National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate (Welsh Baccalaureate) Principal Moderators' Report

June 2023

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

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

Context for Summer 2023 results

Qualification Wales sent a communication to all Centres in September 2022, announcing that the approach to grading in summer 2023 would be to achieve a broadly midway point between the 2019 and 2022 results.

([letter-to-centres-sept-oct-final-eng.pdf (qualificationswales.org](#))

It is with this directive in mind that the results for summer 2023 have been generated. Grade boundaries for all four components were adjusted in January 2023 for results to be in line with Qualifications Wales requirements.

Administration

Entries
Entry numbers for summer 2023 returned to reflect pre 2020 numbers, with the Community Challenge being the exception. For the Individual Project, 192 Centres made entries, numbering 25,490 candidates. For the Enterprise and Employability Challenge and the Global Citizenship Challenge, Centre entries were 149 and 156 respectively, with a combined candidate entry of 32,852. Therefore, Route A was the most popular route chosen by Centres, with 20,384 candidates achieving the qualification this summer via this route. It is pleasing to note that entries for the Community Challenge increased from 28 Centres in summer 2022 to 57 Centres this summer. Centres seemed to be using this component this series for specific groups of learners within their full cohort, as 25 of the 57 Centres entered candidate entries of 10 or less in number. For this Challenge, candidate entries were 3,609. 2,759 candidates achieved the qualification following Route B this summer, combining the Individual Project with the Enterprise and Employability Challenge and the Community Challenge. Route C, the combination of the Individual Project, the Global Citizenship Challenge and the Community Challenge was the least popular route, with 1808 candidates achieving the qualification with this combination of components.

Centres are reminded that the revised specification published in November 2022 requires entries for two of the three Challenge components, along with the Individual Project for future awarding of this qualification.

Controlled Assessment

Revised controls for assessment continued under the adaptations for 2022-2023. These adaptations have now been adopted within the revised specification and will remain the requirements going forward. Centres are reminded that they must use the updated controlled assessment documentation to record candidate marks, assessor and candidate signatures and the time management of the Challenges. These can be found on the Secure website.

Submitting Marks

The majority of Centres are to be congratulated on submitting marks into the IAMIS system by the required deadline dates, which allowed the moderation series to move forward in a timely manner. This series did see some Centres requesting extensions to submit marks beyond the deadline date, due to the extenuating circumstances faced within those Centres.

Submitting Work using E-Submission

The upload of candidate evidence was well managed by all Centres. However, the organisation of candidates' evidence within the uploaded folders was an issue for some Centres. For future series, Centres are reminded that the e-Submission guidance document requests the use of a single zipped file labelled with the candidate's name and number, containing a maximum of six documents of file types that are accepted (mp3, mp4, doc, pdf, xls, ppt and jpeg). Further guidance on uploading work and using the system can be found by visiting WJEC's e-Submission webpage.

Individual Project

General Comments

The summer 2023 series saw a large number of entries from Centres, which was very much expected based on the number of submissions in January 2023.

There were a number of administrative issues (such as clerical errors and missing marks on assessment sheets and missing signatures), whereby Centres do not seem to have implemented 'final checks' prior to uploading work.

The internal standardisation of work is a critical process for Centres, to ensure accurate judgements across all assessors. There is clearly expertise within Centres in relation to teaching and learning for this component, along with confident assessment within the majority of Centres. However, there was a minority of Centres where there were inconsistencies between assessors, and their application of the assessment grid.

Centres have continued to support candidates to achieve good quality outcomes and encouraged them to explore a wide range of topics and titles. Candidates engaged with topics that were of personal interest to them, such as: the impact of social media on young people, mental health and effective links were made to candidates' desired careers. Other candidates explored topics that related to personal interests and hobbies and a small number of artefacts were also seen during this series.

