

Commentary on candidate evidence

Proposal

The title of this project is very clear with an appropriate question that can be answered. The outline is extremely detailed and the paragraphing gives a clear indication of the proposed sequence of the project. There is a lot of detail in the outline, some of which would have been more appropriate in the plan.

The candidate fully justifies their reasons for choosing this project, so meets the A grade criterion for the 'robust and carefully argued justification of the proposal.'

The candidate shows a passion for how their subject knowledge will be used and demonstrates empathy for those working in the project area. The broad contexts have been expanded - this helps a candidate focus in on the usefulness of their project and provides a focus for them to work from, though only one or two need be considered.

Consideration of the business aspect of comics broadens this project, helping meet the A grade criterion for 'substantial links and understanding of possible connections across disciplines contributing to the project'.

The skills development section is very detailed and clearly shows how each skill will be used during the project; however, there is not always an indication of how the project will improve skills from their present level. This would have helped the candidate with their self-evaluation.

Overall, the A grade criterion for a 'well conceived proposal which sets creative and challenging goals which are at the same time realistic, achievable and practicable' has been met.

The assessor feedback is very positive and gives insight into the nature of the candidate, and how carrying out this project will help them to develop. However, more guidance could have been provided to the candidate on how to take their proposal forward.

Plan

The timescales are appropriate and sufficiently detailed, and the breakdown of the planning into stages is an excellent way of showing the progression of the project. The stages build on the outline provided in the proposal.

While it is not a requirement, it is recommended that in the plan, candidates are aware of other commitments like prelims, for example, so that they are not overloading themselves at particular times.

The resources are fully listed but the research methods are lacking in depth. We would expect the candidate to cover how they intend to collect information at the Comic-Con, for example, a survey or interviews. This therefore, does not meet the A grade criterion 'careful selection and effective use of research/investigation techniques.'

The candidate has identified some dependencies both within the dependency section and in the way that they have constructed the planning section. Both contribute towards meeting the A grade criterion of 'clear identification of dependencies or reliance on the success of other strands of work and of necessary adjustments to the plan.'

The 'anticipation of probable and possible factors which may impact on the project' criterion has not been met as the contingencies section is too vague, and the assessor comments highlight and expand on this.

The feedback from the assessor relates to the project, but it could have been more constructive, for example, in terms of next steps or highlighting the lack of contingency.

Presentation of project findings/product

The candidate has described their presentation in detail but there is little justification for the chosen methods and there is no information about the audience.

There is no indication of any interaction between the candidate and the audience, which might have provided evidence of deepening of understanding or feedback for use in the evaluation.

The assessor has not awarded the A grade criterion for 'skilful and creative use of resources, including people, information and learning context to progress the project', or 'critical thinking, analysis and reflection used at key stages in the project to construct rigorous arguments, draw convincing, well supported conclusions, identify and resolve issues', and has justified this in their comments. Some interaction between the candidate and audience, for example a feedback or evaluation sheet, might have helped the candidate to meet these criteria.

Evaluation of project

The evaluation is reflective and quite honest but it could have been more clearly balanced. The assessor comments on the candidate's negativity throughout the project, which means it does not meet the A, grade criterion for 'incisive, well balanced evaluation of the project outcome against project aims, supported convincingly by well selected evidence'. Using the italic prompts to guide them can help the candidate approach this section more logically and help keep a focus on evaluating the project as a whole. This evaluation is somewhat mixed

up and it would have benefitted from headings, for example, strengths, weaknesses and learning points.

The focus is primarily on communication. Across the two sections the A grade criterion for the 'careful choice and skilful use of communication and presentation method(s)' has been met, but by concentrating on communication the overall evaluation is weakened and the A grade criterion for 'incisive, well balanced evaluation of the project outcome against project aims, supported convincingly by well selected evidence' has not been met.

Self-evaluation

The self-evaluation is lengthy and very honest but it focuses more on the product than on the candidate's development of skills. There is some reflection evidenced from the project, but some sections are very unbalanced, for example problem solving covers only one area and presentation contains no mention of audience. This is not sufficient to meet the A grade criterion of 'insightful, balanced and well structured self evaluation of own development.' Had the candidate included more analysis of existing skills at the proposal stage, it would have been easier for them to evaluate their progress in developing skills through completing the project.

Candidates should use progress logs or log books to help them in this section, but these logs are personal, and should not be used by assessors as evidence of self-evaluation. The assessor mentions continual evaluation and the use of logs to reflect on each stage, but the candidate must still record this in this section. There is no mention of feedback at any point, therefore the other A grade criterion 'assertive and justified use of feedback from others in evaluation and identification of development areas' has not been met - reflection on an evaluation of the presentation could have contributed here.

Overview

This project has been awarded a B grade. All C grade criteria have been met as well as a number of A grade criteria across the different parts of the evidence. Evidence of the awarding of these criteria and the B grade has been explained by the comments provided by the assessor. These comments give insight into the development of the candidate throughout the project as well as justifying the grading decisions made.