



KS4 National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate (Welsh Baccalaureate) Principal Moderators' Report January 2020

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

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

Administration

Entries

The number of entries across all four components once again increased from the previous January series. This is a trend that has been seen year on year, reflecting the continuing progress within centres to effectively manage the administration of the qualification, and utilise both the January and June series for candidate entries. There was a significant increase in the number of candidates entered for the Global Citizenship Challenge. However, there were once again centres who entered candidates but did not submit work for these candidates. Centres are reminded that if entries are not amended before the deadline date, entry fees will still be charged (even if candidates are later withdrawn). Please refer to the Administration Handbook for further guidance and information.

Controlled Assessment

This was the last series where we expect to see the submission of old Assessment Sheets and Declaration/Time Sheets. For the forthcoming summer series, only the new **Candidate Booklets** should be used. Centres must ensure all the relevant information is completed e.g. assessor marks, signatures and date/time of completing the Challenge assessment tasks. For future series, if information is missing, the Centre will be required to upload a fully completed document again via the e-submission system.

Submitting Marks

Centres are requested to ensure that both marks and assessor initials entered into IAMIS are checked before submission. In this series, there were several cases where the assessor initials had been mistyped. This will result in extra candidates being requested in the sample, increasing the sample size, as the candidates will be regarded as having a different assessor.

Submitting Work using e-submission

This was the first series where all four components for the National/Foundation qualification were submitted using the e-submission system. Centres are to be congratulated on how smoothly the upload of candidate evidence was managed in most cases. However, the organisation of candidate evidence was varied across the four components. Both the Enterprise and Employability and Community Challenges saw work being presented by a number of centres as numerous single documents, across several files. 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).

Individual Project

Centres were generally proficient at uploading work using the e-submission method, although there were some instances of missing pages for candidates. There is a reminder for centres to check all of the documentation prior to uploading to Surpass. This is to ensure that any missing pages do not impact on the overall mark that has been awarded to candidates.

Please note that it is not a requirement to include Time Logs for the Individual Project component. Candidates are able to receive formative feedback for drafts of their work, which shouldn't be restricted by 'Time Logs'. It is a concern if centres are limiting this opportunity to candidates, particularly when considering the component weighting of 50%.

Centres allowed candidates to explore a wide range of topics and titles. Whilst candidates are encouraged to take autonomy over their subject choices, there should still be some support provided by assessors to refine specific titles to ensure their suitability. It was identified that some titles were too broad to have been studied successfully in depth.

Learning Outcome 1

Identify the focus and scope of an Individual Project

The importance of writing effective aims and objectives was often overlooked. The aims and objectives underpin the Project as a whole and therefore care and attention must be given to this Learning Outcome. Not all candidates used appropriate action verbs and documented a set of tasks instead.

In contrast, introductions were generally well written and allowed candidates to set the context and purpose of the Project, yet they were unable to secure marks in the 'top band' due to the less effective wording of the aims and objectives. This often meant that candidates were often generously assessed for this Learning Outcome.

Centres are reminded to refer to the Delivery Handbook available from WJEC to support the writing of aims and objectives – there is an extensive list of action verbs that candidates could use to write aims and objectives that could then be set into the context that the candidate has chosen to study.

Learning Outcome 2

Select and plan research methods, resources and materials

There was further improvement in the completion of rationales, which allowed candidates the opportunity to be able to explain how they intended to meet their objectives by referring to their chosen research methods. However, there were still a number of candidates who commented on their use of the 'internet' as a secondary source. This inhibited candidates from accessing the higher mark bands. 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. Candidates often neglected to comment on their primary research, or merely stated that they would complete a questionnaire to obtain data. It would also be useful for candidates to state how they will obtain, collate and handle the data. A broader range of primary research methods would also enhance Projects and allow candidates to triangulate their research more successfully.

The very best rationales were specifically linked to each of the aims and objectives and provided a clear focus on how they would fulfil each of them.

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

The majority of 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. Yet again this series, 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 sources. In addition, identifying sources assists to eradicate any potential queries over plagiarism issues.

Centres must ensure that time is spent in reminding candidates about the ethics of their questionnaire writing, particularly as topics such as 'mental health' are a popular choice of study. The questions that candidates pose are highly sensitive and have the potential to offend, or for disclosures to be made to candidates. Candidates should be taught the ethical aspects of primary research and GDPR guidelines – questionnaire respondents should have reassurance that their personal details will be kept safe and responses anonymised.

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.

Candidates were generally reliant on questionnaires to generate data to meet this Learning Outcome. On the whole, analysis of numerical findings were often basic, with candidates presenting information bar charts/pie charts. 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.