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

Strengths
- Candidates were clearly encouraged to investigate topics that were of personal interest to them, and a wide array of interesting subjects were explored across the series as a whole. This motivated candidates to follow the process of undertaking a piece of research, regardless of their ability.
- Introductions provided a useful context for the Project and generally candidates successfully provided an overview of their topic choice, whether that was to further inform knowledge in relation to progression to higher level study, or due to personal interests.
- Well-written aims and objectives provided a clear direction for the Project and were clearly linked to their overall titles. This led to the most successful outcomes.

Areas for Improvement

- Some candidates were too brief in their aim and objective writing, and this had an impact on the success of the overall Project. Taking time to craft and refine the aims and objectives has a positive impact on the completion of the Project, as it provides an effective structure for the candidate to follow.
- Some candidates selected aims that were too broad, which did not allow them to work within the perimeters of the word-count of the Project.
- Candidates should avoid referring to the research methods in their aims and objectives, as these elements are assessed in a different Learning Outcome. A reminder that additional guidance on using appropriate action verbs can be found in WJEC guidance.

Learning Outcome 2 – Select and plan research methods, resources and materials

Strengths

- The most effective rationales were detailed and effective and clearly indicated the planning decisions of the candidates. The most able candidates took the opportunity to employ effective research methods, resources and materials that were intrinsically linked to the aims and objectives and supported the development of the Project.

Areas for Improvement

- Some candidates utilised pre-populated tables that had been issued to them by Centres, which were often limiting and did not allow candidates to think purposefully about their research choices for each specific aim/objective.
- Some candidates divided their rationales into two sections: primary and secondary research and considered them to be two separate entities, rather than intertwining these areas to consolidate findings.
- A broader range of primary research methods would further enhance Projects, as candidates were reliant on questionnaires to fulfil this element of the criteria.

Learning Outcome 3 – Select, collate, reference and assess the credibility of information and numerical data.

Strengths

- There was some evidence of candidates identifying and selecting a wide range of complex sources throughout their Projects, that provided them with detailed and comprehensive material to fulfil their area of research.
- Some candidates demonstrated the ability to summarise complex sources such as Government policies and strategies, allowing them to showcase their critical thinking skills.

Areas for Improvement

- Referencing skills were not always effective, which made it difficult for moderators to ascertain where information had been obtained from. Centres should be reminding candidates of the importance of citing their sources, to allow them to be duly awarded for including their research. In addition, identifying sources assists to eradicate any potential queries over plagiarism issues.
- Candidates should be taught the ethical aspects of primary research as part of a programme of teaching and learning; questionnaire respondents should have reassurance that their personal details will be kept safe, and responses anonymised in line with GDPR requirements.
- Consideration of the credibility of sources (currency, reliability and validity) was present throughout the series, although often these references were limited and insecure.

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

Strengths

- Generally, only a minority of candidates were able to provide a detailed analysis of the numerical data that they collected and demonstrate appropriate use of digital skills to present the data.
- The most successful Projects in regard to this Learning Outcome were achieved when candidates collected primary data that was relevant and meaningful to the Project title and was not "bolted on" as a means to meet the criteria.

Areas for Improvement

- Evidently centres are attempting to restore the numeracy skills of candidates which has been affected by "lost learning" due to the pandemic, although this is clearly an area for development as we recover from disruption to learning. On the whole, the analysis of numerical findings was often basic, with candidates presenting information using bar charts/pie charts. Candidates were not always secure in their analysis of the charts/graphs and often repeated what was often obvious from the chart itself.
- Candidates must ensure that they 'tie in' and link the findings of the charts/graphs to the aim/objective and ensure relevance to the topic and consider whether questions regarding age or gender are in fact relevant to the Project title.
- Candidates should also be encouraged to think about whether their findings correspond to their secondary research, or in fact, oppose it. This in turn, would allow candidates to demonstrate a more complex level of skill.
- Candidates must ensure that the graphs that they select to display their findings are appropriate and fit for purpose in conveying results. Furthermore, the axes should be checked for appropriateness and graphs and charts should be clearly labelled.
- A minority of Centres awarded marks to candidates where there was no evidence of numerical data having been collected.

