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

January 2018

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

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

Administration

Entries

- Centres are expected to withdraw candidates who do not submit any work for a component.

Submitting Marks

- Centres are reminded that when entering marks that 'A' should be entered for a candidate who does not submit any work for assessment.
- Centres are reminded that only if work is submitted for assessment but is found to not be worthy of a mark should '0' be used.
- Centres should ensure that they follow robust internal standardisation and moderation procedures for each moderation series, to avoid adjustment of marks due to inconsistencies across internal assessors.

Submitting Work to Moderator

- A minority of centres failed to adhere to deadlines, it is unacceptable and could compromise the moderation process.
- Centres are advised to check that the total marks on the front sheet correspond with the marks input on IAMIS as there were a number of disparities.
- Where marks have been adjusted as a result of a Centre's internal moderation procedures, this mark should be entered and not that of the assessor.
- The Challenge assessment sheets must be signed appropriately by the assessor, this may be done electronically.
- Centres are reminded that the 'Time Sheet and Candidate Declaration' must be used for all candidates entered for the three Challenges and signed by the candidate, this may be done electronically. The hours recorded should clearly identify how many hours are spent on each task of the assessment, this does included the 10 hours for carrying out the Community activity. Teaching and learning hours should not be included.
- The Individual Project assessment sheet must be signed appropriately by both assessor and candidate, this may be done electronically.
- Centres must ensure that appropriate Challenge Briefs are issued to candidates.
- Centres should always include a copy of the Challenge Briefs that candidates in the sample have used for assessment. If the same brief has been used by all then only one copy is required.

Submitting Work using e-submission

- When using this system centres must ensure candidates work is labelled clearly in a zipped folder.
- Each candidate should take responsibility for organising their own folder. They should not include a large number of documents for a single task; they should combine these in a logical order demonstrating their digital skills which is included in the assessment.
- Centres must ensure that all the required evidence is uploaded. This includes the signed assessment sheet for each candidate, and Time Sheet and Candidate Declaration.

Individual Project

A small number of entries were submitted for this series. This suggests that centres are (wisely) using time to fully develop skills amongst candidates and opting for the summer series to submit work.

The majority of centres remembered to annotate work, which is vital to secure the marks that can be found holistically throughout the Project as a whole (LO3 for example)

Topics were often varied which encouraged candidates and motivated them throughout the completion of the Project. Some titles were rather ambitious and difficult to address within the perimeters of the advised word count within the specification. Projects with a smaller focus tended to be more successful as this allowed candidates to write in a more detailed way, rather than to have superficial coverage on the topic.

Titles are generally more effective when written in the form of a question or hypothesis, rather than a statement. The title in the form of a question also supports the candidate to stay focused throughout the completion of the Project.

A minority of centres were late in submitting their work to the moderator and had not always requested a formal extension. This meant the moderators were contacting centres, who were not always communicative.

Following the release of results, centres should liaise with their examinations department to obtain access to the Moderator report – it was noted that sound advice provided in previous moderator reports had not been acted upon.

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

- Introductions were generally well written and allowed candidates to set the context and purpose of the Project. There was evidence of improvement in the standard of aim and objective writing - candidates utilised the correct actions verb to indicate how they would fulfil their Project. However, this was inconsistent amongst centres and still some candidates referred to research methods ("create a questionnaire"; "carry out secondary research"), or wrote an extensive list of tasks instead.
- Centres are reminded to refer to the Delivery Handbook available from WJEC to support the teaching and learning of how to write aims and objectives to ensure candidates select the most appropriate action verbs.

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

- There was also an 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. Once again, this was inconsistent across centres. Rationales were sometimes a little generic stating that primary and secondary sources would be used without additional justification for choices.
- Candidates were typically more comfortable in discussing how their primary sources would allow them to meet their aims and objectives and tended to focus on this, sometimes neglecting secondary source choices.
- Action plan templates were included by a minority of centres, which did not generally support candidates in achieving higher marks. Planning skills are demonstrated via the writing of effective aims, objectives and rationales.

