



KS4 National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate (Welsh Baccalaureate) Principal Moderators' Report August 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 once again highlighted that some 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 what is 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 reminded 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 includes a maximum of 6 documents for each candidate. In some cases, over 80 items were uploaded within the candidates' evidence folder for this Challenge. This is not acceptable and should be addressed before the candidates' work is submitted.

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 Standardisation and Moderation

It is most important that centres have thorough internal standardisation and moderation processes in place. Again in 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 was evident 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. Centres are also reminded that accurate assessor initials must be used for each candidate submitted on IAMIS. This wasn't always adhered to, and there were discrepancies in the assessor initials on IAMIS compared with those on the Assessment Sheets provided.

Administration

A copy of every Challenge Brief included within the sample must be sent with the evidence 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 detailed breakdown of hours for all task undertaken during that Challenge. There is no need to include a Timesheet for the Individual Project, as both assessor and candidate signatures are presented on the Assessment Sheet. Centres are reminded that there is now new assessment documentation on the Secure Website for all components, which must be used when completing all components from September 2019 onwards.

Individual Project

This was the 3rd series for work to be submitted using the e-submission method, which proved to be an effective process overall. Where moderators encountered difficulties in gaining full access to work, centres were responsive and supportive in assisting to resolve issues.

Please note that it is not a requirement to include Time Logs for the Individual Project component. It is a concern if centres are limiting opportunities to candidates by allocating set hours for completion within the Centre, particularly when considering the component weighting of 50%. The Individual Project can be completed by the learner using both lesson time and their own personal time outside of lessons.

The most effective Individual Projects emerged from centres who gave autonomy to candidates over topics which clearly motivated them throughout their completion. In contrast, there remains a minority of centres who did not guide candidates to the same extent. Some titles were rather ambitious and difficult to address within the parameters of the advised word count within the specification.

Some centres encourage the completion of artefacts, which clearly allowed learners who were not confident in formal 'essay' writing skills to access marks on the assessment grid.

Centre assessment of the Individual Project was generally more accurate for this series. However, some centres were inconsistent in their judgements between assessors, which indicates a need to ensure that robust standardisation takes place within centres.

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 Individual 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 Individual Project. However, this was inconsistent amongst centres and still some candidates referred to research or wrote an extensive list of tasks instead. This often meant that candidates were generously assessed for this aspect.

The aims and objectives form an integral part of the Individual Project, and the success of the overall Project is usually determined by the success of them. 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 in this series, which allowed candidates the opportunity to be able to explain how they intended to meet their objectives by referring to their chosen research methods. Weaker rationales made general references to the 'internet' as a secondary source. In contrast, more effective rationales provided a detailed explanation as to why specific sources had been selected and how the information they had sourced would fulfil their aims/objectives.

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 Individual Projects, some of which were complex and comprehensive, allowing candidates to produce some sophisticated pieces of work. Referencing skills were not always effective, which made it difficult for moderators to ascertain where information had been obtained. 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 Individual Project.

In relation to primary information, candidates typically opted to use questionnaires. 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. In some instances the names of the respondents were also included, which has data protection implications. 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 Individual Project, as on occasions some questions were deemed irrelevant.

Learning Outcome 4

Analyse the numerical data and display using digital techniques

Candidates need to ensure that their topics/titles will provide them with the opportunity to demonstrate appropriate numeracy skills.

Whilst candidates made efforts to analyse the data that they obtained from secondary sources such as charts and infographs, their judgements were often basic. This was also the case for primary data, where candidates provided some basic comments on their questionnaire findings. Candidates need to consider the relevance of the questions that they are asking in relation to the aims/objectives that they are attempting to meet.

For candidates to be able to achieve Band 3 attainment and upwards, they need to demonstrate a greater level of analysis of their findings and ideally aim to link their primary and secondary findings in order to demonstrate more complex skills

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.

