‘synthesis’ (the pulling together of research and information to produce a single coherent Project).

Candidates were able to demonstrate a good level of knowledge and understanding, even at the lower levels which was due to candidates being generally being able to select their own topics of interest.

Lower level candidates who were not as successful in synthesising their findings and ‘pull together’ their research, were generally still able to secure marks for this Learning Outcome by demonstrating knowledge and understanding of their topic.

Candidates who submitted artefacts attempted to show evidence of idea development, although this could have been more detailed to evidence how initial ideas develop into the final outcome (the journey).

## **Learning Outcome 6 Produce and present an outcome**

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a range of basic skills throughout the completion of their Individual Projects and presented a final outcome that mostly addressed the Project aims. Candidates used some relevant skills and techniques to be able to present their research in an appropriate format.

Less able candidates who submitted written Projects clearly found it difficult to meet the demands of the criteria in terms of communicating meaning and expressing viewpoints – centres could consider the completion of artefacts for lower level candidates, who might find that format more accessible to them.

For those candidates who submitted artefact outcomes, a development point for future submissions is to ensure that photographs are clear and that the final outcome is accompanied by a step-by-step production record, evidencing all stages, not just the final outcome.

## **Learning Outcome 7 Make judgements and draw conclusions**

There was an improvement for this series in relation to candidates' conclusions. The majority of candidates provided evidence-based comments in relation to their findings for each objective. More-able candidates were able to provide evaluative comments, rather than describing what was discovered throughout each aim/objective.

A minority of candidates mistakenly referred to the sources that they had used throughout the completion of the Project and how they had been of use to them as their conclusions. Candidates were often able to secure marks based for this learning outcome on the judgements that they made throughout the Project as a whole.

## **Learning Outcome 8 Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project**

There was a definite improvement in the candidates' reflections on their performance throughout the completion of the Project. A vast number of self-evaluations were able to achieve Band 4, as candidates effectively considered the seven skills that are developed through the Skills Challenge Certificate, considering them specifically within the context of the Project.

Occasionally, candidates described the sources that were used throughout the Project, rather than to evaluate the process of researching and applying the skill of critical thinking to select appropriate sources. Some candidates included abstracts in their Projects – this is not required at KS4 and is a feature of the Project at Advanced Level.

# Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The outcomes of the KS4 Enterprise and Employability Challenge continue to show an improvement in candidate performance with many candidates producing quality work because of a detailed and well-planned approach to the Enterprise and Employability Challenge.

Candidates show enthusiasm for the Challenge brief set and become fully involved in an enterprise which they have enjoyed. This approach has led them to become fully engrossed in the tasks where they have shown enthusiasm for the concept, giving them the opportunity to develop their creativity and interest to produce innovative ideas to a high standard.

Band four candidates have identified and addressed each criterion within each of the three Learning Outcomes and have ensured that the necessary evidence exists. The most successful Candidates show immense enthusiasm and commitment which has ensured that their evidence does address all the criteria within each Learning Outcome.

## Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

Candidates addressed this criterion well by generating initial ideas as a result of researching existing products as a starting point. This allowed them to consider a wide range of possible ideas and opportunities based on feasible solutions that broaden their outlook and encourage them to generate a wider range of possible solutions.

However, some candidates fail to generate a range of initial ideas where the strengths and weaknesses of each are considered. Successful candidates used their research to generate a wide range of ideas (not just one idea) within the group, fully analysing the strengths and weaknesses of each, to select a feasible one to take forward.

Overall this Learning Outcome is improving with most candidates. When candidates have used graphical images to convey their idea to the group there is generally a better understanding of the idea by the whole group. This method also leads to others suggesting alternatives which starts the development process to alternative ideas and design development.

The issue of idea development is still a difficulty for many candidates who do not achieve the best marks as there is little evidence of how they have developed their chosen idea by modifying it, introducing new aspects or by combining aspects of several ideas. The development requires candidates to consider how the chosen idea could be evolved, changed or improved in some way. Candidates need to be aware that in the end, as a result of analysis, they may consider the first idea was the best and then implement that. However, they should have considered a development of their chosen idea.