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

- In relation to primary information, candidates typically opted to use questionnaires. Centres must ensure that questionnaires are checked prior to being distributed to the public. Some questions were deemed intrusive in nature, relating to sensitive subjects, such as abortion and mental health issues. This clearly has the potential to offend respondents and the ethical aspects of primary research should be considered by candidates.
- Questionnaires are a vital tool to collect information and some questionnaires within the sample were only asking respondents a limited number of questions, which did not return a sufficient amount of qualitative and quantitative information.
- Candidates must also ensure that the questions they are posing are relevant to the title of their Project, as on occasions some questions were deemed irrelevant to the title of the Project. Please ensure that a single copy of the questionnaire is included with the Project so that the moderator is able to consider the standard of the questions posed.
- Candidates used a range of sources to carry out secondary research and took advantage of government sites to obtain reliable and current information, however work was not always referenced effectively and in some cases, not at all. Candidates must include a Bibliography with their Project to allow the moderator to identify the full range of sources that have been accessed by them.
- Despite candidates being able to select a range of primary and secondary sources, marks for this particular Learning Outcome were often impacted by the lack of reference to the credibility of sources. There was usually acknowledgement of the reliability of sources but reference to currency, and validity were less apparent across submissions in this series. Candidates need to demonstrate a far greater understanding of the terminology associated with the credibility of sources.

4

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

- This Learning Outcome is still proving to be rather difficult for some centres. Numerical analysis was weak across the sample and candidates often re-stated what their charts were conveying, without making reference to what their findings meant in the wider context of the Project.
- Candidates must ensure that they are displaying their findings appropriately – charts and graphs were frequently missing titles and appropriate labelling. Candidates also need to ensure that they are selecting the most appropriate charts to display information.
- Candidates tended to neglect secondary sources from which they could have selected numerical information. Candidates could have used infographs (if available for their selected topic) as part of their analysis of secondary data, as they are visually appealing and therefore contribute to other aspects of the assessment criteria.
- A minority of centres presented their numerical information as a separate 'bolt on' rather than to place it effectively within the main body of the Project. Numerical findings should be intertwined with other research and information to reinforce points and arguments, rather than in a section by itself.
- Centres are advised to refer to recent CPD materials for advice on addressing this aspect of the criteria.

Learning Outcome 5
Synthesise, analyse and use information and viewpoints

- Candidates were able to organise and synthesise their primary and secondary findings appropriately and to some extent provide some analysis on those findings. As work was not always referenced effectively, it was sometimes difficult to identify the origin of the source.
- When candidates had been given autonomy in the selection of titles and study an area of personal interest, they were able to demonstrate a good level of knowledge and understanding.
- Lower level candidates who were not able to successfully synthesise their findings and 'pull together' their research, were generally still able to secure marks for this Learning Outcome by demonstrating knowledge and understanding of their topic.
- Centres were generally secure in the assessment of this Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 6
Produce and present an outcome

- 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 used some relevant skills and techniques to be able to present their research in an appropriate format.
- Less able candidates 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

- There was an improvement for this series in relation to candidates' conclusions. The majority of candidates provided evidence-based comments in relation to their findings for each objective.
- A minority of candidates mistakenly referred to the sources that they had used throughout the completion of the Project and how they had been of use to them.
- 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' reflections had improved during this series and had taken advantage of the advice to include them in the appendix. This allowed candidates to explore the development of their skills more fully.
- It was pleasing to see that some candidates had referred to the seven skills that are developed throughout the WB qualification as a whole (Literacy, Numeracy, Digital Literacy, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Planning and Organisation, Creativity and Innovation and Personal Effectiveness). This provided a useful structure for them to follow in referring to planning and completion etc.

6

Enterprise and Employability Challenge

The outcomes of the KS4 Enterprise and Employability Challenge are showing a general improvement in candidate performance with many candidates producing quality work because of a detailed and well-planned approach to the Enterprise Challenge. There is generally great enthusiasm shown for this Challenge at all levels of marks which is encouraging and shows great potential for its development in centres.

It is encouraging to see candidates enthused by the Enterprise Brief set and becoming fully involved in an enterprise which they enjoyed. This approach has led them to become fully engrossed in the tasks where they have shown enthusiasm for the concept, giving them the opportunity to develop their creativity and interest to produce innovative ideas to a high standard.

To achieve the highest marks candidates have identified and addressed each criterion within each Learning Outcome and ensured that the necessary evidence exists. The most successful Candidates have shown immense enthusiasm and commitment which has ensured that their evidence does address all the criteria within a Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

Candidates addressed this criterion well by generating initial ideas as a result of researching existing products as a starting point. This allowed them to consider a wide range of possible ideas and opportunities based on feasible solutions that broaden their outlook and encourage them to generate a wider range of possible solutions. However, some candidates fail to generate a range of initial ideas where the strengths and weaknesses of each are considered in order to select a feasible, realistic and effective one to take forward and develop. Successful candidates used their research to generate a wide range of ideas (not just one idea) within the group, analysing the strengths and weaknesses of each, before selecting a feasible one to take forward.