A minority of centres included all of their data analysis in the appendix of their Individual Projects. Presumably this was a strategy to exceed the permitted word-count. A reminder that data analysis forms an integral part of the Individual 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

There was an increasing number of centres that presented samples that contained screenshots of sources which candidates reviewed objectively. This created a 'stilted' style to the Individual Project and did not allow candidates to develop formal writing skills conducive to the requirements of the Individual Project. This approach is not recommended, as it does not allow candidates to successfully synthesise and 'blend' their findings together. Neither does this approach prepare candidates for future study, as it is not a feature of academic writing. Candidates should adopt traditional referencing methods, by either using Harvard referencing techniques or footnotes.

A minority of candidates included sections of work 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 Individual Project). Whilst adhering to the word-count can be a challenge, candidates need to be selective with the content of the Individual Project and ensure that they are not tempted to put too much in the appendix. The appendix should only contain: a single copy of a questionnaire, any workings evidencing data analysis and the self-evaluation, and not whole sections dedicated to primary/secondary findings.

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.

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).

Centres were generally secure in the assessment of this Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 6

Produce and present an outcome

Candidates used some relevant skills and techniques to be able to present their research in an appropriate format and work was generally well organised and well presented.

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 were confident in their Digital Literacy skills in using software to create their Individual Projects.

Less able candidates who submitted written Individual 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.

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 included self-evaluations in this section. A reminder that this Learning Outcome assesses candidates' ability to summarise the key points that have been discovered throughout the Individual Project.

Candidates were often able to secure marks based on the judgements that they made throughout the Individual Project as a whole.

Learning Outcome 8

Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project

This Learning Outcome continued to be an area of strength for centres for this series, with candidates able to access Band 4 attainment with perceptive observations on their performance. Candidates effectively considered the seven skills that are developed throughout the SCC qualification and considered them within the context of the Individual Project (Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Planning and Organisation, Creativity and Innovation and Personal Effectiveness).

Occasionally, candidates tended to describe the sources that were used throughout the Individual Project, rather than to evaluate the process of researching and applying the skill of critical thinking to select appropriate sources.

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The Enterprise and Employability Challenge continues to provide a range of opportunities for candidates to develop enterprising skills and attributes. Candidates continue to demonstrate great enthusiasm and engagement, particularly where there are well-planned opportunities and engaging briefs.

Learning Outcome 1 Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

This Learning Outcome encourages candidates to generate evidence where creativity and innovation has been demonstrated. Candidates need to generate more than one initial idea for an enterprise concept as a group. Where this has been approached effectively, candidates have brainstormed a number of different ideas that would allow them to meet the needs of their chosen brief. This mapping of ideas has then been supported with detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each feasible and realistic idea. A SWOT analysis does allow candidates to move forward with some ideas and reject others.

Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate original thinking when selecting, developing and implementing an idea. Existing products or services should be adapted or developed to appeal to the agreed target audience in line with the chosen brief. The process of developing the chosen idea is an area where many candidates are failing to evidence the process effectively. Where this has been approached successfully candidates have provided diagrams, prototypes and different versions of the final idea.

An area for improvement continues to be the reflection of the process involved in developing a new concept. Where this has been approached successfully candidates have evaluated the process and considered the development of their Creativity and Innovation skills rather than provide a description of the Challenge.

Learning Outcome 2 Understand Personal Effectiveness

This Learning Outcome continues to be a strength, allowing candidates to generate evidence in demonstrating their Personal Effectiveness. Candidates are identifying their skills through completing a skills audit. From this analysis candidates need to identify personal skills and team skills that are strengths and plan for areas of improvement. Many candidates evidenced personal skills, team skills and plan for improvement this series using the results of their skills audits effectively.

Application forms are continuing to be submitted as evidence in demonstrating skills. However, application forms can limit candidates when discussing their skills. This is particularly evident where application forms do not provide or provide limited questions to showcase skills. In most cases, candidates complete an application letter to demonstrate personal skills. Candidates who do this well provide detailed examples to where they have demonstrated both personal and team skills in real life situations. Application letters allow candidates to outline skills in more detail.

Most candidates evidenced the performance of own role and responsibilities, time management and appropriate behaviour through minutes of meetings. Minutes are being used more to evidence progress within the team and specific role. This is allowing candidates to achieve higher marks, particularly when used as part of a review process.

Many candidates are producing reflections based on the development and application of personal and team skills throughout the Challenge. Candidates must ensure these remain the focus of their reflections rather than producing a narrative of their Challenge experience.

