



**Post-16 National and 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>

# Administration

## Entries

- Entries for both the post-16 Foundation and National Skills Challenge Certificates were very small compared to previous two years.

## 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.
- Where marks have been adjusted as a result of a Centre's internal moderation procedures, this mark should be entered in IamIS and not that of the assessor and the corrected marks must show on the assessment sheet.

## Submitting Work for Moderation

- A minority of centres failed to adhere to deadline of sending work to WJEC for moderation, 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 some disparities.
- 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 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.
- If sending work electronically on a usb or cd, centres must ensure that the work is labelled clearly with the Centre Name and Number. Each candidate should have an individual file labelled with the Candidate's Name and Number. Candidate's documents should be labelled and collated effectively e.g. labelled by task. Candidates should not include a large number of documents for a single task, they should combine these in a logical order demonstrating their digital skills.
- Any photographic evidence should be of adequate quality to show in detail the evidence that it is capturing.

# Individual Project

There were very few entries when compared to previous series. There was a significant reduction in the number of colleges entering candidates for the Individual Project at National level.

In relation to assessment, the majority of centres were accurate in their judgements, which evidenced a good understanding of the criteria. There were however, a minority of centres who awarded marks for sections that had been completely omitted from the Projects.

## Learning Outcome 1 – Focus and scope

- It is evident that candidates still require support in the writing of aims and objectives to convey the focus and the scope of the Project. Centres are advised to refer to the Delivery Handbook produced by WJEC for examples of action verbs.

## Learning Outcome 2 – Rationale and Research Methods

- The rationale should be a description of what methods the candidate is actually going to use to meet the aims and objectives. Whilst the majority of candidates were able to consider the primary and secondary sources they required, the information included was sometimes generic and not directly linked to specific aims and objectives.
- The justification for the choices of research methods was also weak across samples.

## Learning Outcome 3 – Select, collate, reference and credibility of sources

- Bibliographies were not always included, which made it difficult to ascertain how sources had been used. It is essential that all sources are cited throughout the Projects to avoid issues of suspected plagiarism. Referencing should form part of the teaching and learning programme for the Project and candidates must be reminded of the penalties of plagiarism.
- The majority of candidates chose questionnaires to obtain primary information. Although questionnaires demonstrate an effective way to obtain numerical data, candidates could consider alternative methods to obtain primary information.
- The consideration of the credibility of sources was barely evident across all the work moderated. Candidates need to consider the currency, reliability and validity of the sources they have utilised in their Project. These aspects fit readily into the rationale section of the Project (Learning Outcome 2)

## **Learning Outcome 4 – Analysis of numerical data and display using digital techniques**

- Numerical analysis was weak across all work moderated, with candidates reliant on the use of questionnaires to generate data which is generally too simplistic for National level.
- Candidates were able to demonstrate only basic skills to be able to display the data that they had collected - charts were not always in the most appropriate form, nor appropriately formatted or labelled.

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

- Candidates were generally successful in gathering together information that informed their design and final outcome when submitting an artefact.
- Candidates submitting written outcomes were generally successful in gathering viewpoints and synthesising the information. Candidates should be discouraged from inserting screenshots of their sources and instead, include the actual information that they require from the source and apply appropriate referencing skills.

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

- In relation to artefacts, candidates generally developed ideas that were linked to their main qualifications and allowed candidates to further develop their vocational skills. A reminder to centres that they must provide photographic evidence of the development of the outcome and a written step-by-step account of the skills applied in carrying out the finished outcome.
- Written Projects were generally successful, with candidates devising appropriate titles that they were engaged with.

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

- Candidates often confused LO7 and LO8 and often referred to their performance rather than the fitness for purpose of their outcome in this section. Candidates need to make judgements on the quality of the final outcome, its strengths and weaknesses. It should be evidence based with candidates referring to any feedback that has been given by peers or assessors on the standard of the outcome.
- When submitting written Projects, candidates should provide evidence based comments on their overall findings of the Project – they could refer to each aim in turn.

## **Learning Outcome 8 – Reflect on personal performance**

- Candidates were able to provide basic reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of their own performance, although this is clearly an area for development for future submissions. Candidates could consider the skills contained within the Skills Challenge Certificate as a framework to complete this section in detail: Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Creativity and Innovation, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Planning and Organisation.

# Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The Post-16 Enterprise and Employability Challenge continued to see an improvement across the range of candidate work. This was often the result of an enthusiastic and detailed approach, linking the candidates' supporting qualification with their Enterprise and Employability Challenge.

When candidates are given a Challenge Brief, which is appropriate to their interests and level they become fully involved in an enterprise culture. As a result, candidates have shown enthusiasm for the idea and have developed their creativity and innovation well.