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

Learning Outcome 5

Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints

Many candidates opted to present a source analysis on a range of sources and then to discuss them objectively. This created a 'stilted' style to the 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 referencing techniques such as Harvard or using footnotes.

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). Quite often, there were some basic research notes included, which then 'jumped' to the final outcome, without any evidence of developmental work.

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 by using software to create their Projects.

Less able candidates who submitted written 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 reminder that each aim and objective should be re-visited for this Learning Outcome, to ensure that each has been evaluated. There should not be anything 'new' brought to the conclusion, as it is intended to be a summary of the research and key points that have unfolded throughout the completion of the Project.

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

Learning Outcome 8

Evaluate own performance in managing an Individual Project

Candidates tended to describe the completion process, instead of evaluating their own Personal Effectiveness of the completion process. For this Learning Outcome, candidates are required to consider which of the skills they have developed throughout the course of the Project and to provide examples. Candidates should focus on the skills that are listed in the specification: Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Personal Effectiveness, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Creativity and Innovation and Planning and Organisation.

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The first series of electronic submission for this Challenge has allowed candidates to demonstrate a wide range of Digital Literacy, Innovation and Creativity skills. The 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. More Centers are moving away from generic briefs and are engaging candidates with the WJEC approved briefs, allowing for more innovative and authentic evidence from candidates.

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 explored 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 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 which many candidates are failing to evidence effectively. Where this has been approached successfully candidates have provided diagrams, prototypes and different versions of the final idea. Evidence for the development and the implementation of the idea can also be seen in detailed minutes. Where this has been done effectively, minutes provide a picture of the process the group has gone through from idea generation to final outcome.

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 rather than provide a description of the Challenge. The use of leading questions other than those prescribed in the controlled task can prevent candidates from achieving higher marks. Candidates should be addressing an evaluation of the process involved in developing a new concept for this Learning Outcome.

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. It is important to note that the completion of a skills audit questionnaire is not enough on its own to move up the mark bands. This was still the evidence being presents by some candidates. From the outcomes of the questionnaire, candidates need to identify personal skills and team skills that are strengths, and plan for areas of improvement. Many candidates effectively analysed their skills audits in order to accomplish this. Centres are encouraging candidates to complete skills audits before and after the group process, this is good practice and allows candidates to analyse the skills developed.

Application forms are continuing to be submitted as evidence for highlighting candidates' 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, where candidates complete an application letter to demonstrate personal skills it is more effective than the application forms. 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, which for the majority are only referred to in an application form.

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. The use of questions other than those prescribed in the controlled task can prevent candidates from achieving higher marks. Candidates should be addressing the evaluation on the development and application of personal and team work skills for this Learning Outcome.

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

This Learning Outcome continues to improve each series with most candidates demonstrating a clear understanding of the factors involved in developing a business proposal. More Centres are using the approved briefs available. Where these are approached effectively, groups are generating original and creative ideas.

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 approved 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. Some candidates are submitting videos of their pitch as evidence. This is encouraging the digital literacy skills of candidates and allowing for more authentic evidence to be produced. Most candidates produce well-structured and creatively developed Visual Displays that engage their audience. The quality of photographs of Visual Displays continues to be varied. It is imperative that evidence submitted for external moderation encompasses the whole process in which the group has been through. Candidate 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

Centre assessment of the Global Citizenship Challenge was generally more mixed for this series, with many centres assessing candidates above the level of work presented. Centres are reminded that the guidance given by the moderators in previous centre moderation reports must be taken into consideration and acted upon in the subsequent series. Centres must also ensure that robust standardisation takes place within centres so that all assessors are assessing work to the same level.

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

The majority of centres presented well-planned source packs with 4 sources including written information, numerical data and images. These were often differentiated in response to learners' needs. Candidates responded well to the source packs, demonstrating good problem solving and decision-making techniques through annotation and highlighting of sources. Various techniques were again seen this series, including PESTLE, RURU and CRAAP. A minority of centres are reminded of the need to upload candidates' source packs as they can often contribute significant marks to this Learning Outcome.

Some centres successfully adhered to the 800-word count control, with candidates able to skilfully synthesise information in a succinct manner. However, many candidates across whole centres had written in excess of the word limit, some writing 3000-4000 words. Centres are reminded that if candidates' Personal Standpoints are substantially over the permitted word count, they cannot be considered effective and therefore would not be able to access marks at the top end of Band 4. It is worth noting that candidates do not have to mention every source, including their credibility, or every PESTLE factor found in the source packs. In order for the Personal Standpoint to be both detailed and effective the candidate should carefully choose the relevant information from sources, consider their credibility where relevant, and include PESTLE factors as and when they support or contrast with their standpoint.

