



National/Foundation Skills Challenge Certificate (Welsh Baccalaureate) Principal Moderators' Report June 2022

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 2022 results

Qualification Wales sent a communication to all centres in October 2021, announcing the following:

‘For summer 2022, we have decided to align with the approach being taken in England, to ensure that learners in Wales are not disadvantaged relative to other learners. That is, to treat 2022 as a transition year to reflect that we are in a pandemic recovery period and learners’ education has been disrupted. In 2022 we will aim, therefore, for results to reflect broadly a midway point between 2021 and 2019. In 2023 we will aim to return to results that are in line with those in pre-pandemic years.’

([gw-cc21-05-e-letter-to-centres-arrangements-for-2022.pdf \(qualificationswales.org\)](#))

It is with this directive in mind that the results for summer 2022 have been generated. Grade boundaries for all four components were adjusted either in January 2022 or June 2022 for results to be in line with Qualifications Wales requirements.

Administration

Entries

June 2022 submissions saw the first summer external moderation series since 2019. As many centres had absent candidates for the January 2022 moderation series, both the Enterprise and Employability Challenge, and the Global Citizenship Challenge had significantly higher entries than was seen in June 2019, with 23,908 and 20,895 respectively. The entries for the Individual Project had parity with the numbers entered in June 2019, at 24,768. Whilst for the Community Challenge, entry numbers were significantly lower than June 2019, with only 2,507 entries. As a result, it was Route A, the combination of the Individual Project, the Enterprise and Employability Challenge and the Global Citizenship Challenge that the vast majority of entries followed to gain the qualification.

Controlled Assessment

Revised controls for assessment continued under the adaptations for 2021-2022. These revised controls remain in place for 2022-2023. 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. The submission of these documents was an issue this series, with a large number of centres uploading candidate work to Surpass, without the vital assessment documentation required.

Submitting Marks

With over 200 centres making entries this summer, a significant number found it difficult to submit marks into the IAMIS system by the required deadline or were unable to meet the deadline date to upload candidate work. Understandably, this was due to the extenuating circumstances that continue to be faced in centres. WJEC appreciated the open lines of communication with these centres who were facing issues, allowing the moderation process to move forward in a timely manner. Another issue this series was a greater number of clerical errors on the system, with individual candidate marks being imputed incorrectly into IAMIS.

Submitting Work using E-Submission

The upload of candidate evidence was well managed by all centres. Understandably, the organisation of candidates' evidence within the uploaded folders was more of an issue than seen during previous series. 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, axles, 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 2022 series saw a large number of entries, compared with the January 2022 series, which was very much expected. The long-lasting impact that the Covid pandemic has had on centres was evident across the samples that were moderated, however centres must be commended on their resilience and immense efforts to ensure that candidates have been able to complete their Individual Projects by the required WJEC deadline.

There was a significant increase in the number of administrative issues (such as clerical errors and missing signatures), although it is recognised that centres may not have been able to implement their usual 'final checks' prior to uploading work, on account of the extraordinary circumstances that centres have found themselves in.

In relation to centre assessment, there were some inconsistencies between assessors. This meant that some mark adjustments needed to be made to individual assessors during the moderation process. These adjustments are clearly referenced on the centre reports. Going forward, it is hoped that the standardisation processes that the majority of centres historically implemented, can be followed more robustly to ensure accurate judgements across all assessors.

It was apparent that teaching and learning programmes may have been disrupted at a number of centres on account of the pandemic – this was evidenced through candidate reflections where they acknowledged missed learning time due to periods of self-isolation.

Despite these challenges, 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, gun-crime laws and the ethics surrounding euthanasia. Other candidates explored topics that related to personal interests and hobbies and a small number of artefacts were also seen during this series.

Centres are reminded about the importance of checking the suitability of a topic/title, to protect not only candidates' well-being, but also the well-being of moderators, who can be exposed to material that can be inappropriate.