Successful candidates have acknowledged each criterion within each Learning Outcome and identified the task within the challenge to which the work related. Candidates who fully addressed the creativity and innovation section showed high levels of commitment and enthusiasm which continued into all other aspects of the work.

Candidates produced a range of good work at both levels which will enable them to progress in the whole of the Welsh Baccalaureate along with their supporting qualifications.

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

- Candidates achieved this Learning Outcome by successfully generating initial ideas as a result of researching existing concepts. This allowed them to base initial ideas on feasible solutions that had been trialled by others.
- Candidates used their research to successfully generate a range of ideas within the group, analysing the strengths and weaknesses of each in a SWOT analysis, in order to select a feasible concept to take forward. When Candidates did not consider a wide enough range of initial ideas but concentrated on a pre-determined solution from the outset they limited their marks.
- Candidates often did not undertake the development stage to a sufficient level. The need to show how an initial idea had been developed, changed or amended to move the idea forward is a criterion. This is often effective when groups make use of graphics to sketch ideas, with written analysis showing the thinking process involved. Using this method can make it easier for the candidate later on, to produce a detailed and well-reasoned evaluation of the process they have used.
- When developing an idea, many groups used customer research analysis in the form of questionnaires and discussions to inform the development process. This approach allowed the group to make sure that the direction in which the idea is being developed is acceptable to the customer, allowing the concept to be successful.
- Candidates that made use of a prototype as part of the creative process were better informed of its fitness for purpose and general appeal to the consumer. These Candidates achieved higher marks as their creativity and innovation showed the selected concept to be realistic.

## Learning Outcome 2 - Understand Personal Effectiveness

- Candidates had undertaken a skills inventory, but the analysis of the skills identified varied widely. To achieve the higher marks, candidates need to undertake a clear and structured audit at Foundation level and a detailed and effective audit at National level. There is a need for a clear analysis of the skills identified to write an audit which has a detailed consideration of how these skills are important for the challenge. Candidates need to have a plan of how they will develop and improve their skills within the challenge, this plan must consider both personal skills and team skill.
- Within the teaching and learning programme candidates should be reminded, that when using a tick box system for a skills inventory, they need to consider in their audit each skill in terms of why it is important in the Challenge and what they can do to improve identified personal skills and team skills as the Challenge develops.
- Almost all candidates recorded the performance of their own role and responsibilities through minutes of meetings but recording of time management and working as a team was not as well recorded.
- Some candidates did realise that personal effectiveness in a team involves encouraging others and allowing all members to work to their skill strengths. Candidates did not record this aspect with the same detail as other aspects of personal performance. Candidates need to consider this issue in order to achieve the higher marks.
- Many candidates provided a reflection on the development and application of their own performance within the team. However, candidates often provided a story of the progress of the Challenge without reflecting and considering how the skills, both personal and team, were used to good effect, developed and improved upon, as the Challenge progressed.
- Often, within the reflection, candidates feel that if they identify room for improvement that this will lead to reduced marks. The ability to reflect and identify “What I would do if I had to do this again?” is an area that needs to be understood so that candidates realise that the world does not get things right first time. The reflection process is part of the idea development process in the real world when there is time to revisit the idea after the first trial.

## Learning Outcome 3 - Be able to apply Numeracy

- Within the Challenge there is a need to show effective use of numeracy to solve problems together with evidence of interpretation of numerical results. Candidates had used numeracy within the Challenge based on set-up and running costs for the enterprise concept. This was then used as evidence of numeracy to solve a problem, with many candidates using the information further to interpret numerical results.
- It is not sufficient to include numeracy such as costings without using the data to interpret issues such as individual costings when purchasing in bulk. At National level, effective use of numeracy is called for in the higher bands of marks. The use of calculations is useful. Moderators are simply looking for evidence of the successful or effective use of numeracy to solve a specific problem and interpret results.

