Many centres presented evidence of units clearly. Evidence was often referenced to a check sheet. In general, moderators were able to agree with the teachers. Best practice included clearly numbered pages referenced to Assessment Criteria recorded on the Assessment Record.

The WJEC Entry Pathways Mathematics website includes example forms and the Units and Guidance booklet. The secure website also includes exemplar materials.

A few centres have a misunderstanding, moderation is moderation of units and teacher interpretation of the Assessment Criteria. Hence it is important that the evidence in arranged by unit not by candidate. The EP1 sheets are arranged to listed units so consequently evidence should be submitted in this way.

A number of centres have developed good practice for internal moderation. This includes the use of centre designed sheets attached to each unit as a checklist. These require a check that evidence is referenced, marked accurately and that every aspect detailed in the guidance for the assessment criteria has been evidenced by a sufficient number of correct examples. This generally eliminates errors in marking, as significant errors in marking can have impact if evidence sent is minimal, such a one or two examples with one or two of these marked as correct when actually incorrect. A few centres did not indicate whether any internal moderation had taken place.

On occasions, centres had used only the Assessment Record sheet to collate evidence. This sheet does not list the full requirement of the Assessment Criteria. There is specific guidance with details of the minimum requirement in orders to meet each of the Assessment Criteria. Moderators check the evidence submitted against the full guidance, looking for evidence of all the aspects listed. Hence, it is important that centres do send sufficient evidence matching the guidance for the unit, not merely the flavour of the unit. Using the AC codes on the candidates work is a way of referencing, the short statement on the Assessment Record is not the full content, it is important to check the full requirements in the guidance. This is of utmost importance to avoid a unit not being passed due to misunderstanding the breadth and depth of the assessment criteria.

A number of centres actually submitted far more evidence than was required. Once a skill is demonstrated there is no need to submit all evidence related to that skill, usually two or three activities completed is sufficient. It is better to organise the evidence by skill in the order given by the Assessment Criteria than to have a mix of repetitive evidence. The specific guidance given in reports to centres indicates if this had been a particular concern. The balance between repetitive and minimal evidence has been referenced within individual reports to centres in order to aid submissions in the future.
A number of centres had submitted evidence previously, so it is pleasing to see that advice from previous reports has been implemented, with any shortcomings addressed. However, a few centres had not acted upon advice and submitted evidence with errors, misinterpretations or omissions that had been highlighted previously in a detailed report to the centre. The reports to centres are drafted to offer comment and advice to aid the centre in the understanding of the requirements and the specific details of the assessment criteria. Consequently, it is important that centre leaders share reports with the internal assessors. If advice is acted upon, there should be no issues with further submissions, this should lead to teachers having greater confidence that evidence meets the assessment criteria.

Again witness statements had been included for a number of oral or practical activities. The details were generally sufficient for the moderator to understand the nature of the activity, the type of questioning involved and the outcomes. Most of the witness statements were appropriate and thorough in the level of detail. It should always be made clear what the objectives of the task were, against assessment criteria, and the candidate response to each element. Annotating photographs is good practice.

It was pleasing to see evidence of activities that included context. Many activities were also based on subjects of interest. The inclusion of cross curricula opportunities to aid skill development is good practice.

Where answers are given to questions related to directions on a map, the map should be included within the evidence, enabling moderators to check the suitably and accuracy. This is true for many of the more practical activities, as it aids moderators understand the justification of meeting assessment criteria. Obviously answers or solutions without understanding of the nature of the task do not allow moderators to verify meeting assessment criteria.

There was some evidence of incorrect marking, that may actually be teacher misunderstandings or simple slips. For example, in the marking of the names of 3D shapes triangular prism and triangular pyramid were interchanged, lines of symmetry of 2D shapes, also in marking fractions with a unit numerator (that is for example 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, ...). It is important to mark work accurately.

The lengths that teachers go to in order to ensure tasks are accessible to candidates with motor difficulties is much admired and appreciated. The engagement of these candidates with tasks is clear, benefiting from practical activities and games, rather than a diet of worksheets. Moderators really value the sources of evidence sent including annotated photographs with witness statements. Moderators are aware that assessors take time in collating and referencing evidence. The organisation of evidence takes time to reference, this is much appreciated. Many centres had clearly worked to engage candidates with stimulating activities, then annotating evidence with feedback to the candidate on next steps. This is good practice.