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

Effective aims and objectives are pivotal to ensuring the success of the overall Project. Some aims and objectives were a little overly ambitious, which put pressure on candidates in their attempts to work within the perimeters of the word-count of the Project. In contrast, some candidates were a little too simplistic in their aim and objective writing and composed a list of tasks, however, this still allowed candidates to follow an order and logical sequence to achieve generally successful Projects. On the whole, introductions were generally well written and allowed candidates to set the context and purpose of the Project for the reader. On occasion, candidates were generously assessed for this Learning Outcome, especially where candidates were either overly ambitious or where they slipped into referring to research methods.

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

There were a number of candidates who commented generally on their sources rather than specifically linking them to their aims and objectives. Some candidates utilised pre-populated tables that had been issued to them by centres, which were a little limiting and did not allow candidates to think purposefully about their research choices for each specific aim/objective.

There was also a tendency for candidates to divide their rationales into two sections: primary and secondary research and considered them to be two separate entities, rather than intertwining these areas to triangulate 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.

There was some evidence of candidates employing a range of complex sources throughout their Projects, which provided them with detailed and comprehensive material to fulfil their area of research. 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 research. In addition, identifying sources assists to eradicate any potential queries over plagiarism issues.

Centres must ensure that time is spent reminding candidates about the appropriateness of the material that they collect. Candidates should be taught the ethical aspects of primary research; 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) were rarely explored in detail by candidates, or where it was present, comments were a little insecure.

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

This was an area of weakness for this series, possibly on account of lost teaching time within traditional classroom-based settings, where underpinning numeracy skills would have been taught and practised. The pandemic has also made it difficult to implement the innovative ways that centres have addressed this area, by drawing on the expertise from the mathematics department and sharing good practice in relation to numeracy development. On the whole, the analysis of numerical findings was often basic, with candidates presenting information 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. 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.

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

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 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 demonstrated a range of relevant 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 confident in their 'digital literacy skills' by implementing software to create their Projects. Candidates more so now than ever, are accustomed to using digital tools to support their research and study and have adapted well, where technology permits. Less able candidates who submitted 'essay format' 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, whilst others wrote more generally about their overall findings. 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 one has been appropriately evaluated. Candidates were also able to secure marks based on the judgements that they made throughout the Project as a whole, thus achieving additional marks.

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

Some candidates noted the difficult circumstances that surrounded the completion of their Projects as a result of the pandemic, providing an honest and poignant account of the adversity that they had faced. On account of this, both candidates and centres need to be commended for their approach and diligence in ensuring that the work submitted was to a generally good standard.

A reminder that candidates should refer to the seven skills that are developed throughout the Project as a structure to complete this learning outcome successfully: Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Personal Effectiveness, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Creativity and Innovation and Planning and Organisation.

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

General Comments

The purpose of the Enterprise and Employability Challenge is to give candidates opportunities to experience working as a team whilst developing enterprising skills that employers are looking for. Whilst it has been a difficult time during Covid to operate face to face in schools, it is pleasing to see centres who have adapted tasks using virtual platforms and enhanced the digital skills of candidates in keeping with the working world around us.

It is clear that candidates who are provided with real-life scenarios and who carry out the development of a service or product, although not required for assessment purposes, are more engaged in the process. Whilst the candidate booklet has been provided as a structure, candidates should be encouraged to add their own pages and show their creative process rather than carry out tasks in isolation. This series saw an increase in booklets that had been only partially completed with no additional material from the candidate.

The administration aspect was mixed this series with some centres following the guidelines and others using outdated resources or creating their own. It is essential that all centres are aware of updated publications by WJEC; [‘National/Foundation SCC Managing Teaching and Learning’](#), and [‘National/Foundation SCC Managing Assessment’](#), when planning delivery of the course and preparing for assessment. If in doubt, please contact your Regional Support Officer for advice.

