



# **KS4 National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate (Welsh Baccalaureate) Principal Moderators' Report January 2019**

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

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

# Procedures

## Controlled Assessment

This series has highlighted that centres need to be reminded of the requirements for carrying out controlled assessment for the components of the Skills Challenge Certificate.

- Centres must refer to the **Code of Practice** before undertaking any assessment.
- The 3 Challenges must be taken under **controlled conditions** as set out in the **KS4 National/Foundation Delivery Handbook**.
- Centres are reminded there are set controls for **time, resources, supervision, collaboration and feedback** for each task of the assessment.
- Not adhering to the set controls is **malpractice** and the centre results could be in jeopardy.
- Once a task begins **no** lessons or guidance can be provided other than stipulated in the controls.
- It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that candidates' work is kept **secure** and candidates **cannot access** their work once each task is completed.
- Once the Individual Project has been submitted for assessment it **must not** be returned to the candidate to improve it.

## Submitting Work using e-submission

For this series, e-Submission was again used for the Community Challenge and Individual Project, with very little issues arising from the upload process. The majority of centres are clearly managing this process well and are able to meet the deadline date set. Whilst a single document was the norm to be uploaded for the Individual Project, there were still some discrepancies seen with the number of documents being uploaded for the Community Challenge. Centres are encouraged to refer to the *Digital Submission of Evidence* document which can be found in the Administration section of the website, where it states for the Community Challenge that a single zipped folder should be uploaded which include a maximum of 6 documents for each candidate. In some cases, over 50 items were uploaded within the candidates' evidence folder for this Challenge.

Centres are reminded that from the January series 2020 onwards, all components of the KS4 National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate will be submitted using the e-Submission platform.

## Internal Moderation

It is most important that centres have a thorough internal moderation process in place. Again this series there were several centres where different mark adjustments were applied to different assessors within a centre. This was not just the case for centres with many assessors, but in some centres where there were only two or three assessors. If there is a clear lack of consistency across assessors within a centre in future series evidence for the whole cohort may be requested.

## Administration

A copy of every Challenge Brief included within the sample must be sent with the work for the moderator to understand the context of the work. In some cases, the briefs provided didn't correspond to the tasks completed, and this must be addressed by centres.

Centres are reminded that candidate signatures for the Challenges are provided through the Candidate Declaration and Timesheet which must be included with the work. Candidates must include a breakdown of hours for all task undertaken during that Challenge. There is no need to include a Timesheet for the Project, as both assessor and candidate signatures are presented on the Assessment Sheet.

# Individual Project

As has been the case for all January series', a very small number of centres entered candidates for the Individual Project. This report therefore is reflective of the limited evidence seen during this moderation series.

## 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. It is clear that the choice of some aims and objectives are having a detrimental effect on the overall success of the Project. Candidates need to take care that their aims and objectives are not too broad, as they are unable to fully explore each one within the confines of the word count.

A number of candidates are still not utilising appropriate action verbs and mistakenly refer to research methods in this Learning Outcome ("create a questionnaire"; "carry out secondary research") This often meant that candidates were generously assessed for this learning outcome by centres.

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. 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

The purpose of the rationale is to indicate which research methods will be used, to fulfil the aims and objectives, with justification for said choices.

For this series, candidates appeared insecure in their understanding of an effective rationale. Candidates tended to provide a description of their primary and secondary sources, but they were often generic in tone and therefore not always linked to specific aims and objectives.

Candidates often stated that they would be using the 'internet' to research secondary information and a 'questionnaire' to obtain primary research, with opportunities to explain their research methods in detail being missed.

Candidates were more comfortable in discussing secondary research methods, but reference to primary research methods were often neglected. Many candidates also missed opportunities to consider sampling strategies and how they would 'collate' the information that they gathered and how it would be used.

More able candidates took the opportunity to consider the credibility of sources, which further strengthened rationales as it reinforced justification for their choices.

### **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, and many learners tended to include screen shots of their sources and discuss them objectively, rather than to collate them and include the information into their writing. Centres are advised to steer candidates away from this style of referencing.

Most candidates included a bibliography, even where the referencing of sources was not effectively undertaken, this allowed moderators to clearly identify the type and range of sources that were used overall, throughout the completion of the Project.

In relation to primary information, candidates typically opted to use questionnaires, which allowed candidates to collect numerical data, although these were not always fit for purpose and did not always generate information that could effectively contribute to the findings.

### **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. Candidates often simply repeated the information that their charts were indicating when attempting analysis, missing opportunities to demonstrate their evaluative skills and link their primary and secondary findings.