The use of customer surveys and prototypes has helped many candidates make informed decisions about their initial ideas. However, there needs to be clear evidence of how the selected idea was implemented.

Candidates need to put significant detail into their evaluation of the process involved in developing a new concept and reflect on its strengths and weaknesses to achieve the higher bands

## Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

This Learning Outcome has again continued to show significant improvement in this series. All candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms, but it is the analysis of the skills identified that is needed to achieve higher marks. While most candidates considered their personal skills, there are still candidates that have not considered team skills within their evidence.

Candidates need to undertake an audit or analysis of the skills they have identified and plan how stronger skills can be used, and how weaker skills will be improved upon during the Challenge. Many candidates did this successfully.

There was generally good recording of performance within the group through minutes of meetings, but it is important to recognise that all candidates need to identify their personal contribution. In lower mark bands, candidates did not always identify their individual contribution, what they did, when they worked as a team and how their skills were used to best effect.

Most candidates evidenced their time management and appropriate behaviour within a team situation but often, those in the lower mark bands, did not provide sufficient evidence.

Many candidates encourage others in a team and allow the team to work to their strengths. This is an excellent example of team working and evidence is needed to show that this has taken place.

Most candidates had clear and realistic reflection of the development and application of their skills, but a limited number of candidates tell a story of the enterprise initiative and do not actually reflect on the development and application of their personal skills and team work skills. Candidates need to reflect on their development of both personal skills and team skills.

Candidates need to be aware that identifying improvements is not a weakness but a strength and allows them to achieve higher marks.

## Learning Outcome 3 – Understand factors involved in an Enterprise and Employability Challenge

This Learning Outcome was well developed with candidates having a clear understanding of the Enterprise and Employability Challenge. It was evident from the work submitted that there continues to be significant enthusiasm for the Enterprise and Employability Challenge. Candidates became enthused by the Brief and became motivated to achieve higher marks. Candidates who had enthusiasm for the idea and product or service were more easily able to convince others when it came to the pitch. A well-structured and creatively developed visual display should draw on the idea development section produced earlier in the Challenge. When candidates had used images from the generation and development of ideas in LO1 to support the evidence in the Visual Display the Pitch was engaging and candidates were able to 'sell' their idea in the presentation.

When candidates had taken this approach, they were successful in achieving higher marks for the pitch.

There was often a detailed understanding of the factors involved in developing the business proposal which is an improvement in many centres. Most candidates understood the factors involved in developing their business proposal and had evidenced it well. Work was well structured with many achieving the higher band for a creatively developed Visual Display.

This often included the full range of display materials that had been generated in the development of the ideas section. Candidates should show their idea generation and development in the pitch as well as any point of sale material, advertising, costing and forecasts.

Challenging the accepted methods of producing a visual display will enable candidates to be more creative in this section.

Communication skills were recorded well and generally contained appropriate comments.

When candidates had produced graphics and/or prototypes as part of the idea development process they were more structured in their approach and better able to communicate their ideas with reason. Having an artefact as part of the pitch is often more engaging and demonstrates detail and effective understanding when the presentation is made.

# Global Citizenship Challenge

The Global Citizenship Challenge continues to be an important contributor to young people's understanding of the world they live in. Supporting young people in developing a conscience about what is right and wrong is a very positive outcome of this Challenge, and centres must be applauded for this. Whilst working with topics that can be sometimes eye opening for young people, helping them to develop ideals that make for a better world to live in and understanding the factors that influence decisions is again a worthwhile endeavour. Centres must share in the very worthy responsibility of developing our young people into adults who have a sense of morality and who are able to act with kindness.

Aside from the context of the Global Citizenship Challenge, the skills of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving alongside Creativity and Innovation become completely transferrable to other subjects. This makes the outcomes of the Challenge even more encouraging. In this series, the work presented for moderation show that centres who are following the guidance set out in their centre reports are making good progress and strengthening their understanding of the requirement of the Challenge.