Learning Outcome 5 – Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints

Strengths

- Candidates were generally able to provide a detailed synthesis and analysis of the information that they included, with confident candidates providing a wide range of viewpoints to produce well-balanced final pieces.
- Candidates were able to demonstrate a good level of knowledge and understanding, even when synthesis and analysis was lacking, which was due to candidates generally being able to select their own topics of interest.

Areas for Improvement

- Less able candidates might be more confident to tackle the demands of the Projects if they were offered the opportunity to complete an artefact, rather than a written Project, which some candidates clearly find challenging. The synthesis in relation to artefacts refers to the 'pulling together of ideas' and 'idea development', when working towards completing an outcome.

Learning Outcome 6 – Produce and present an outcome

Strengths

- Candidates demonstrated a range of relevant skills (notably digital skills) and techniques to be able to present their research in an appropriate format and work was generally well organised and presented a final outcome that on the whole, addressed the Project aims.
- Candidates were generally successful in producing a final outcome that addressed their initial Project aims that were established at the start of the process.

Areas for Improvement

- As mentioned in Learning Outcome 5, Centres could offer less able candidates the opportunity to complete artefacts, who might find this format more accessible to them, as it can focus on more practical skills, rather than academic. In some instances, written Projects were incomplete.

Learning Outcome 7 – Make judgements and draw conclusions

Strengths

- The majority of candidates provided evidence-based comments in relation to their findings, demonstrating their ability to summarise information.
- The most successful candidates were able to provide evaluative comments, rather than describing what was discovered, or providing opinion-based comments.
- Candidates were also able to secure marks based on the judgements that they made throughout the Project as a whole, thus achieving additional marks.

Areas for Improvement

- A minority of candidates had difficulty in providing judgements and conclusions. A helpful approach is for candidates to consider each aim and objective in turn, which then allows a structure to be able to complete this Learning Objective successfully.

Learning Outcome 8 – Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project

Strengths

- Some candidates were able to demonstrate some highly detailed and well-reasoned reflections in their performance throughout the completion of the Project, with coverage of all of the skills that are developed: Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Personal Effectiveness, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Creativity and Innovation and Planning and Organisation.

Areas for Improvement

- Some candidates produced work in this section that would have been better evidenced in Learning Outcome 7, as it referenced the findings of the research, rather than containing reflective comments on the actual process of planning and completing the Project.

8

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

General Comments

Many Centres are making positive use of the Candidate Booklets provided by WJEC and this helped to support candidates to 'store and showcase' their evidence in a logical and structured way. However, there are a few Centres continuing to use their own 'booklets' which include prompts, leading questions and limiting templates, restricting candidates in the evidence they are producing. Alongside the Candidate Booklet that has been provided as a structure, candidates should be encouraged to add their own additional pages of evidence and showcase their creativity. As highlighted in the previous Principal Moderator report there were a number of booklets that had not been fully completed and candidates did not provide any additional supporting material as evidence.

Many candidates are making use of tools such as CANVA, Google Slides Presentations, Padlets and Jamboards to show evidence of collaboration and creativity and this is encouraging to see.

The administration during this series varied greatly. Some Centres followed the WJEC guidelines and used the correct documentation whilst others used Candidate Assessment Booklets that were out of date. This must be addressed by Centres. Co-ordinators are reminded to check that the correct Candidate Assessment Booklets are used as this highlights the correct timings for each task which is essential as part of the Candidate Time Log. For example: Task 2 is a total of 10 hours and not 17 hours. Centres must also ensure that marks for each Learning Outcome and the overall total of all Learning Outcomes are included on the front page of the Candidate Assessment Booklets before uploading to Surpass.

There are still issues that need to be addressed with the administration involved in uploading the work to Surpass, despite this being highlighted in previous Principal Moderator reports. For these Centres, it is still common to see vast numbers of documents per candidate, rather than collating the evidence into a more manageable number of documents or one full document before uploading the folder.