## Learning Outcome 4 - Understand factors involved in an Enterprise and Employability Challenge

- Candidates show significant enthusiasm for the Enterprise and Employability Challenge undertaken within their group when the idea considered possible business proposals linked to their supporting qualifications. Candidates that became enthused by the Challenge became motivated and achieved higher marks. When candidates had enthusiasm for the concept they were more easily able to convince others when it came to the pitch. A well-structured and creatively developed Visual Display at National level or a clear and appropriate Visual Display at Foundation level should draw on the ideas generated in the creativity section produced earlier. When candidates had adopted this approach, they were successful in achieving higher marks for the Pitch as they were convincing and engaging.
- Almost all candidates understood the factors involved in developing a business proposal including the use of the 5 Ps of product, price, place, promotion and people. Work was generally well-structured at National level and clear and appropriate at Foundation level but few achieved the higher band of this Learning Outcome because of a lack of detail and depth.
- Communication skills were generally appropriate with a Visual Display of a small business proposal creatively developed.
- When candidates had used their evidence from the generation of appropriate and realistic ideas within the pitch they were more structured in their approach and better able to communicate their ideas in detail and with reason. Having the Creativity and Innovation aspects as part of the Pitch is more engaging and demonstrates clear and appropriate understanding at Foundation level and detail and effective understanding at National level when the presentation is made.

# Global Citizenship Challenge

This is the third series for the Post 16 National and Foundation Global Citizenship Challenge. Work was submitted from further education centres as well as schools and this is encouraging as it shows schools are recognising that some candidates are working best at Level 2 when they go into Sixth Form. Centres are giving candidates an opportunity to build on their success at KS4 whilst others are studying the qualification for the first time within the context of their vocational courses. This shows very positive utilisation of the qualification in a range of circumstances.

In this series, the work presented for moderation show that centres who are following the guidance set out in their centre reports from 2017 are making good progress and strengthening their understanding of the requirements of the challenge. However, there is definite progress and assessment decisions are becoming more consistent and reliable.

Choosing the most appropriate Challenge Brief is essential for those candidates who are also studying a vocational course to ensure the brief compliments the vocational context of the candidate's programme of study. Where this had been actioned, the outcomes were better. In this series there were challenge briefs for waste management, solar energy and problems with disposable nappies (ethical and eco-friendly products), commercialism in sport (consumerism), recycling plus others with a clear vocational context. Schools used Challenge Briefs that were less vocationally focused such as the impact of social media (new technologies) and these proved to be worthwhile.

It cannot be understated how the choice of source materials sets the balance for the whole challenge. Where candidates can understand and read the materials given, then their engagement is already assured.

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

- It was clear that many centres have made an effort with the sources of information to support the problem-solving evidence for the Challenge. Some compiled the sources into bound booklets/folders which were well presented and easy for candidates to access. This approach is to be commended. The use of templates is acceptable within certain contexts; however, centres must realise that this can limit some candidates who want to write more.
- Disappointingly there were a number of centres who did not provide sources of information in the submission. This evidence is essential for moderators to be able to assess the candidate's problem-solving skills. The annotation and/or selection of information shows the candidate's ability to select key information prior to writing their personal standpoint. There are many problems solving tools that candidates can use when working with the sources of information.

- Centres are reminded that candidates should be well versed with the elements needed for assessment which are opinions, views and arguments, PESTLE factors and a consideration of the credibility of the source.
- There was an encouraging number of centres who facilitated a class discussion and this is very good for the candidates. Some failed though to remind candidates to include the most enlightening part of the discussion into their personal standpoints and this is a shame as it provides evidence of opinions.
- The quality of the personal standpoints was a clear reflection of how the candidates had engaged with the sources. Critically, the statement or question posed in the Challenge Brief had an impact, with those who had been given a question to answer often creating better personal standpoints. The best personal standpoints included a range of opinions on a global issue, different points of view including those of peers. The element of credibility was not strong and this is something centres needs to concentrate on for the next series as evaluating a source in an important aspect of critical thinking. Determining if the source is up to date, or biased or reliable helps to develop the understanding that not all information is equal.
- Candidate reflections have been much better in this series and this is really encouraging. A reminder that the reflections do not need to be too long and candidates must make sure they focus on the skills for the learning outcome. Some are still focussing too much on what they have learned about the global issues and not how their skills have developed. There was a number of candidates with no reflection at all and this will affect their marks for LO1.
- As this Challenge is completed under control, centres must take responsibility for candidates copying and pasting information. Candidates should not be allowed access the Internet whilst preparing for and completing their personal standpoint. The temptation for some to use the Internet for information is too great, but this is not allowed and invariably is not successful with candidates using information that is out of context or not correct. Also, large amounts of copying from the sources used for the problem solving should be discouraged.

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

- There has been limited progress in the second task of the Challenge. All centres have recognised the need for candidates to present the packs, but there is still a feeling that this part of the work is not being given the right amount of time in order for candidates to develop their skills of creativity and innovation.
- There was a move away from creative outcomes to electronic versions to raise awareness with the exhibition packs. Whilst the process of information sharing globally has become electronic based, candidates who are working at this level tended to produce leaflet and posters. They were often basic with many elements copied directly from the Internet which lacks creativity and innovation. There were some more innovative methods such as websites, but these were often not displayed clearly for the moderator to get the view of what had been made and the standard of the outcome. There needs to be a link to the actual site or several clear photographs of the website. One page of a website is not enough for higher levels of outcome. Also the centres should think about printing evidence for the sample in colour to ensure the impact of the exhibition packs and any photographs.