Overall this Learning Outcome is improving with most candidates. There is a requirement to generate realistic ideas. Sometimes this is limited to one idea with insufficient consideration of strengths and weaknesses in a SWOT analysis. This first section can be well developed in a group where each member brings forward one idea as a result of research. By discussing the SWOT analysis of each idea, the group can then take one idea forward giving reasons why the idea was selected, and other ideas rejected.

The process of idea development is still an issue with many candidates who do not achieve the best marks as there is little evidence of how they have developed their chosen idea by modifying it, combining new aspects or by combining aspects of several ideas. The development requires candidates to consider how the chosen idea could be evolved, changed or improved in some way. Candidates need to be aware that in the end, as a result of analysis, they may consider the first idea was the best and they have not chosen to use a development. However, they should have considered a development of their chosen idea.

The use of customer surveys and prototypes has helped many candidates make informed decisions about their initial ideas. There needs to be clear evidence of how the selected idea was then implemented.

Candidates need to put significant detail into their evaluation of the process involved in developing a new concept and reflect on its strengths and weaknesses to achieve the higher bands

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

This Learning Outcome has again shown significant improvement in this series. All candidates had undertaken a skills audit in one of several forms, but it is the analysis of the skills identified that is needed to achieve higher marks. While most candidates considered their personal skills, there are still some that have not considered team skills within their evidence.

Candidates need to undertake an audit or analysis of the skills they have identified and plan how these skills are improved during the Challenge. Many candidates showed evidence of this in this series.

Within the skills audit, many candidates did not only to use a tick box system but also considered each skill in terms of why it is important, how it is useful in the challenge and how they can improve the identified skills. There was generally good recording of performance within the group through minutes of meetings, but it is important to recognise that all candidates need to identify their personal contribution. In lower mark bands, candidates did not always identify their individual contribution, what they did when they worked as a team and how their skills were used to best effect. Most candidates evidenced their time management and appropriate behaviour within a team situation but too often, those in the lower mark bands did not provide sufficient evidence.

Many candidates encourage others in a team and allow the team to work to their strengths, but evidence is needed to show that this has taken place.

Most candidates had clear and realistic reflection of the development and application of their skills, but some candidates still tell a story of the enterprise initiative and do not actually reflect on the development and application of their personal skills and team work skills. Many candidates will consider questions such as 'What went well? What did not go so well? What would I / we do next time?' to highlight the strength of skills used and identify areas that still need improving.

Some candidates need to realise that identifying improvements is not a weakness but a strength and allows them to achieve higher marks.

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

This Learning Outcome was developed well in this series with candidates having a clear understanding of the Enterprise and Employability Challenge. It was evident from the work submitted that there was significant enthusiasm for the Enterprise and Employability Challenge undertaken, with candidates who had enthusiasm for the product or service able to convince others with ease when it came to the pitch. A well-structured and creatively developed visual display should draw on the idea development section produced earlier in the Challenge. When candidates had taken this approach, they were successful in achieving higher marks for the pitch.

There was often a detailed understanding of the factors involved in developing the business proposal which was a significant improvement seen in this series. Most candidates understood the factors involved in developing their business proposal and had evidenced it well. Work was well structured with many achieving the higher band for a creatively developed visual display. This often included the full range of display materials that had been generated in the development of ideas section. Candidates should show their idea generation and development in the pitch as well as any point of sale material, advertising, costing and forecasts. Challenging the accepted methods of producing a visual display will enable candidates to be more creative in this section.

When candidates had produced graphics and/or prototypes as part of the idea development process they were more structured in their approach and better able to communicate their ideas with reason. Having an artefact as part of the pitch is often more engaging and demonstrates detail and effective understanding when the presentation is made. Communication skills were often effective and generally appropriate.

Global Citizenship Challenge

The Global Citizenship Challenge is proving to be the conduit for young people across Wales to develop an understanding of global issues. This series has been most encouraging with the presentation of Personal Standpoints that show a clear understanding of the complex issues faced by society and the factors that create change. Additionally, creativity has been embraced in many centres with candidates presenting innovative and original raising awareness packs.

In reaching these outcomes, the work submitted for moderation shows that many centres are strengthening their understanding of the challenge. Evidence of using a range of Challenge Briefs with differentiated sources, highlights that centres are working towards accessibility and success for all candidates. This is most encouraging.