The internal standardisation within Centres remains a strength of this component, however for a minority this is still an issue. It is important that all assessors are clear on the different band requirements and are part of an internal standardisation process to understand the standards. There are training videos provided by WJEC on the Secure Website to assist Centres with this process.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

Strengths

- In Centres where ideas generation had taken place individually and in groups there were multiple ideas identified and these ideas were assessed for their strengths and weaknesses.
- The most successful Enterprise Challenges provided examples of the development of an idea which was clearly selected and included sketches at different stages to evidence the process. Candidates are not being assessed on their artistic ability, but the creative process of idea development, which is required to achieve the higher bands. Digital drawings are starting to be more common with candidates using devices and styluses.
- The SWOT task as mentioned in previous reports remains a strong aspect of this Learning Outcome, and most candidates included justifications for the chosen idea. There was also evidence of RAG rating being used as a method of selection. Task 2a requires individuals to undertake research of the Challenge Brief and develop their own ideas for a product or service to put forward to the team and this process can be evidenced in the minutes of meetings.
- Where candidates decided as a group their top three or four ideas and considered in detail the strengths and weaknesses of their ideas there was a better opportunity for reflection of the process involved in developing a new concept. This is a vital component of this Learning Outcome.
- Where candidates had chosen a service, it was pleasing to see that not only had some considered development of a logo but approached it from a branding angle. This included consideration to packaging, colour palette, typography, website, and social media - all with the target audience in mind.

Areas for Improvement

- Some of the ideas chosen were not realistic, feasible or effective in the time allocated to the task and as a result these candidates were unable to access Band 3 and 4. Many were able to select the idea but there is a lack of development of this. There should be more than one word with annotations/sketches to accompany the idea to demonstrate its development. Comments on the aesthetics, materials, size, safety and sustainability of the product are worth consideration at this stage.
- Whilst the task doesn't require candidates to invent a brand-new concept, combination and development of ideas as well as imagination and initiative are part of the creativity and innovation aspect. This could include personalisation or a unique selling point. Creation of a prototype can help identify design faults and help further develop an idea. This was an area of weakness in this series for many Centres.

- The reflection of the Learning Outcome is often a description of what happened rather than a balanced evaluation of the process involved in developing a new concept. Some Centres are giving leading questions and providing templates for candidates to answer. Although suitable for Level 1 candidates these templates will restrict candidates from accessing Band 3 and 4. Centres are to be aware of the publications from the WJEC Secure Website under the heading '2022-2023 National/Foundation' labelled 'Reflection tasks across the Challenges'. This provides access to a presentation and video to support Centres with this requirement.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

Strengths

- The skills audit was generally successful with most candidates using and analysing the results to plan improvements. The most successful candidates revisited the skills audit at the end of the process to identify improvements and develop the reflection.
- The letter of application was on the whole well written detailing personal skills. For Level 1 candidates it is appropriate to give further support framework for this. Where a CV was also included this strengthened evidence of where personal skills were being identified.
- Where candidates are using their personal skills audits to choose the most appropriate team to work with, there is better evidence of personal skills matching appropriate team roles and responsibilities. Where team skills are then considered this helps to ensure that candidates can contribute their best when working collaboratively.
- In some Centres in this series, it wasn't always clear what the candidate had done to carry out their role. However, as mentioned in previous Principal Moderator reports annotations from the assessor continue to be very helpful. Some group work can look impressive, but not all members of the team will have contributed equally. Annotation from the assessor who is in the classroom shared with the moderator who is evaluating the Centres ability to apply the assessment criteria, continues to be good practice and valuable during the moderation process.

Areas for Improvement

- As mentioned in the January 2023 report auto generated skills audits can be used, however, candidates are still providing extensive screenshots of every page to evidence this has been carried out. Some Centres used the auto generated skills audits as the only evidence provided without any analysis of the strengths and weaknesses. The Enterprise Catalyst tool and Careers Smart audit were poorly used by candidates in some Centres.