It has been encouraging to see more centres using a range of Challenge Briefs that has enabled access at all levels. The most successful Challenge Briefs have been those posing a question for the candidates to answer. Centres must not be worried about using different Challenge Briefs within one entry. By choosing one topic for the Challenge but then by selecting an appropriate level question for the candidate will result in better outcomes. The Challenge Brief used must be approved by the WJEC. If in doubt, centres should check with the Regional Support Officer.

An important point to remember about the Challenge is Task 1 is allowed 5 hours. This is time for reading and annotating the sources, completing a class discussion and typing the Personal Standpoint. Excessively long standpoints show that centres are not following the rules of the controls and these will be raised as a concern. Some centres are not managing the time for the controlled assessment to ensure a balance between the Personal Standpoints and the Raising Awareness packs for Learning Outcome 2.

Centres are reminded that candidates are not allowed use of the Internet during Task 1 of the Challenge. Centres are also reminded that they must not use the same specific topic for the Challenge that they have used for skills development lessons prior to the Challenge. These issues were a cause for concern this series.

It is highly recommended that centres spend time with candidates discussing what is meant by the terms detailed, basic and limited. Access to the assessment grid is an essential part of the teaching and learning process for this Challenge. Also, it is imperative that centres have rigorous standardisation and internal moderation procedures so that assessors also have a clear and agreed understanding of the standards.

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

In this series there has been a step backwards for a small number of centres who did not submit the sources of information used in the evidence provided for moderation. This evidence is essential for moderators to be able to assess the candidate's Problem Solving skills, as well as being a vehicle to demonstrate and apply Critical Thinking skills. The annotation and selection of information shows the candidates ability to select key information, highlight the PESTLE factors and consider the credibility of the sources. This is an important part of the assessment decision. If centres do not present these sources, and adequate evidence cannot be found in the Personal Standpoint, marks will be adjusted for LO1.

The lack of sources from a small number of centres was overshadowed by the significant number of centres who have included differentiated sources of information for their range of candidates. There has been a definite improvement in how the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving evidence is being presented by candidates. The most successful centres are moving away from template driven evidence for those candidates working at a higher level. Many are now simply summarising and highlighting the sources for key elements. This includes key facts and figures, PESTLE and credibility. It is encouraging to see that candidates are using useful decision making tools such as RURU, What-Where-Why-When-How and NOP, notes, spider grams and flowcharts. The most successful centres also included evidence of a class discussion, this is very important for showing the views of others. Good quality problem solving encourages critical thinking, but it does not have to be complex in order to prepare candidates to write a competent Personal Standpoint.

Again, in this series, the Personal Standpoints were a pleasure to read with candidates very often having thoughtful opinions. There is definitely an improvement across the whole entry in the quality of the Personal Standpoints and this is most encouraging. There continues to be a marked distinction of those candidates who had been able to blend the information collected from the sources with their understanding of PESTLE factors, credibility of the sources, alongside their own opinions and opinions of others. It is worth noting here that the ability to blend and synthesise the opinions and arguments alongside PESTLE factors and credibility of sources was clearly linked to the candidates accessing the sources of information. Therefore, it cannot be emphasised enough how important the sources of information are.

Reflections have been much better in this series and this is very encouraging. The reflections do not need to be too long (1 hour is allocated to this part of the controlled assessment). Whilst some candidates are still discussing what they have written in their Personal Standpoints, more candidates are now able to write about their skills of Critical Thinking and Problems Solving, evaluating how they think they have developed during the first part of the Challenge.

## Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

This part of the Challenge showcases candidate's ability to think creatively and indeed in this series there have been some exciting examples of Raising Awareness packs - from films, videos and songs, to jewellery and gift boxes,. This has been a very encouraging element for this series.

The best outcomes always come after a clear process of development. The most successful centres are now clear about the stages of development. These could include development in the form of research from the Internet for several initial ideas, a SWOT analysis of the ideas, spider grams, action plans, mood boards, 1<sup>st</sup> draft ideas, feedback from peers on draft ideas, 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of idea, further SWOT, final product, feedback from audience, photos of stages and photos of final outcomes. Students could use highlighters to show where text/images/data had changed from the previous draft. Many successful candidates included a peer assessment of their final product. This was useful information for their reflection for Learning Outcome 2.

