

# Commentary on Science candidate evidence

## Are low fat food products fuelling obesity and diabetes?

**Assessor: graded A**

**Verifier: graded B**

### Project proposal

The outline gives a clear indication of the topic and shows several strands which could be followed.

It allows for independent learning and access to learning environments out with the school environment.

There is strong justification for the project, allowing it to meet the A criteria for this. It clearly sits within the broad context of citizenship given the health-related nature of the topic.

The candidate has carried out a good skills analysis and has made good use of the italicised prompts showing her current skills base and how the project will help her skills develop.

The assessor has given good feedback to the candidate.

In the assessor report, the assessor mentions that some links did not work out. This could have been explained further, for example, was it the university link? Where one link fails the candidate should consider exploring other avenues, for example, the Home Economics department.

**All A and C criteria have been met, though the third A criterion would have been more secure with an additional link.**

### Project plan

The plan matches with the outline from the proposal. The timeline is detailed and contributes to the dependencies criterion. There are sufficient resources and research techniques to meet the A criteria.

The assessor feedback to the candidate suggests using a Gantt chart and online survey methods, neither of which the candidate has taken on board nor later justified why. This has impacted later in the self-evaluation.

The contingencies could be stronger, though two of them seem to have been implemented. The assessor report acknowledges this.

The candidate has outlined how she intends to record skills development and appears to have done so.

**All A and C criteria have been met.**

### **Presentation of project findings/product**

The slide presentation was not carried out, however some justification for this has been given in the evaluation. This was a skill that was to be developed and as such more effort should have been made to meet this target.

Much of what the candidate has written is related to the design of the poster rather than the content. The assessor could have provided more insight into the use of resources, the relevance of the information and the rigour of conclusions made.

The second A criterion can be awarded holistically as the evaluation and self-evaluation both provide more insight, however there is little evidence of the first A criterion – ‘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’ - being met and this cannot be awarded.

The comments regarding discussion in the assessor report justify awarding the third A criterion in this section.

**All C criteria have been met along with the second and third A criteria.**

### **Evaluation of project**

The evaluation is well balanced and acknowledges strengths, weaknesses and learning points.

The choice of communication and presentation methods are effective but have not been chosen carefully or skilfully. There is no mention of communication related to the surveys, anyone in the supermarket or the school nurse. Given the importance placed on the information from the surveys and supermarket, communication in these areas should have been discussed. This means the second A criterion has not been met.

**All C criteria have been met along with the first A criterion.**

### **Self-evaluation of generic and cognitive skills development**

This is an insightful, balanced and well-structured self-evaluation of the candidate's development. Good use has been made of the italicised prompts to direct the input and, consequently, the first A criterion can be awarded.

The only feedback which seems to have been taken on board is the suggestion of the initial skills analysis. However there is no recognition of how using a Gantt chart or an online

survey might have impacted on time management, allowing meeting of the initial target of carrying out a PowerPoint presentation. This means that the second A criterion has not been met.

**All C criteria have been met along with the first A criterion.**

### **Overview**

Given that there are several A grade criteria which should not have been awarded, this project should now be graded as a B.