- The evidence of meetings being carried out between team members was a weakness in this moderation series. Minutes are a valuable way to be able to provide evidence of Personal Effectiveness. It is important that a minimum of three meetings are carried out. Templates can be used to evidence the discussions that have taken place between team members, using the one in the Candidate Booklet, or candidates can create these templates themselves, to suit their needs or access a wide range of templates available electronically. Candidates should be bringing ideas and points to discuss to the meetings and individual candidates should be named in the minutes with dates and notes showing clearly what needs to be actioned by each member of the team. It is important that candidates then carry out what is actioned to them and can evidence what they have completed. Often in the minutes, comments were vague and brief, with no further evidence to show what the individual had done to undertake their role or responsibility to meet the requirements of the higher assessment bands. How minutes are recorded and revisited at the start of the next meeting is an area to focus on to improve the evidence produced for this Learning Outcome.

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

Strengths

- For the majority of Centres this continues to be the strongest Learning Outcome. Where Centres encourage candidates to create a Visual Display in the form of a presentation and also include a written script, mood board, photographic evidence etc this helps to support both this Learning Outcome as well as providing evidence of a candidate's individual role and responsibility. This is clear evidence of Personal Effectiveness.
- The concept of the 5 P's is clearly being covered effectively in many teaching and learning programmes as there is good evidence of aims, objectives and details of the product, price, target market and promotional materials being included in the evidence provided by candidates. Higher band achievers used spreadsheets with charts to represent their findings and to display their costs, cashflow or projections. Some candidates are also making good use of digital skills to promote products and services and creativity is clearly demonstrated through the use of social media accounts, short advertisements, and websites.

Areas for Improvement

- Some Centres are continuing to omit any evidence of a Pitch as part of Task 3. The Visual Display, supported by a script, prompt cards, photographic evidence etc is a requirement of this Learning Outcome. Many Centres are providing a Confirmation Statement to say that a Pitch has taken place, but the candidate is not providing any evidence to support this. The Confirmation Statement on its own is not sufficient evidence.
- To achieve the higher band for Learning Outcome 3, candidates need to show a well-structured and creatively developed Visual Display. This is an area where candidates should take the opportunity to show further creativity. Candidates should be encouraged to explore a range of apps or software to create engaging Visual Displays that will capture the attention of their audience.
- Cost analysis remains the weaker area in the Visual Display with candidates not researching costs correctly or producing unrealistic figures for materials or services.
- The use of questionnaires as part of market research are now commonplace. However, often adequate analysis of the data/results is not carried out. It is how the information is used to drive the design / concept / advertising forward that is important, and this is often missing.

Global Citizenship Challenge

General Comment

This series saw a very good range of global issues studied by candidates including the refugee crisis, extremism, single-use plastics, and gender inequality etc. In general, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of these global issues. Whilst most Centres included the source pack in the sample of work uploaded, some Centres did not and of those that did, they very often included more than 4 sources. Centres are encouraged to check the most up-to-date requirements for the Challenge, which stipulate that there should be 4 sources in total. This can also be found on page 9 of the 'Managing Assessment: Teacher Handbook 2'.

Where candidates work had been well organised, these were zipped into 1 folder and either contained separate folders, clearly labelled as Task 1, Task 2, and Task 3, or had been submitted as 1 document e.g., a PDF. This greatly facilitates the moderation process.

Centres should ensure that the new Candidate Assessment booklets are used, which can be downloaded from the WJEC Secure Site. These include the revised time controls which must be adhered to. Many Centres are continuing to use previous versions of this.

When using the Candidate Booklets to demonstrate candidates' understanding and knowledge through the 3 Learning Outcomes, Centres do need to ensure that the booklet is used as a guide, with a basic layout. Centres, and candidates, are encouraged to change the layout of the booklet to suit their needs, including adding extra pages, orientation, tables, images etc. Where this is not done, some candidates' creativity and innovation risk being constrained.

If candidates include links to digital productions to showcase their creativity and innovation within their booklets, Centres are reminded of the need to check that the links will open for the moderator. There were several issues with this during this series.

Although there was some evidence of internal standardisation, this was only found in a minority of Centres. Centres must ensure that a robust process and system of internal standardisation takes place so that all assessors fully understand the requirements of each Learning Outcome.