Centres should be aware that the adaptations for the Enterprise and Employability Challenge have changed for 2022-2023. Documentation can be found on the WJEC secure website under the heading *‘2022-2023 National/Foundation’* in a zip folder labelled *‘Welsh Bacc 2022-2023 Documents’*. For Task 3, the pitch is once again a requirement for 2022-2023, and the appropriate confirmation statement should also be part of the evidence submitted.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

Generation of multiple ideas continues to be successful across most centres with the most popular method being a mind map. However most candidates hover in Band 2-3 of the assessment grid for this Learning Outcome and fail to access Band 4. This is mainly due to ideas not being realistic or effective. Ideas need to be more than one word with annotations/sketches to accompany the idea. Taking ideas a few steps further before dismissing/choosing it as one of the top ideas would allow candidates to access the higher bands. It is pleasing to see candidates creating their own ideas individually before taking them to a meeting as this helps to spark debate and creativity.

The SWOT task is a strong aspect of this Learning Outcome, and for the most part includes justifications for the chosen idea. However the development of the idea is then somewhat missed, and candidates tend to jump to a finished version and class the 5Ps as the development. Whilst the 5Ps are an integral part of how the idea is developed, to access Bands 3 and 4 candidates need to show how an initial idea has changed, and how the creative process has been applied. Including designs along the way, saying why and how they improved each version following meetings and discussions with the team is largely missing from submissions.

A questionnaire can be part of the process of improving an idea, and most candidates include one in the evidence presented. However, few candidates include an analysis or actually implement any changes following feedback. This could be a focus of a meeting giving the opportunity of a re-draft to adapt to the market/audience and implement creative developments.

Some candidates are choosing images from the internet to show how they want their product to look. Whilst using free copyright images is useful at the start for illustrative purposes and for sharing ideas with the team, they should be accompanied by annotations and additional ideas showing a candidate's creativity. The Challenge is not necessarily about inventing something new, it can be about developing ideas that already exist. There were quite a few entries this year that were images from the internet with nothing more added.

It is difficult for candidates to write a reflection on the process of development if this is missing from the work undertaken as a group. This section of the Learning Outcome is often a description of what happened rather than a balanced evaluation. Some centres are giving leading questions for candidates to answer and restricting the marks. If a candidate is capable of Band 3 and 4 marks, they should be allowed to write freely without prompts.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

The skills audit is generally very successful with most candidates analysing the results and planning improvements. It is good practice to revisit the skills audit at the end of the process to identify improvements and inform the reflection. Unfortunately, there are still examples of candidates applying for a role in the team which has nothing to do with the Challenge. Candidates are required to write a letter of application for their role; however many centres are only including a CV in the format of a form which limits the candidate's ability to explain what skills they have for their chosen role and give examples of where they have used them.

Most candidates now include initials/names on work to show responsibility for tasks completed. As candidates are being assessed on how they carried out their chosen role including time management, behaviours, personal and team working skills, this method of highlighting roles and responsibilities is very helpful during the moderation process to identify individual and team contributions.

More successful candidates included links within the meetings table to show how they actioned points arising, as a result thus evidencing further how they were carrying out their role. When using links it is important to remember to make the shared links accessible. It was noted that some meeting minutes were written retrospectively so were not authentically part of the process.

It was pleasing to see some candidates reflect on how they function as part of a team. However, reflections were largely about what team skills candidates had, and did not reflect how these skills were used during the Challenge and how they had changed/developed as a result.

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

This Learning Outcome continues to be the most successful of the three. Most candidates included prices, information about the product, a loyalty or promotion aspect and who they planned to sell to within their evidence. There were some very good examples of market research in this series, including materials to be used. It is becoming more common for candidates to consider the origin of materials when creating a product such as recyclable items, the impact on environment and carbon neutral considerations. This shows candidates are becoming more attuned to the business environment of today.

Prototypes are an effective way to showcase a product, but there was a decline in the amount seen this series (possibly due to the omission of the pitch as part of the requirements due to the adaptations). Visual displays were largely PowerPoints, with some including excellent examples of using social and electronic media such as video adverts, Tik Toks and Reels as promotion. To access Band 4, candidates need to produce well-structured and creatively developed Visual Displays.

Financial planning remains a weaker aspect of this Learning Outcome, with some costings being unrealistic or plucked out of the air rather than researched figures. Higher band achievers used Excel spreadsheets to display their costs, cashflow or projections. When putting together the business proposal the numeracy aspect is important and should include costs of materials.