As the fifth series of work has been put forward, there is reason to be confident that the Global Citizenship Challenge means young people are becoming better informed. They can present opinions and develop outcomes that can be shared with others. This is a positive situation for Wales.

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

- A range of now familiar Challenge Briefs were used in this series. The more successful candidates were those who had been given a question to answer in their Challenge Brief. There was evidence of successful centres using a range of Challenge Briefs within the centre. This presented a breadth of complexity, suitable for all leaners.
- All centres are now using sources of information for candidates to read and analyse prior to writing the Personal Standpoint. Being able to read and understand the information in the sources is the starting point for the Challenge. Sources should not be too complex, for any level of candidate. The most successful centres, without exception, are those using differentiated sources. This needs to be encouraged in centres where learners are working at different levels. Centres are reminded that it is vital to include the sources used with the work sent for moderation, as it can evidence Critical Thinking and Problem Solving techniques utilised by the candidates.
- The most successful centres in this series have spent time teaching candidates to read the sources for meaning and to use range of problem solving techniques to show they have identified key issues, PESTLE factors and considered the credibility of the sources. This does not have to be a complicated process. The best problem-solving outcomes showed candidates highlighting and annotating on the sources. In many successful centres, candidates were encouraged to summarise their findings on the back of the source or on a separate sheet with notes, spider grams, flowcharts etc. The most successful also included evidence of a class discussion, this is very important for showing the views of others. Good quality Problem Solving encourages Critical Thinking, but it does not have to be complex in order to prepare candidates to write a competent standpoint.

- In this series there was evidence of some centres moving towards more complicate and extensive methods of reviewing the sources. This is not necessary and wastes time for the candidate. This can also lead to confusion as to which part of the work is the evidence of Problem Solving and where the Personal Standpoint begins. Centres should avoid lengthy, segmented sections of PESTLE factors and credibility of sources prior to writing the Personal Standpoint. Centres are reminded that candidates only need to focus on relevant PESTLE factors and not necessarily all six.
- The Personal Standpoints are a pleasure to read with candidates very often having thoughtful opinions. Again, there was a marked distinction of those candidates who had been able to blend the information collected from the sources with their understanding of PESTLE factors, credibility of the sources, alongside their own opinions and opinions of others. Less successful outcomes were presented when notes were segmented and consisted of separate sections about the sources and another section about the PESTLE factors. The ability to bring all these factors together into one essay style document shows a development of Critical Thinking and synthesis. It is worth noting here that the ability to blend and synthesise the opinions and arguments alongside PESTLE factors and credibility of sources was clearly linked to the candidates accessing the sources of information. Therefore, it cannot be emphasised enough how important the sources of information are. The standpoint should be typed.
- For the reflection, successful centres have taught candidates how to think about the skills they have developed within the context of the challenge e.g. reading and analysing, developing opinions and viewpoints, taking part in a discussion, understanding PESTLE factors and why the credibility of sources is important. The best reflections had candidates stating how they could use these skills in other ways and in their other subjects. Some centres are still not focusing on the reflection of the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving skills but more on the global issue. The reflection should not be too long, candidates have 1 hour to complete this part of the challenge for LO1 and LO2 together.
- It is highly recommended that centres spend time with candidates discussing what is meant by the terms detailed, basic and limited. Access to the assessment grid is an essential part of the teaching and learning process for this challenge.
- Some important points to remember about the challenge are task 1 is allowed 5 hours. This is time for reading and annotating the sources, having a class discussion and typing the Personal Standpoint. Excessively long standpoints show that centres are not following the rules of the control and these will be raised as a concern. Candidates are not allowed on the Internet during this stage of the challenge. Centres must not use the same specific topic for the Challenge that they have used for delivering the skills lessons prior to the Challenge.

Learning Outcome 2 – Be able to apply Creativity and Innovation

- Creativity was plentiful in this series for those successful centres that had spent time on this part of the Challenge and encouraged candidates to be innovative and develop their ideas. This part of the Challenge should not be overlooked and should be given its full time allocation. It is often the part candidates enjoy the most and can be a change of focus after Task 1. Centres should not be reluctant to allow their candidates to engage in creativity and think 'outside the box'.
- Centres are reminded that in LO2, the idea for the raising awareness pack must be 'implemented' to secure the marks and so it is essential that candidates choose feasible ideas. This is something centres should give candidates some guidance on. If candidates say they are going to stage an event e.g. a Fair Trade Coffee Morning, or an assembly on child poverty, then this should take place in order to secure marks for implementation. It is not enough just to make the supporting materials.