Learning Outcome 3

Understand factors involved in an Enterprise and Employability Challenge

This Learning Outcome continues to improve with each series with most candidates demonstrating a clear understanding of the factors involved in developing a business proposal. The inclusion of social media to advertise is increasing, with many candidates demonstrating sound digital skills. Candidates, in particular in the higher mark band, are producing detailed evidence to support the 5 P's within their proposal. Many support decisions with primary and secondary research which allows candidates to provide valid justification for their chosen idea. Centres are engaging with the range of briefs available which provides candidates with a clear focus and target market in most cases.

Candidates are producing varying styles and approaches to the Visual Display which encourages both Creativity and Innovation. Most candidates produce well-structured and creatively developed Visual Displays that engage their audience. Candidates' evidence and Confirmation Statements demonstrate enthusiasm and engagement in the chosen brief. Detailed comments by assessors on the pitch Confirmation Statements support candidates further and justify marks allocated for communication skills.

Global Citizenship Challenge

Candidates are being provided with good opportunities to build knowledge and understanding on a range of global issues. There continues to be a good range in centre selection of global issues, with many centres using more than one Challenge Brief to appeal to their learners. Resource Packs presented are often differentiated in response to learners' needs and this good practice is to be encouraged. Templates can be appropriate for candidates who will achieve marks into the lower bands. However, centres are still reminded that the use of over-prescriptive templates and leading questions will limit accessibility of marks in the higher bands.

The Resource Packs themselves can provide evidence of candidates' Critical Thinking and Problem Solving processes. Although the majority of centres include the Resource Pack in candidates' work, where this is not presented, candidates risk being disadvantaged from achieving higher marks.

This series has seen variation in the quality of Resource Packs presented. Centres are reminded that 4 sources should be used in the Resource Pack, including written sources, numerical data as well as an image. Candidates should also be encouraged to access their own 2 sources to develop alternative opinions, views and arguments. Guidance on what to consider when selecting material for the Resource Pack can be found in the Delivery Handbook on page 23.

In line with the new requirements, many candidates have successfully and effectively written to the 800 word limit for their Personal Standpoint during this series. The skill of analysing

and synthesising information in a succinct manner is a Band 4 skill and there is promising evidence of this being successful.

A varied range of creative outcomes were presented this series, ranging from posters and leaflets to T-shirts, phone-cases and high-visibility jackets. A small number of centres continue to over-assess the development of candidates' final idea and centres are reminded of the need to evidence several stages of creative development in realising the final outcome.

Centres are reminded that the Controls for Task 1 state that candidates should not have access to the Internet. In a small number of centres candidates demonstrate the clear use of copy and paste, which internal assessors are not identifying. Candidates cannot be credited for any work that is not their own.

Learning Outcome 1

Be able to apply Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Overall, candidates demonstrate commendable engagement with the Resource Packs and the global issues studied. Many candidates demonstrate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving through various methods e.g. RURU, COP, PESTLE or PRESTLE and highlighting of sources. It is helpful to the moderation process, if candidates are highlighting, to include a key to show understanding and relevance of the information found. Nearly all centres include evidence of a class discussion having taking place. This is useful in aiding candidates' development and understanding of alternative views and opinions.

Most candidates demonstrate the ability to write detailed Personal Standpoints and significant progress has been made in this area. The most effective candidates are able to use the critical evaluation of the source material, including their annotations and knowledge gained from highlighting factors, and transfer this to the Personal Standpoint. To achieve Band 4 marks, candidates must demonstrate synthesis of their Critical Thinking and Problem Solving skills, with material from the Resource Pack confidently handled in the Personal Standpoint. This includes evidence from the class discussions, as this is at times overlooked.

A few centres are over-assessing Personal Standpoints. In order to be fully effective, Personal Standpoints must reference the source material in detail, relevant PESTLE factors, as well as consider the credibility of sources used, synthesising this information into the Personal Standpoint.

Reflection of the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving process continues to be an area for further development for many centres. The reflection contributes a substantial amount of marks to the Learning Outcome and therefore should not be overlooked. Candidates should be encouraged to reflect on the use and development of their Problem Solving and Critical Thinking skills, rather than a description and recount of the tasks undertaken.