Global Citizenship Challenge

General Comment

During this series it was extremely pleasing to see a range of Challenge briefs which provided candidates with the opportunity to respond to a variety of global issues, events and perspectives, including for example, poverty, cultural diversity and nutrition. It is evident that the majority of candidates gained knowledge and values from these global issues at a range of levels, which is to be commended.

Many centres also continued to demonstrate a good and clear understanding of applying the assessment criteria, in particular for Learning Outcome 3.

Consideration has been given both to candidates, as well as centres, for the challenging period during which this Challenge was completed. One noticeable impact of this was the limited evidence of internal standardisation, with several assessors within the same centre assessing work at different levels. In addition to this, this series saw several administration issues, including missing candidate numbers, time-logs not being complete, missing/wrong samples being uploaded and digital links which either did not work or were password protected. Centres are asked to check that all administrative features are correct and present prior to future submissions.

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

Most candidates now appear to be well-used to using and applying Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving tools to the source pack, including highlighting and commenting on PESTLE factors, and annotations about the credibility of sources e.g., RURU. Where this was done effectively it was synthesised into the Personal Standpoint where appropriate. This is also true of the class discussion. Candidates working within the higher bands were able to synthesise others' views and arguments succinctly into the Personal Standpoint. Centres are reminded that source packs should be uploaded with the sample of work as they can provide evidence of candidates' Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving processes. These can be scanned in if candidates have done this by hand, or as comment boxes on digital copies. Where source packs are not uploaded, candidates may be disadvantaged from being awarded marks into the higher bands.

In order for Personal Standpoints to be considered detailed, clear and effective, direct reference must be made to the source material. This should be synthesised into the Personal Standpoint and within the 800-word count limit for this Challenge. Centres are reminded that candidates do not need to refer to every source. However, information from the source material should be selected, where appropriate, in order to demonstrate both the candidate's own opinions, as well as consideration of alternative views and arguments.

The quality of reflections on the Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving process remains an area for improvement for many centres. Candidates must be encouraged to use evaluative language, critically assessing their own strengths and weaknesses for this Learning Outcome e.g., how well they were able to evaluate the credibility of sources, to identify facts and arguments from the source material, and to express their own opinions.

Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

The majority of candidates demonstrated that they were able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their ideas in order to decide which was the most appropriate method to raise awareness. However, in this series many candidates had skipped the initial step of generating multiple ways to raise awareness. In this first step candidates should be encouraged to think of as many realistic and feasible methods as possible to raise awareness, before limiting their analysis of strengths and weaknesses to a few chosen ideas.

The majority of the ideas chosen and justified by candidates were feasible, realistic and ones which the candidates were able to implement. Although most candidates were able to select and implement their idea, there must be evidence of several stages of development in order to achieve marks in the higher bands. In this series there were several examples of candidates producing a draft and a final version of their raising awareness method and being awarded marks into the higher bands. However, this would not provide sufficient evidence of the creative process to justify awarding these marks. In a minority of centres some candidates continued to plan and design ideas that they did not implement e.g., a learning conference, or merchandise. This impacts on the marks awarded for both this Learning Outcome and Learning Outcome 3, as the raising awareness method will not have been implemented or produced.

Reflections on the process involved in developing a new concept continue to be of a better quality than the reflections for Learning Outcome 1. Where this was done effectively, candidates reflected on the several stages and processes of design and development that they went through in order to produce their final raising awareness outcome.

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

This continues to be the most accurately assessed Learning Outcome. Nearly all candidates were able to give their own opinions on the global issues, developing a range of understanding at different levels/bands.

The majority of candidates were able to identify key factors within the global issues covered. Where source packs were submitted, many candidates demonstrated both coverage and understanding of PESTLE factors. Although the work submitted demonstrated that many candidates could accurately identify PESTLE factors, many candidates still did not synthesise coverage of the PESTLE factors into their Personal Standpoint, which limited them from achieving marks into the higher bands.