To achieve higher bands, candidates need to demonstrate a greater level of analysis of their findings and take care over the selection of charts to illustrate their findings. Many candidates used pie charts to display findings and did not consider the use of an alternative format which may have been more effective. Furthermore, charts and graphs were often missing titles and appropriate labelling.

Some candidates tried to address this learning outcome by calculating mean, median and mode, yet the findings were not contextualised within the Project and therefore, in general, did not add to the quality of the Project.

Some candidates employed the use of infographics to provide them with secondary data. These were effective, as they 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.

## **Learning Outcome 5**

### **Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints**

This Learning Outcome was an area of strength for candidates, as they were able to organise and synthesise their primary and secondary findings appropriately and to some extent provide some detailed analysis on those findings.

The candidates' use of screen shots within the main body of the Project, (as mentioned in Learning Outcome 3) had a negative impact on the success of this Learning Outcome. When candidates include information in this format, it limits their ability to demonstrate the skill of synthesising information from primary and secondary information to form a whole Project.

Candidates were able to demonstrate a good level of knowledge and understanding, even at the lower levels which was due to candidates 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.

## **Learning Outcome 6**

### **Produce and present an outcome**

The majority of Projects, if not all that were seen during the sampling process, were in a written format, rather than artefacts.

Again, this Learning Outcome was an area of strength for candidates and most were successful in being able to produce a piece of work that was fit for purpose. It was evident that candidates took pride in the visual aesthetics of the Project and contained images etc. that added an additional quality to the Project. Work was generally well formatted and well presented.

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

## **Learning Outcome 7**

### **Make judgements and draw 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**

Despite some effective comments for this Learning Outcome in previous series, candidates were often not specific in acknowledging the skills that they had developed throughout the completion of the Project and often referred to the quality of the sources that they had utilised.

This Learning Outcome allows learners to write a detailed reflection on how they have been able to apply the skills that they have developed throughout the completion of the Project and should focus on: Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Creativity, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving etc. This provides a useful structure for learners to write a detailed section on each of these skill areas.

# **Enterprise and Employability Challenge**

This series continues to show improvement in the delivery and administration of the Challenge. In the majority of centres, evidence is collated in a logical way or by task and includes photographs of visual displays and prototypes. The majority of entries are produced digitally allowing pupils to develop digital literacy skills. However, some centres chose to submit partly printed and partly digital work, which made the moderating process more difficult.

Whilst there is clearly enthusiasm for this component, there is a danger that some familiar Challenge Briefs have become stagnant. It is vital centres have the correct infrastructure to deliver the Enterprise and Employability Challenge, but it is also important pupils have fresh opportunities to show their Creativity and Innovation.

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

The majority of Challenge Briefs are designed with a product as the outcome. Many centres are choosing to create prototypes or continue to the manufacture stage, which has helped to improve engagement with the creative aspect. The evidence shows candidates are re-visiting their designs and further developing their initial ideas knowing it is something they will physically have to produce. It also ensures ideas are feasible and realistic.

Challenge Briefs where candidates are tasked with developing a service, must ensure the focus remains on Creativity and Innovation and not purely on logistics. Examples where logos and other promotional material had been developed were more effective in demonstrating the creativity aspect.

When generating ideas, most candidates choose to use a mind map. There was a positive development during this series of using concept maps, which allowed candidates to clearly communicate ideas and discover new ideas and the propositions that connect them. Similar ideas were grouped, and the initial idea sparked a series of further solutions – often with pictures to illustrate.

Sketches and early ideas were seen more frequently this series, which is pleasing. How initial designs have been challenged and adapted is vital in showing innovative development. Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate original thinking and not simply recreate a service or product that already exists. Opportunities of how the product or service could be adapted and developed for a target audience should be explored to show innovation.

The market research aspect is now evident in the creative stage rather than after the design has been completed. Competitor analysis is becoming more common place and is good practice. Strengths and weakness are documented well, but there is more scope to consider opportunities and threats. Although there is evidence of SWOT analysis in most entries, reasons why an idea is taken forward is not always documented.

In many submissions, candidates seek target audience feedback by means of a survey or questionnaire. It is pleasing to see more and more candidates using digital platforms to collect this data and reaching wider audiences in the process. However, there is often no link between the potential customer feedback and further developments to the idea.

An area for improvement continues to be the evaluation strand of this Learning Outcome. Evaluations are often heavily template led, even with higher achieving pupils, and continue to be descriptive rather than evaluative.

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

This Learning Outcome has showed significant improvement from this series last year. Analysis of the skills audit continues to be a strength with the addition of team skills becoming a focus. Team skills that are outlined when choosing roles help justify decisions. Personal skills are outlined in a letter of application in most instances, showing candidates can give examples of when they used that skill.