11

- Marks are given for the development of the raising awareness pack. Whilst the quality of the final outcome is considered in LO3, it does not have to be a complicated outcome. Handmade products can be just as successful as those made using a computer. PowerPoints and leaflets sometimes lead to copying and pasting from Internet sources. This does not show creativity. If students are using these methods for their raising awareness pack, centres must make sure candidates know to use their own notes in the slides.

- The most successful centres are now clear about the stages of development. Here is a reminder; development could be in the form of research from the Internet for several initial ideas, SWOT of the ideas, spider grams, action plans, mood boards, 1st draft ideas, feedback from peers on draft ideas, 2nd draft of idea, further SWOT, final product, feedback from audience, photos of stages and photos of final outcomes. Students could use highlighters to show where text/images/data had changed from the previous draft. Many successful candidates included a peer assessment of their final product. This was useful information for their reflection for LO2. Centres must be clear that in order to achieve higher marks, a SWOT and an outcome is not enough evidence for LO2. There must be several stages to the development.

- Being able to see what the candidate has made for their raising awareness pack is essential for the moderator. Centres must ensure photographs are clear, printed materials should be in colour to show the outcome to its best effect. Where possible and sensible, the original items should be included for moderation.

- In this series, good examples of raising awareness packs were songs that had been composed and performed to an audience (which was filmed), PowToon's, display boards with several elements to them, interactive games (some electronic), assemblies for lower school (which were filmed), clothing, handmade books. There were also creative leaflets, posters and PowerPoints that candidates had written and designed themselves. There was a mix of hand made and electronic products. Centres must ensure that if the raising awareness pack is electronic e.g. a Powtoon, the moderator must have access to the account to view the final product. Centres need to check there are no access restrictions on links to products. This is the responsibility of the centre.

- The reflections for LO2 were best when the candidate discussed whether they thought their creativity and innovation skills had developed. Those candidates only discussing whether their final raising awareness pack was good, did not score as well. Those candidates who had been given time to develop their raising awareness packs, always had stronger reflections. Centres should teach the candidates how to write a reflection prior to the challenge and remind them it must focus mainly on their skills development.

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

- There was clear evidence in this series that candidates had enjoyed the opportunity to engage with this Challenge, with many saying they felt they had benefitted from taking part and their understanding had developed. This is encouraging.

- Candidate's understanding was identified in many places. This included how they worked with the sources at the start of the Challenge by picking out the key information. It also included the quality of the Personal Standpoints and also how the candidate portrayed the information about the global issue in the raising awareness pack.

12

- When candidates can show their understanding of the key issues associated with the global issue and then combine this with the PESTLE factors, they start to showcase their Critical Thinking and their ability to synthesise. This will attract higher marks. This is why it is so important to have accessible sources in the first instance because this leads to better understanding, a better choice of relevant PESTLE factors and these results in a stronger Personal Standpoint and finally a more effective raising awareness pack. The most successful centres recognise this process.
- The PESTLE factors can be a challenge for some candidates, but there is clear evidence that centres are recognising the need to differentiate their approach to the teaching and learning programme for those candidates working at Level 1. Again, as a reminder, candidates need to only include information of PESTLE factors that are relevant to the global issue.
- It was most encouraging to see candidates putting forward work that received maximum marks in this series. They presented a very high level of understanding of the global issue. This shows significant commitment by centres to ensure that candidates are given every opportunity to develop their skills and show their understanding to the highest level and this is to be commended.
- The raising awareness packs are becoming a most encouraging part of the challenge with many centres embracing the opportunity for encouraging their candidates to be innovative and creative. Making a decision about the quality of the raising awareness pack is not based on whether it had been made on the computer, but whether it is effective in delivering the message about the global issue. Those candidates who had been given the opportunity to develop their idea, always finished with a better product than they started with and this will increase the marks in LO3.

13

Community Challenge

The outcomes of the KS4 Community Challenge were encouraging this series with clear evidence that the most successful centres are able to provide purposeful and valuable activities which provide ample opportunity for candidates to demonstrate the independence and responsibility needed for the highest bands. As a result many centres provided evidence that showed candidates had fully engaged with the Challenge and were able to complete each of the necessary tasks to provide appropriate evidence for all Learning Outcomes.

As has been identified previously, centre planning is key to ensure the Community Challenge is a success. Once again some centres would choose suitable briefs however their implementation didn't allow sufficient opportunity for learners to achieve the higher bands. Centres using the revised Challenge Brief which give specific breakdowns for each generic challenge theme tended to be more successful in ensuring that each candidates was given adequate opportunity to present the necessary evidence. When the 'doing' aspect is insufficient either in time or complexity it hinders the candidates ability to present detailed and effective planning and reflection.