Some creative outcomes were seen this series, including appropriate Kahoot activities (which had been delivered in school), Top Trumps card activities, as well as visual art displays. This allowed candidates to show how they had developed their creative and innovative skills by presenting their message through their raising awareness outcomes. Some raising awareness outcomes did not contain the appropriate file types that are required for submission to Surpass, namely, a zip file containing mp3, mp4, doc, pdf, xls, ppt, or jpg only. In addition to this, some links which were included within candidates' work were password protected. Centres are asked to ensure that file types comply with the list above, and to check that any links included are able to be opened by moderators.

Some candidates had failed to include their final raising awareness outcome. Where these had not been included, candidates could not be credited with the marks. Relating back to Learning Outcome 2, raising awareness outcomes must be feasible and realistic, so that they can be both developed and implemented by candidates.

Community Challenge

General Comment

Significantly fewer candidates had been entered for this series due the restrictions that have faced centres over the past few years. These restrictions have clearly impacted centres' opportunity to provide purposeful and valuable activities for the Community Challenge. If choosing to complete the Community Challenge as part of the pathway to achieve the qualification, centres are encouraged to carefully consider how they can implement the brief in order to provide ample opportunities for candidates to demonstrate the independence and planning needed for the higher band marks.

Centre planning remains 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 in such a way that the 'doing' aspect is sufficient in time and complexity to allow candidates to present sufficient evidence across all Learning Outcomes. Short activities such as hosting a fundraising stall or activities which involve a high number of candidates such as beach cleans for full cohorts can hinder candidates' ability to demonstrate sufficiently the independence and responsibility needed as part of their planning and organisation.

Centres are encouraged to revisit the assessment grid to ensure that candidates present evidence relevant to the Community Challenge as there were instances where the evidence appeared to be an amalgamation of the Enterprise and Employability Challenge and/or the Global Citizenship Challenge.

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 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 the specification).

Overall centres made successful use of Candidate Booklets however there were examples where the centre had added additional structure which hindered the candidates' ability to demonstrate their digital literacy skills and develop their Personal Digital Record in a creative manner.

Due to the small number of centres who entered candidates for this Challenge, comments on the Learning Outcomes focus mainly on the strengths of evidence presented.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Planning and Organisation

The most successful evidence began with a clear and focused brief allowing the candidates to present appropriate aims and objectives that were relevant to the "doing" aspect of their Challenge. Centres are reminded that the planning and organisation must focus on how candidates intend to deliver their chosen activity.

There were some strong examples of planning when implementing a Coaching brief and candidates were able to show clear monitoring and development as they documented how they carried out each session.

The most successful candidates showed consideration for the various examples of content listed in the specification (page 28) such as targets, required resources, risks, team and individual action plans.

The strongest evidence of monitoring and development was seen through detailed Participation Records where candidates would refer to strengths and any improvements made when implementing their plans.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

Most candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms. The strongest analysis and plans for improvement were clearly related to the candidate's chosen activity.

Those with a detailed Participation Record in which they clearly documented the implementation of their plan were able to demonstrate effective performance of their own role and responsibilities during the activity.

Where candidates were able to carry out a purposeful and valuable activity, they were able to include specific examples of how they have applied various skills during the Challenge within their 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. In a minority of cases this was too generic across candidates as they described the neighbourhood or communities in general and centres are reminded that this should be completed individually with a clear focus on their chosen activity.

Centres are reminded that the Challenge required sufficient hours carrying out the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge through work with or in their chosen community. There was an increase in Social Welfare briefs during this series where candidates were focused more on promotion and/or fundraising which does not fulfil the entirety of the Social Welfare brief requirements. Centres are encouraged to revisit the briefs when planning how to implement the Community Challenge in a way that addresses the criteria and is appropriate for their school setting.

The Participation Record is a key element of the Personal Digital Record and is a source of evidence for each of the Learning Outcomes. This was strongest when candidates clearly documented the implementation of their plan and provided a record of what they personally did during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge using individually arranged and annotated photographs, digital diaries, personalised videos, blogs etc.