- The main area of concern in LO2 was the lack of development of the candidate ideas. Candidates are in general submitting a list of ideas and a basic SWOT and then an outcome. Candidates could include: research for several initial ideas, SWOT of the ideas, spider grams, action plans, mood boards, 1<sup>st</sup> draft of chosen idea, feedback from peers on draft idea, 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of idea, further SWOT, final outcome, feedback from audience, photos of stages and photos of final outcomes.
- Where there has been group work, there must be clear identification of a candidate's contribution and when sending photographic evidence they must clearly show what is written and/or content.

### **Learning Outcome 3 – Be able to apply literacy**

- Again, as in the last series this was one of the stronger learning outcomes. The grammar, punctuation and spelling was mostly accurate with many examples of effective outcomes. The personal standpoint is where a lot of the evidence was sourced, however annotation and summaries of the sources was considered. Also, the information presented in the exhibition packs was accepted. Therefore, on this point, it is better for candidates to use their own notes in the exhibition pack rather than copying and pasting from the Internet. The outcomes for the class discussion is also an important sources of evidence.
- Where candidate's literacy was not as strong as in the personal standpoints was in the reflections. Centres need to work on this part of the Challenge so that candidates are using a suitable first-person evaluation approach to review the development of their skills.

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

- Overall the understanding of the global issue was influenced by the choice of Challenge Brief topic and the sources provided. On a positive note, those candidates who have completed a reflection all said they felt they had learned a lot about the topic from taking part in the Challenge and this is a very positive outcome.
- Decisions about the PESTLE factors took into account the evidence in the problem solving and the personal standpoints and where applicable in the exhibition packs. There is still a level of concern about candidates being able to blend this information into the personal standpoints, they seem able to write about them separately but when applied to sources it becomes a challenge in itself. Centres must provide candidates the opportunity to practice this skill in preparation for the controlled assessment. Selecting sources where the PESTLE factors are clear and easily spotted will also help.
- As mentioned in LO2, there seems to be a change in approach with many exhibition packs being electronic and these are not always the most creative or innovative in their nature if they are presented as PowerPoints, leaflets and posters. Still there is a chance to encourage candidates to incorporate creativity. For example, in a PowerPoint, there could be transitions, hyperlinks, quizzes and games, animations that tell a story. A PowerPoint can also be turned into a movie if the centre is using an up to date version of the program. This more engaging outcome will come, if centres allocate the right time to the development of the exhibition packs in the controlled assessment.

# Community Challenge

A variety of Challenge Briefs were seen which provided candidates with an opportunity to undertake valuable community activities. The most successful briefs were clearly linked to a particular subject area and provided sufficient focus in order for the candidate to identify the purpose and benefit of their chosen activity. Although a general improvement was seen in the accuracy of assessment for this series, some centres continue to be over generous at National level.

Several centres chose to approach the Community Challenge as a team task and almost all did so successfully, however, some should refer to the specification which indicates that a team is defined as having 3 – 6 members. Centres are reminded that when completing the Challenge as a team there are several principles to consider including that “learners must provide an individual response as part of any task outcome” and that “evidence must be clearly attributable to each individual member of the group”. Centres must ensure sufficient individuality within the work presented. In some cases identical aspects of work such as the annotated photographs as part of the Participation Record were presented across all members of a group. Some very good use of templates was seen at Foundation level as centres provided sufficient scaffolding to allow candidates to access higher bands without the over use of leading questions or restricting candidates’ responses in length or content.

The Challenge requires sufficient “hours carrying out the ‘doing’ aspect of the Challenge through working with or in the community”. Although many of the candidates appeared to meet this requirement, there was evidence in some centres to the contrary. There were some instances whereby the Challenge Brief didn’t allow for the necessary hours or the opportunity for sufficient planning such as those asking candidates to raise awareness. Centres are reminded that these are not appropriate activities for this Challenge. Any activity must allow sufficient opportunity for the candidates to provide detailed planning and organisation.

Annotation by assessors needs to be strengthened across most centres, ensuring accurate use of the key differentiators which reflect the evidence presented. The annotation should then be reflected in the marks awarded.

Centres must ensure that the work presented is appropriate for the level of the qualification as once again, in several instances, evidence at National level was more appropriate for Foundation and didn’t reach the necessary standard.