The most effective Personal Standpoints included information which had direct reference to the sources. However, this series many candidates had presented a Personal Standpoint that lacked any reference to the source pack at all. Candidates should also be encouraged to blend information gained from class discussions into their Personal Standpoint, where relevant.

Reflection on the Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving process continues to be an area for further development and should not be overlooked. Candidates must be encouraged to reflect on and evaluate the Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving process, including, but not limited to, how well they were able to identify and develop arguments, take into account opposing views and consider validity and reliability etc.

Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

The majority of candidates demonstrated the ability to generate multiple ideas for raising awareness, including consideration of strengths and weaknesses. However, some candidates had not included this initial step in their evidence for task 2. The majority of the ideas generated were realistic, however some candidates continue to include ideas that would not be feasible for them to implement.

This series has seen many centres over-assessing this learning outcome. Centres must ensure that every sentence of the learning outcome is addressed, in particular, the need for ideas to be developed. Where candidates have produced an initial draft and a final version only, they are restricted from achieving marks into the higher bands. The most effective evidence of development is seen when candidates clearly develop their original idea e.g. research on the strengths and weaknesses of existing products from the candidates chosen idea, mood boards, first drafts, peer feedback which is actioned to produce another draft, before a final outcome is produced. If candidates completely change their design from first draft to a final version without justification, the development of their idea is unclear. Development should build on the initial design idea, demonstrating growth and justifying/explaining any changes made.

A few centres had included evidence of retrospective development, with candidates including comments on their final version about how they had developed their idea. If work is presented in this way, there must be evidence of those several stages of development (e.g. rough drafts, consideration of image, colour etc.) so that the design process is evident. Where this was not present, it prevented candidates from achieving marks into the higher bands.

Reflection on the process involved in developing a new concept was generally of a better quality than reflections on the Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving process. Many candidates were clearly able to reflect and evaluate on the process of developing their idea. This was most effective in centres where candidates had demonstrated several stages of development, as they were able to reflect on the design process and consider how and why they had changed and developed their idea, leading to their final raising awareness outcome.

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

Again, in this series the majority of centres were the most confident in assessing this Learning Outcome. The majority of centres appropriately assessed candidates' understanding of the global issues covered, with many candidates demonstrating detailed and effective understanding.

Many candidates are now writing Personal Standpoints which synthesise relevant PESTLE factors, evidencing higher level skills in doing so. Where candidates had not synthesised PESTLE factors into their standpoint, but had annotated the factors in the source pack, or included additional notes, centres had mostly assessed this appropriately.

There was a pleasing range of outcomes in this series, including animations, videos and resources produced for teaching PSE. Centres are encouraged to continue to inspire creativity in their learners, producing a whole range of outcomes. A minority of centres had included evidence of designing a range of raising awareness merchandise, but these had not been produced e.g. hoodies, pens and memorabilia. Centres are therefore reminded that outcomes must be produced by candidates otherwise this will limit their marks for this Learning Outcome.

Community Challenge

There was clear evidence that many centres are able to provide purposeful and valuable activities which give ample opportunity for candidates to demonstrate the independence and responsibility needed to achieve at 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.

Centre planning is key to ensure the Community Challenge is a success and consideration is needed on how chosen briefs can be implemented within the individual school's setting. 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 once again 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 continue to allow candidates to undertake their chosen activity as a pair which isn't in line with the specification which indicates that the size of the team must be 3 to 6 members.

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). Centres are advised that where evidence is deemed as too similar or identical in nature it can result in work being ineligible for assessment or to investigations of malpractice by the centre.

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 alongside the Confirmation Statement 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 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 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 effective 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 as when incorrectly implemented candidates are unable to provide sufficiently detailed planning for the higher band marks. Taking part in activities such as a sponsored run or hosting a stall at a school fair for the third part of the requirements didn't allow sufficient opportunity "to work with or in the community" as is noted in the specification.

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 shooting at the goal", "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.

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.

There was once again evidence of centres using rigid structures and workbooks successfully to assist candidates to achieve band 1 marks. However, some centres continue to provide too much structure to all candidates which include templates with leading questions which limits accessibility to higher band marks as they restrict learner response.

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. 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

All candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms, but centres are once again reminded that it is the analysis of results that allows candidates to achieve higher marks. Presenting a computer-generated audit alone isn't sufficient.

Strongest 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 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.

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 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.

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 the majority 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 they continue to be completed incorrectly. 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 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 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 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 well organised portfolio of evidence making use of hyperlinks or embedded images.