Centres must be clear that in order to achieve higher marks, a SWOT and an outcome is not enough evidence for Learning Outcome 2. There must be several stages to the development. It is felt that there has been considerable focus on this aspect of the Challenge through CPD, regional working parties and support from the Regional Support Officers. The marks for Learning Outcome 2 are based on the strength and weaknesses of ideas, the development of a chosen idea and then evidence that it has been implemented. The quality of the Raising Awareness pack is judged in Learning Outcome 3. If the development is missing then an important part of the marks is missing and therefore in the next series, centres should expect their marks to be adjusted if there is no element of development. Additionally, it is important for centres to recognise the difference between the evaluation of ideas in comparison to the development of ideas.

Feasibility is important. Big ideas such as TV adverts can be exciting to think about, but are not feasible. Quite often the grand designs were linked to candidates working at a lower level and so extra support and guidance is suggested. Also, the question of 'what is implementation' often arises. If a candidate designs a fact filled assembly presentation for Year 7 which has never taken place, the question is has this idea been implemented. In theory it has not and so centres should be guiding candidates to be clear about the purpose of the Raising Awareness pack. In this example, it would be better stating that the evidence was an information pack for sharing with Year 7, but an even better outcome would be that candidates do in fact get the chance to meet with their younger peers and share this information. In centres where this happened, the outcomes were quite rewarding and the photographs that accompanied these submissions showed that the candidates had developed a sense of purpose and responsibility in sharing their findings of a global issue.

Being able to see what the candidate has made for their Raising Awareness pack is essential for the moderator. Centres must ensure photographs are clear, printed materials should be in colour to show the outcome to its best effect. Where possible and sensible, the original items should be included for moderation.

There was a sense in this series that the Raising Awareness packs made using ICT which were either a leaflet, PowerPoint or a poster have not been of a particularly high quality as candidates are finding it hard during the implementation not to stick to their own words and ideas. Copying logos and images and large pieces of writing does not show creativity. The best outcomes in this series were handmade or where candidates had used more sophisticated ICT delivery methods such as films, Powtoons, Sway and electronic games. Centres must make sure the moderator can access the work if it is electronic.

In this series the reflections for Learning Outcome 2 have overall been better with centres recognising the need in guiding candidates to review their skills of Creativity and Innovation. Whilst it is expected that candidates will write about the Raising Awareness pack, it is important for candidates to focus on their skills and not the outcome of the pack.

### **Learning Outcome 3 – Understand issues involved in a Global Citizenship Challenge**

The Challenge continues of engaging our young people in the discussion of well-chosen global issues. Almost all say they have enjoyed the Challenge and learned a lot. The level of understanding is a testament to the quality of teaching and learning taking place across centres. The work submitted for moderation shows that across the country, young people are recognising that the world they live in is an increasingly complex place and this is encouraging as many are our decision makers of tomorrow.

Candidates' understanding was identified in many places. This included how they worked with the sources at the start of the Challenge by picking out the key information. It also included the quality of the Personal Standpoints and how the candidate portrayed the information about the global issue in the Raising Awareness pack. There is always a positive outcome with skills development with this Challenge, however small.

PESTLE factors are no longer a mystery of the Challenge, with centres working hard on this element of the Challenge. Many more candidates are now showing they understand what the PESTLE factors were, and the relevance to the global issue. This is an encouraging outcome, but as stated in Learning Outcome 1, some centres must work towards this information being blended into the Personal Standpoint. Some centres must also make sure the sources they choose allow identification of the PESTLE factors for all level of candidates.

A small number of centres are still directing candidates to keep the PESTLE factor information separate from the Personal Standpoint. This is wasting time for candidates. They should be highlighting these elements on the sources and then they should be blending this information into the Personal Standpoint. All candidates can access PESTLE factors if the right sources are chosen in the first instance for the Challenge.

The Raising Awareness packs are becoming the element of the Challenge that creates the most excitement. Many centres are embracing the opportunity to encourage their candidates to be innovative and creative. Those candidates who had been given the chance to develop their idea, always finished with a better product than they started with and this will increase the marks in Learning Outcome 3. There has been a significant range of ideas for raising awareness in this series. Many, after development have been of a very high standard.