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

- The most successful work began with a clear and focused brief related to a specific subject area allowing the candidates to present appropriate and realistic aims and objectives that were relevant to the work undertaken. Successful briefs would allow candidates to take control of the planning and organisation which allowed access to the higher bands at National level.
- More successful candidates showed consideration for various examples of content listed in the specification such as aims and objectives, required resources, risks but this was inconsistent across centres.
- Although the work is carried out in teams, centres are reminded that aspects of this Learning Outcome must be individual as the candidates should provide evidence of planning their contribution to the task in order to ensure the success of their team activity.
- Many candidates were too brief or generic when completing action plans and didn't provide sufficient detail explaining the actions each team member/individual would need to complete in order to ensure success as is expected at National level.
- Good evidence of the management and implementation of plans were seen by some candidates, including the use of an activity log or a short reflection and plan for improvement following an activity which was to be repeated.
- At Foundation level, some centres made good use of templates to help candidates structure their planning and reach higher bands without restricting responses.
- The use of standard templates is accepted, however centres are reminded that they can in some instances limit learner response which hinders higher marks. Templates with leading questions will also limit accessibility of the higher mark bands at National level. Over use of templates was seen by several centres which restricted marks and resulted in very similar work between candidates and a level of detail resembling that which was presented at Foundation. This must be addressed for future submissions.
- Candidates are not penalised when circumstances arise that mean the original plan cannot be implemented however this should be fully explained within the reflection and the candidate still needs to provide evidence of management and implementation of the revised activity.
- It was evident that candidates require support with reflection as very few would refer to the strengths and weaknesses of the planning process. The reflection for LO1 was a weakness across all centres as very few candidates would refer specifically to the strengths and weaknesses of the planning process. This was stronger by those who had clearly engaged with independent planning for their chosen activity.

## Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

- The most successful work included a clear skills audit where the candidates were encouraged to provide a personal analysis along with a plan for improvement relating to the community activity itself. Some provided an individual plan for improvement through the use of SMART targets. At National level there was some detailed analysis by the candidate along with a plan for improvement relating to the community activity itself.
- The use of an analytical tool such as the enterprise catalyst is permitted but centres are reminded that candidates must show an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses identified and decide how these will be improved in their chosen activity. Presenting a computer generated audit alone is not sufficient.
- Some candidates' analysis was limited due to the skills audit template chosen as they required short answers or tick boxes without any further explanation. As candidates were unable to present a detailed and effective audit this restricted the marks available.
- The strongest candidates included a clear plan for improvement in terms of skills and then used these to focus their reflection following the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge. Again centres are reminded that more detail is needed at the National level than at Foundation and so the teaching and learning programme provided should prepare candidates accordingly.
- In some centres candidates effectively evidenced performance of roles and responsibilities with the use of minutes of meetings, participation diaries and/or annotated photographs.
- The reflection for this Learning Outcome was stronger than that of LO1 with candidates making reference to development and application of skills during their chosen activity. Some candidates were able to provide basic reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of their own performance, although this is clearly an area for development for future submissions. The strongest candidates included a clear plan for improvement in terms of skills and then used these to focus their reflection following the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge.

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

- When a clear and focused brief was provided, candidates were able to show consideration of the purpose and benefit of the activity. In the minority of cases at National level where the brief lacked focus or the activity was not clearly related to Community, it was reflected in the candidates' inability to identify and discuss the purpose and benefit of their given activity within the chosen community.
- The strongest candidates presented a Personal Digital Record which included evidence of their participation during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge through annotated photographs, videos or digital diaries.
- At National level annotated photographs were the most common record of participation and these were generally done well by candidates. However centres are reminded that the collation of the digital record is an individual task and so identical photographs of whole cohorts or groups is not sufficient.

- Candidates are required to demonstrate evidence of organisation and management of digital information and many did this through a well-structured PDR. In a few cases work presented included empty templates or duplicate grids which imply a lack of organisation skills. Candidates should be more creative in producing their PDR and centres must therefore ensure that all candidates are able to complete the work electronically with the freedom to collate and present their evidence as they want. Some hand written work was still presented by candidates and too much structure was seen in some cases which doesn't allow candidates to demonstrate organisation and management of their PDR.
- Most centres provided valuable and interesting opportunities to candidates which allowed for the necessary hours 'doing' as is required for the Challenge. This must be extended across all centres.
- Although a confirmation statement was provided by the vast 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 Challenge itself should be chosen. Additional comments relating to the candidate's role within the Challenge is useful for moderation in order to better understand the marks allocated however these should be applicable to the individual candidate and not a general comment for the cohort as a whole.