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

Strengths
- Many candidates demonstrated effective problem-solving and decision-making techniques through use of various tools e.g., highlighting of PESTLE factors, RURU annotations, text-boxes, tables and grids etc.
- Nearly all candidates had written a Personal Standpoint which demonstrated understanding of the global issue being studied.

14

- Many candidates had included evidence of having taken part in a class discussion, which helped their understanding of alternative opinions, views, and arguments.

Areas for Improvement
- Where source packs had not been included in the sample of work presented, or where the quality of the photographed/scanned in work was poor, candidates may have been disadvantaged from achieving higher marks, as this can show evidence of their problem-solving and decision-making processes.
- Some candidates failed to make reference to the source pack at all, or very minimally. Therefore, candidates could not demonstrate effective consideration of the credibility of sources, or PESTLE factors, or synthesise these into their Personal Standpoint.
- For candidates who had not annotated their source pack, or taken part in a classroom discussion, the quality of their reflection for this Learning Outcome was weaker, as they could not refer to the critical thinking and problem-solving processes involved in writing a Personal Standpoint.

Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

Strengths
- Nearly all candidates were able to consider the strengths and weaknesses of ideas for raising awareness. Many candidates also included a SWOT analysis which can demonstrate effective evidence applying creative and innovative skills.
- The majority of candidates selected appropriate and feasible ideas for raising awareness.
- The majority of candidates implemented their ideas for raising awareness.
- Candidates' reflection for this Learning Outcome continues to be more effective that their reflections for Learning Outcome 1. Where this is done well, candidates are able to reflect upon several stages of developing their idea.

Areas for Improvement
- Many candidates had omitted the first step in generating multiple ideas for raising awareness, prior to considering their strengths and weaknesses. This is an important first step in the creative and innovative process and candidates should be encouraged to think of as many creative ideas as feasibly possible.
- Some candidates were only able to consider basic strengths and weaknesses of their ideas for raising awareness. Centres are encouraged to ensure that this requirement of the Learning Outcome is completed in sufficient depth and detail.
- Although some candidates demonstrated several stages of developing their idea, this was inconsistent across Centres. Candidates must show evidence of several stages of development in order to achieve marks in the higher Bands. A draft and a final outcome will not be sufficient for this. Development could include action plans, mood boards, mind-maps, photos of pack in action, peer reviews, first and second drafts, as well as feedback from stakeholders etc.

15

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

Strengths
- Nearly all candidates were able to show understanding of the global issue they had studied, either through their raising awareness outcome, their Personal Standpoint, or both.
- Many candidates were able to identify PESTLE factors from their source pack, where these had been presented. The most effective Candidates were also able to synthesise their PESTLE annotation into their Personal Standpoints.
- A range of creative outcomes was seen in this series, including posters, digital games, SWAY presentations, songs and raps, as well as artwork.

Areas for Improvement
- In order to achieve marks into the top Bands, candidates must demonstrate the ability to synthesise their PESTLE analysis into their Personal Standpoints.
- Where candidates had produced an outcome that was visual e.g., a poster, Centres are requested to upload these in colour so that the quality of the final outcome can be moderated appropriately. Likewise, if candidates have produced a presentation, Centres are requested to upload these as a presentation instead of a series of screenshots, as candidates may have included animations etc, which otherwise cannot be seen.
- Some Centres had over-assessed the quality of the final outcomes in this series. Centres are reminded that to justify marks into the top Bands, outcomes must be appropriate and of good or high quality.

Community Challenge

General Comment

There was clear evidence that several Centres are able to provide purposeful and valuable activities which provide ample opportunity for candidates to demonstrate the independence and responsibility needed to achieve the highest band marks. The evidence presented showed that candidates that had fully engaged with the Challenge and were able to complete each of the necessary tasks to provide the necessary evidence across all Learning Outcomes.