# Community Challenge

There was clear evidence that many centres are able to provide purposeful and valuable activities which provide ample opportunity for candidates to demonstrate the independence and responsibility needed for the highest bands. As a result many centres provided evidence that showed candidates had fully engaged with the Challenge and were able to complete each of the necessary tasks to provide appropriate evidence for all Learning Outcomes.

As has been identified previously, centre planning is key to ensure the Community Challenge is a success. Some centres once again chose suitable briefs but their implementation did not provide candidates with sufficient opportunity to produce the necessary evidence for each of the Learning Outcomes. When the 'doing' aspect is insufficient either in time or complexity it hinders the candidates' ability to present detailed and effective planning in particular. Centres are reminded that generic volunteering opportunities or simplistic activities hosted with family members will hinder the candidates' ability to reach the higher bands unless there is an opportunity to demonstrate sufficient independence and responsibility which allow for planning and organisation.

Most centres chose to approach the Challenge as a team task and the majority did so correctly. A small number of centres must address the size of the team in future as it is stated in the specification as 3 to 6 members. Once again centres are reminded that although the activity itself is carried out as a team, the majority of evidence will be completed individually. With the exception of some components of task 2 (e.g. opportunities and risks, resources, lesson plans) there must be individuality in the evidence presented as candidates "must provide an individual response as part of any task outcome" (page 33 of specification).

The most accurate assessment was seen by centres when all criteria of the Learning Outcomes were clearly applied to the evidence presented by candidates. Some centres were over generous in their assessment and would often reference work that was "restricted in size, amount or content" (description of "limited" on page 44 of specification) as "detailed". Centres are reminded that only the evidence presented by candidates can be considered for assessment.

## Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Planning and Organising

The most successful work began with a clear and focused brief allowing the candidates to present appropriate and realistic aims and objectives that were relevant to the work undertaken. This was assisted when the Community hours were linked to purposeful activities as candidates would present detailed and effective planning relating to what they intended to do during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge.

Where planning was poorly completed candidates tended to focus on the preparation with little consideration for what they intended to do during the activity itself. Centres are reminded that the planning and organisation must focus on how candidates intend to deliver their chosen activity as opposed to the collation of evidence for their PDR. When the brief lacked a clear focus candidates were unable to show detailed planning as the evidence showed a lack of understanding of the requirements of the proposed activity. Some candidates present retrospective planning which also hinders their ability to achieve higher bands as they are describing what they did during their chosen activity as opposed to planning and reflecting on its delivery.

There were very strong examples of lesson plans when Coaching briefs had been used and candidates were able to show clear evidence for monitoring and development as they revised plans between deliveries when asked to repeat sessions more than once, or reflected and adapted ideas when teaching over a longer period of time. Some good evidence was also seen this series in relation to the Neighbourhood Enhancement briefs, with some candidates presenting detailed and effective planning for what they intended to do in order to improve their chosen areas as well as the use of annotated photographs before, during and after the work to provide evidence of implementation.

The most successful candidates showed consideration for the various examples of content listed in the specification (page 28) such as setting targets, required resources, risks, team and individual action plans but this was inconsistent across centres. Centres are reminding that candidates are not required to explain each of the elements as understanding is shown through their use during the planning process.

As part of the planning and organisation candidates must provide sufficient detail in the action plans provided with clear allocation of responsibilities when working as a team. Some candidates continue to use generic statements such as “finish session”, “do activity” within their action plan which isn’t sufficient to reach the higher bands. Similarly repeating the same statement throughout the action plan doesn’t show evidence of detailed and effective planning.

The use of industry standard templates was done successfully by most centres with candidates using them appropriately as part of their planning process. The most common templates were those used for risk assessments, lesson plans, action plans and SWOT analysis.