Learning Outcome 2

Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

The majority of candidates are able to generate appropriate and realistic ideas for raising awareness. There has been an improvement this series in centre and candidate

understanding of the need to generate realistic and feasible ideas which can be implemented. There have been excellent examples of concept webs and idea maps, which highlight basic strengths and weaknesses of different methods. Centres must however ensure that candidates consider strengths and weaknesses in detail and depth, in order to achieve higher band marks.

Many candidates' work demonstrated several stages of development in producing their final outcome. This included market research of similar, existing products, mood boards, consideration of image and colour etc. Effective use was also made of peer-feedback where candidates actioned the feedback in a subsequent draft or final design. There is still however, a tendency to over-assess the development of candidates' work and centres are reminded that there must be evidence of several stages of robust development in order to achieve marks in the higher bands.

Reflections on the process involved in developing a raising awareness outcome are, on the whole, of a better quality than reflection on the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving process. There is more evidence of candidates being able to reflect on the processes involved in developing their final outcome. For candidates who have done this effectively and in detail, they have used the information gleaned from peer feedback, as well as their several stages of development, to consider what worked well, how they improved their design and why, as well as any further changes that could be made.

Learning Outcome 3

Understand issues involved in a Global Citizenship Challenge

The majority of centres seem to be most confident in assessing this Learning Outcome for the Global Citizenship Challenge. This element was generally strong with candidates able to demonstrate their understanding and response to the global issues through the viewpoints and opinions offered in the Personal Standpoint. The most effective candidates were able to analyse and synthesise their understanding from the sources, including the PESTLE analysis, into their Personal Standpoints. The ability to synthesise information from the sources and blend them effectively into Personal Standpoints is a Band 4 skill. Where candidates have highlighted and annotated sources with PESTLE but have not been able to transfer this information into their Personal Standpoint, marks for this Learning Outcome will be more limited.

Many candidates also show their understanding of the global issue through the content included in their raising awareness outcomes. This ranges from the text content of bunting, to logos and tag lines used on mobile phone cases, to use of appropriate images on T-shirts. Centres are reminded that candidates should be encouraged to focus on one method for raising awareness only. If candidates choose more than one method, they risk diluting the quality of development that they could demonstrate by using one method only. Centres are also reminded that if candidates copy and paste large amounts of text or infographs from the internet, that this does not demonstrate detailed or effective understanding by the candidate themselves.

A few centres had not included the final raising awareness outcomes of the candidates and where screen-shots had been included these were sometimes of poor quality and unreadable. Centres must ensure that clear evidence of outcomes are provided in order to justify the marks awarded.

Community Challenge

There was clear evidence this series 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. Most centres chose suitable briefs; however in some instances 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 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. Additionally 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, group action 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. 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. The strongest candidates presented 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 allowing candidates to access higher band marks.

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 Personal Digital Record (PDR). When the brief lacked a clear focus, or the activity didn't provide sufficient responsibility candidates were unable to show detailed planning which restricted the marks available.

There were very strong examples of lesson plans with Coaching briefs. Here 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 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. Centres are encouraged to look at the revised Challenge briefs which outline the time which can be allocated to various activities in particular in relation to the Social Welfare briefs. When these were incorrectly implemented candidates are unable to provide sufficiently detailed planning for the higher band marks.

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 reminded 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 and should be marked accordingly.

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 continue to provide candidates with a rigid structure or workbook; although there was evidence of these being used effectively to facilitate Band 1 learners, centres are once again reminded that providing too much structure and templates with leading questions will limit accessibility to higher band marks as they restrict learner response and can lead to work being too similar across candidates. This was once again an issue during this series.

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.

The more able 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.

The more able candidates 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 on 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, the reflection for this Learning Outcome tends to be stronger than 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 continue to be 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 in order to better understand the marks allocated. However these comments 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. This was using individually arranged and annotated photographs along with digital diaries, personalised videos, interviews and blogs. Centres are once again reminded that the record of participation should be collated by the candidate individually 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 PDR's were seen during this series with candidates presenting well-structured work showing evidence of organisation and management by collating the various tasks into a well organised 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.