Self-assessment is part of Personal Effectiveness. Following the analysis of skills, submissions where SMART targets are a focus, show individual development planning. It also allows pupils to review their achievements against set targets giving well-reasoned reflections on their development. Evidence of SMART targets was less prevalent this series.

More candidates are providing minutes in their evidence which is encouraging. Minutes of meetings provide an opportunity to display efficient time management and to record progress within the group, in line with the roles they have assigned each other. Candidates who do this well clarify how, when, why and by whom decisions were made and have a sense of ownership and accountability. Candidates sometimes use their minutes as a review document to measure progress and to discuss development of skills. Minutes that are written retrospectively lack detail and don't help candidates progress.



Evidencing effective team work can be seen in the increasing amount of detailed reflections. Although there is still some disparity, more candidates are now focusing on explaining how they have developed skills and what they have learned, rather than an account of what they did.

There continues to be a use of designed templates or worksheets to focus candidates on this Learning Outcome and these are used effectively with lower level candidates. Centres are encouraged to differentiate appropriately, giving templates to lower level candidates only as this can limit marks for more able candidates.

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

This Learning Outcome continues to improve and is the one most evident in work presented for moderation. Confirmation Statements reflected enthusiasm for candidates who produced prototypes and were proud to display their work. Centres where the assessor had given more detailed comments on the Confirmation Statement helped to capture the presentation of the pitch/visual display.

Financial planning is often an area which is underdeveloped when considering factors involved in developing a business proposal. Most candidates had decided on a price for their product or service, but there was little research to show how they came to that figure. In some cases, a spreadsheet or income/outcome table showed consideration of the cost of production but didn't always consider factors such as time. Candidates who were able to show an understanding of profit margins and cash flow scored more highly.

Candidates are increasingly using social media to promote their products and services. Using social platforms to connect with a target audience and increase awareness of their brand is an important skill for future jobs and demonstrates the candidate's awareness of how to effectively promote a business proposal.

## **Global Citizenship Challenge**

There is clear evidence that many centres are addressing a wide variety of relevant global issues, which fully engage candidates. The global issues considered, as well as their source packs are mostly well accessed by candidates, enabling them to demonstrate effective and detailed Critical Thinking and Problem Solving skills. Knowledge and understanding of PESTLE factors has improved again and most centres appear to be consistent and secure in their teaching of this.

The most successful centres have encouraged candidates to be creative and innovative, thinking outside of the traditional poster or PowerPoint. Whilst posters and PowerPoint (amongst other methods) are appropriate, feasible and realistic methods to raise awareness, the development of the chosen method remains an area for further development.

Reflections on Critical Thinking and Problem Solving skills, as well as evaluations on the process involved in developing a new concept continue to improve across many centres. Further consolidation work is still needed in the teaching and learning programme on the skills of reflection and evaluation, rather than narration or descriptions of the tasks undertaken.

A small number of centres had not adhered to the time controls set for each task, as evidenced through the candidate time sheets. Adhering to these controls is essential, allowing equality of delivery and assessment for all candidates in each centre. Centres are also reminded of the need to read and action their previous Centre Moderation reports, as in several samples it was obvious that centres had not acted on the recommendations given by the moderator and therefore the same issues were present in this series.

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

For the majority of centres source packs are well developed, differentiated in response to learners' needs and meet the requirements of the Challenge. In a small number of centres, source packs do not follow the set requirements and candidates are presented with too many sources, and there is too much information for candidates to synthesise. Centres are reminded of the need to check the guidelines for the resource pack in the Delivery Handbook.

Many centres once again did not submit the source pack used by candidates as evidence within the sample. Annotation of sources, as well as highlighting of information in the source pack aids candidates in the skills of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Where the centre does not provide the source pack as evidence in the sample candidates may be disadvantaged from higher marks in demonstrating and evidencing these skills e.g. identification of fact versus opinion, identification of key information and factors and credibility of sources etc.

Most centres had included evidence of a classroom discussion, which should be encouraged as it aids learners' development, and understanding of alternative opinions and arguments. However, at times, this again was not synthesised into the Personal Standpoint.

Consideration of the credibility of sources has improved well, with many centres now using well-established methods such as RURU, CARP, CRAAP and COP. Candidates appear able to apply these methods successfully whilst annotating their source pack and should be encouraged to synthesise this into their Personal Standpoints.