Some centres provide candidates with a clear structure or workbook and this was done effectively in some cases to facilitate Band 1 learners; however centres are reminded that providing too much structure and templates with leading questions will limit accessibility to higher band marks as they tend to restrict learner response and can lead to work being too similar across candidates. This was once again an issue during this series. Centres must not provide candidates with generic action plans and/or risk assessments as these are elements that should be completed independently under controlled assessment as part of task 2 by the candidates themselves.

Good evidence of monitoring and development was seen through detailed Participation Records where candidates would refer to the strengths and improvements made when implementing their plan as part of their activity log.

Strongest candidates referred clearly to the planning process within their reflection indicating why their planning was successful or what areas they could improve. Many candidates describe the activity as opposed to provide evaluative comments on the planning process itself and centres are encouraged to address this.

## **Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness**

All candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms but centres are reminded that it is the analysis of results that is needed to achieve higher marks. Presenting a computer generated audit alone isn’t sufficient.

Strongest candidates would include specific examples of how they’ve applied various skills in the past to illustrate the results of the audit as well as show consideration of how the skills relate to their chosen Community activity. Most successful candidates included a clear plan for improvement with a focus how they could be developed during the “doing” aspect of the Challenge.

This also provided candidates with a clear focus when reflecting on their skills following the activity itself.

Those with a detailed Participation Record in which they clearly documented the implementation of their plan were able to demonstrate effective performance of own role and responsibilities during the activity as they included commentary and/or evaluations of what they did throughout the Community hours.

Reflection for this Learning Outcome tended once again to be stronger than Learning Outcome 1. Use of examples to illustrate and justify how they applied and developed the skills allowed candidates to reach the higher bands. Descriptive reflections where candidates merely identify the skills tended to be limited or basic only. In some instances candidates' responses were restricted due to the leading questions provided. In a few instances centres have hindered candidates' responses through the provision of a structured template in which they complete the reflection.

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

When a well-defined brief was provided, candidates were able to show consideration of the purpose and benefit of the activity, usually in the form of an introduction to the Personal Digital Record. Those reaching the higher marks would identify the purpose and benefit in relation to their chosen community as well as the benefits the activity provides for them individually. In a minority of cases this was too generic across candidates, and centres are reminded that this should be completed individually.

Centres are reminded that the Challenge requires sufficient hours carrying out the 'doing' aspect of the challenge through working with or in the community. Although a significant number of candidates met the requirement with purposeful and valuable activities, there was evidence in some to the contrary. Failing to provide opportunity for the required hours not only hinders learners at Learning Outcome 3 but also has a detrimental effect on the planning and organisation as well as their ability to demonstrate efficient and effective performance.

Although a Confirmation Statement was provided by the majority of centres, its completion wasn't always appropriate. Centres are reminded that only the statement which best reflects the candidate's participation during the "doing" aspect of the Challenge should be chosen. Additional comments relating to the candidate's participation is useful for moderation in order to better understand the marks allocated however these should be applicable to the individual candidate and refer to their participation in the activity itself as opposed to the collation of evidence.

A marked improvement was seen in the Participation Record element of the PDR for this series with candidates providing a record of what they personally did during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge using individually arranged and annotated photographs along with digital diaries, personalised videos, interviews and blogs. Centres are reminded that the record of participation should be collated by the candidate and generic photographs or videos are not sufficient.

As part of the Challenge candidates are required to demonstrate digital literacy skills as they develop their PDR in a creative manner. When the centre provides too much structure the candidates are unable to reach the higher bands as they are not able to show effective organisation, storage and management in how they collate their evidence individually. Some very strong Personal Digital Records were seen during this series with candidates presenting well-structured work showing evidence of organisation and management by collating the various tasks into a single portfolio of evidence making use of hyperlinks or embedded images. Most centres

presented work digitally however some continue to present scanned versions of hand written work and this must be addressed for the next series.

Once again centres are reminded that there is no requirement to include evidence of organisation and storage in the form of screen shots of saving or encrypting files as part of this Learning Outcome.

## Administration

On the whole centres presented well organised work which was uploaded on time. Files were well labelled using candidates name and number however centres must refer to the *Digital Submission of Evidence* document which can be found in the Administration section of the website where it states that a zipped folder should be uploaded which includes a maximum of 6 documents.