Most centres chose to approach the Challenge as a team task and the majority did so correctly.
A small number of centres must address the size of the team in future as it is stated in the specification as 3 to 6 members. Although the activity itself is carried out as a team, centres are reminded that the majority of evidence will be completed individually and so with the exception of some components of task 2 (eg. opportunities and risks, resources, lesson plans) there must be individuality in the evidence presented as candidates "must provide an individual response as part of any task outcome" (page 33 of specification).

The most accurate assessment was seen by centres when all criteria of the Learning Outcomes were clearly applied to the evidence presented by candidates. Some centres were over generous in their assessment and would often reference work that was "restricted in size, amount or content" (description of "limited" on page 44 of specification) as "detailed". Centres are reminded that only the evidence presented by candidates can be considered for assessment.

Learning Outcome 1 – Be able to apply Planning and Organising

The most successful work began with a clear and focused brief allowing the candidates to present appropriate and realistic aims and objectives that were relevant to the work undertaken. This was assisted when the Community hours were linked to purposeful activities as candidates would present detailed and effective planning relating to what the intended to do during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge. 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. When the brief didn't relate to the activity (eg. using a Coaching brief for Neighbourhood Enhancement task) or if the briefs lacked a clear focus candidates were unable to show detailed planning as the evidence showed a lack of understanding of the requirements of the proposed activity.

There were 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 this series 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.

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.

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 "start activity", "do activity" within their action plan which isn't sufficient to reach the higher bands. Similarly repeating the same statement throughout the action plan doesn't show evidence of detailed and effective planning.

The use of industry standard templates was done successfully by most centres with candidates using them appropriately as part of their planning process. The most common templates were those used for risk assessments, lesson plans, action plans and SWOT analysis.

Some centres providing candidates with a given structure or workbook and this was done effectively in some cases to facilitate band 1 learners; however centres are reminded that providing too much structure and templates with leading questions will limit accessibility to higher band marks as they tend to restrict learner response and can lead to work being too similar across candidates. This was once again an issue for some centres. Centre must not provide candidates with generic action plans and/or risk assessments as these are elements that should be completed independently under controlled assessment as part of task 2 by the candidates themselves.

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. Many candidates describe the activity as opposed to provide evaluative comments on the planning process itself and centres are encouraged to address this.

Learning Outcome 2 – Understand Personal Effectiveness

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

Strongest candidates would include specific examples of how they've applied various skills in the past to illustrate the results of the audit as well as show consideration of how the skills relate to their chosen Community activity. Most successful candidates included a clear plan for improvement with a focus on why these skills were relevant to their chosen activity and 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 well-structured Personal Digital 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.

Reflection for this Learning Outcome tended once again to be stronger than LO1. Use of examples to illustrate and justify how they applied and developed the skills allowed candidates to reach the higher bands. Descriptive reflections where candidates merely identify the skills tended to be limited or basic only. In some instances candidates' responses were restricted due to the leading questions provided.

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 in relation to their chosen community as well as the benefits the activity provides for them individually. In a minority of cases this was too generic across candidates and centres are reminded that this should be completed individually.

Centres are reminded that the Challenge requires sufficient hours carrying out the 'doing' aspect of the challenge through working with or in the community and should refer to the revised briefs for confirmation of how this can be broken down for different Challenge types. Although a significant number of candidates met the requirement with purposeful and valuable activities, there was evidence in some to the contrary. Failing to provide opportunity for the required hours not only hinders learners at LO3 but also has a detrimental effect on the planning and organisation as well as their ability to demonstrate efficient and effective performance.

Although a confirmation statement was provided by the majority of centres, its completion wasn't always appropriate. 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 part of the Challenge candidates are required to demonstrate digital literacy skills as they develop their Personal Digital Record in a creative manner. Most centres presented work digitally however some continue to present scanned versions of hand written work and this must be addressed for the next series.

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 single portfolio of evidence making use of hyperlinks or embedded images. Better independence and creativity was seen during this series with candidates providing a record of what they personally did during the 'doing' aspect of the Challenge. There was good use of annotated photographs once again along with personalised videos, interviews and blogs. Centres are reminded that the record of participation should be collated by the candidate and generic photographs or videos are not sufficient for the higher bands.

There is no requirement to include evidence in the form of screen shots of saving or encrypting files as part of this Learning Outcome.