Centre planning remains key to ensure that the Community Challenge is a success and careful consideration is needed on how chosen Briefs can be implemented within the individual school's setting. The vast majority of Centres chose a suitable brief however the way they are implemented by a small number 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. Those choosing to adopt a Coaching or Neighbourhood Enhancement Brief tended to be more successful during this series. In some instances, those following a Social Welfare Brief tended to be too focused on the raising awareness or fundraising with insufficient time allocated to actively supporting their chosen charity.

Centres are reminded that although the activity itself can be carried out as a team, the majority of evidence will be completed individually. With the exception of task 2 (e.g. risk assessments, resources, group action plans etc.) there must be individuality in the evidence presented across all other tasks. Centres are advised that where evidence is deemed too similar or identical in nature it can result in work being ineligible for assessment.

Many Centres provided appropriate and relevant annotation and the most accurate assessment was seen by centres when all criteria of the Learning Outcomes were clearly applied to the evidence. Centres are reminded that only the evidence presented by candidates can be considered for assessment.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Planning and Organisation

Strengths

- The most successful work began with a clear and focused Brief allowing 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.

17

- There were once again 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 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.
- 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.

Areas for Improvement

- 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 evidence they plan to collect as part of their Personal Digital Record. When the Brief lacked a clear focus or the activity didn't provide a 'doing' activity with sufficient time or responsibility, candidates were unable to show detailed planning and restricted the marks available.
- 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 as when incorrectly implemented candidates are unable to provide sufficiently detailed planning for the higher band marks. Only taking part in activities such as a sponsored run or hosting a stall at a school fair didn't allow sufficient opportunity "to work with or in the community" as is noted in the specification.
- 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 shooting", "work with pupils" 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.
- Some candidates continue to describe the activity as opposed to provide evaluative comments on the planning process itself which again hinders the marks available.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

Strengths
- All candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms and those achieving highest band marks completed detailed analysis. The 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.
- The reflection for this Learning Outcome tends to be stronger than Learning Outcome 1. Use of examples to illustrate and justify how they applied and developed the skills allowed candidates to reach the higher bands.

Areas for Improvement
- Presenting a computer-generated skills audit alone didn't allow candidates to assess the "strengths and weaknesses of personal and teamwork skills relevant to the Challenge".
- Descriptive reflections where candidates merely identify the skills tended to be limited or basic only.

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

Strengths
- 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 or the activity in relation to their chosen community.
- The majority of candidates were provided with the opportunity to complete sufficient hours carrying out the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge through working with or in the community and the evidence showed good engagement in the activities undertaken.
- Most Centres provided a confirmation statement for each candidate with many including valuable supportive comments as well as choosing the statement that best reflected the candidates' performance during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge.
- The Participation Record is a key element of the Personal Digital Record where candidates document the implementation of their plan and show what they personally did during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge. The strongest evidence showed candidates collating and organising their evidence creatively and individually with good use of annotated photographs and digital diaries seen across Centres.

19

- The most effective use of Candidate Booklets was seen where Centres encouraged candidates to personalise it and create their own Personal Digital Record of the Challenge.

Areas for Improvement

- In a minority of cases the consideration of purpose and benefits was very generic across candidates and Centres are reminded that this element should be completed individually. Candidates are not required to describe the meaning of a community in general or explore the various communities open to them as this isn't included as part of the assessment criteria.
- In some cases, a Confirmation Statement was provided by the Centre but was completed incorrectly. The assessor would choose all statements as opposed to the one that best reflected the candidates' performance during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge.
- The Participation Record is a key element of the Personal Digital Record as it is a source of evidence for each of the Learning Outcomes. In a minority of instances candidates focused on documenting their preparatory tasks as opposed to what they did during the 'doing' aspect of the Community Challenge. Centres are reminded that the record of participation should be collated by the candidate individually and generic photographs or videos are not sufficient for higher band marks.
- Although Candidate Booklets are a useful way of providing clear structure for candidates to present their evidence, some Centres added additional structure which hindered candidates' ability to demonstrate their digital literacy skills and develop their Personal Digital Record in a creative manner. When the Centre provides too much structure the candidates are unable to reach the higher band marks as they are not able to show effective organisation, storage and management in how they collate their evidence individually.