Centres appear to be much more confident in the structure of a Personal Standpoint and clear work has gone into the teaching and learning programme in terms of the structure. However, many Personal Standpoints read as a commentary of sources (including credibility), with separate commentary on PESTLE factors. To achieve the highest marks candidates must demonstrate more sophistication in the synthesis of information into a Personal Standpoint. This includes identification, development and analysis of arguments, as well as evaluation and credibility of sources in the resource pack. Candidates are also expected to summarise and justify their own personal standpoint, whilst identifying, considering and using a variety of facts, opinions and viewpoints identified from the resource pack.

Reflections continue to develop well, with more understanding of what Critical Thinking and Problem Solving is. When reflecting on these skills candidates still need to be encouraged to use reflective and evaluative language, as opposed to recount and describe what they did.

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

The majority of candidates generated multiple, appropriate ideas for raising awareness, which was very pleasing to see. Most of the work presented included realistic ideas for candidates to develop and implement. Candidates appear secure in their ability to consider strengths and weaknesses of their ideas. The majority of candidates chose to focus on 4 of the ideas out of the multiple ideas generated, with more able candidates conducting a detailed SWOT analysis of their methods, which is an appropriate evaluation tool.

Centres must still be careful to ensure that candidates are aware that their ideas must be feasible and realistic for them to implement. A minority of centres presented work where candidates had developed ideas such as National TV adverts or celebrity-endorsed events. These would not be feasible or realistic for candidates to consider, as they would not be able to implement them, thereby limiting the number of marks awarded for both Learning Outcome 2 and 3.

Some very good examples were seen of development of ideas; however, this remains an area for further development for the majority of centres. Development can include consideration of colour, font, music, placement of images, use of rhetoric devices for speeches, first drafts, peer feedback which has been actioned, second drafts etc. There must be sufficient evidence of stages of development to achieve higher marks.

The majority of samples seen in this series included an evaluation on the process involved in developing a new concept. However, as for Learning Outcome 1, this is often descriptive in nature and needs to focus on critical evaluation of the process of creativity in developing candidates' final outcome. Better quality reflections were demonstrated by candidates who evidenced several stages of development, as they found it easier to reflect on the process involved in developing their concept.

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

Nearly all candidates demonstrated good understanding of the global issues considered, building knowledge and understanding of the topic. Understanding was shown through the perceptive viewpoints and opinions offered, as well as the analysis in the Personal Standpoint, annotation of the source pack and the quality of the final outcome.

The quality of PESTLE analysis has much improved again in this series. Candidates appear confident in their understanding and use of PESTLE factors. Candidates approach this in different ways, with some highlighting PESTLE factors using a colour-coded key, annotation on the sources themselves, a page of notes following each source, or an overall summary of all PESTLE factors from all sources. In order to achieve into Band 4, candidates must then synthesise this information and blend it effectively into their Personal Standpoints. Some candidates had clearly spent a lot of time on the annotation of their source pack but had not transferred this information into their Personal Standpoint, which is a higher level-skill.

There were many examples of high quality and effective outcomes in this series, ranging from bunting, videos, and simple computer games to T-shirts and coffee cups. A small number of candidates did not present an outcome for the raising awareness process, as they were unable to implement their idea e.g. music festivals, or memorabilia such as mobile phone cases which had not been produced. As previously mentioned, centres must ensure that both they and their candidates understand the need to produce an outcome, as otherwise this will prevent them from achieving higher band marks for both Learning Outcome 2 and 3.

## Community Challenge

There was clear evidence that many centres can 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 in previous reports, 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. Centres are reminded that generic volunteering opportunities 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).

Some centres provide candidates with a rigid structure or workbook and it is 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.

The most accurate assessment was seen by centres when all criteria of the Learning Outcomes were clearly applied to the evidence presented by candidates. 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. There was a clear improvement this series with most candidates presenting planning which clearly related to what they intended to do during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge as opposed to focusing on the preparation alone. This allowed for more detailed and effective planning.

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.

There were very strong examples of lesson plans with Coaching briefs 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. 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 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 "practise drills", "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.

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 providing 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.

Once again, this series, the reflection for this Learning Outcome tends to be stronger than for LO1. 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 by the centre and in a few instances, centres have hindered candidates' responses through the provision of a structured template in which they were expected to 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 of the activity in relation to their chosen community. 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 LO3 but also has a detrimental effect on the planning and organisation as well as their ability to demonstrate efficient and effective performance.

A confirmation statement was provided by the vast majority of centres, however in very few cases it wasn't completed correctly. 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 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 or the preparatory work.

The Participation Record is a key element of the PDR as it is a source of evidence for each of the Learning Outcomes. Once again, an improvement was seen in this element for this series with candidates clearly documenting the implementation of their plan and 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.

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.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)