"Are the public properly informed about benefits and risks of vaccinations?"

(B Grade)

Introduction

Evidence for the five stages of the project, along with comments to candidate, was submitted using the SQA templates. The plan was supported and strengthened by a Gantt chart. Detailed Assessor Comments were provided for each of the mandatory stages of the project. These clearly indicated which criteria had been judged by the centre to have been met and explained why specific criteria had not been felt to be satisfied.

Proposal

The project title is clear and concise and gives a strong indication as to the project aims and content. The candidate's outline is very logical. The overall aim of the project is stated immediately and appropriate methods for achieving this aim outlined. The candidate gives strong justification for selection of S2 classes to work with in terms of their being about to receive vaccination against HPV. The candidate has clearly thought about methods she might use to seek feedback. The proposal is well justified in terms of the candidate's strong personal interest in the subject, her career plans and general relevance to society. Each broad context covered is amplified by a paragraph describing its relevance. A wide range of learning environments is identified to support a variety of research methods including internet based and face to face interviews. The candidate's proposed methods will make good use of the school learning environment while also requiring access to less familiar contexts.

The proposal is judged as meeting all Grade C criteria and the Grade A criteria for "Well conceived proposal setting creative and challenging goals which are at the same time realistic, achievable and practicable" and "Robust and carefully argued justification". In feedback given to the candidate the Assessor makes it clear that the A Grade criterion for "Substantial links and understanding of possible connections across disciplines contributing to the project" has not been met as the candidate could have given a more detailed analysis of relevant subject areas.

The assessor feedback to the candidate provides helpful guidance to inform the plan.

Plan

Tasks, sub tasks and timescales for completion are indicated on a Gantt chart. This is detailed and includes the set up phase of the project. Prelim dates, holidays and Interdisciplinary Project deadlines are all noted. It is clear, from Assessor comments and later folio pieces, that the Gantt chart was a working document which the candidate used extremely effectively to monitor progress as well as direct her activities. The candidate's Gantt chart also shows that dependencies have been carefully considered. Planning is logically and concisely set out in a manner that develops and expands upon her proposal. The resources the candidate plans to use are as suggested in the proposal and imply use of a wide range of learning environments. In the research methods section the candidate makes it clear that work has begun. Methods suggested in the proposal have been clarified. The candidate discusses possible presentation methods and shows insight in her recognition that her eventual methods may not be those she first planned to use. A number of contingencies are suggested and sensible solutions offered. The candidate outlines the use of her project log to record skills development and development needs. This is strengthened by discussion of exactly how and when this will be done. It is clear that the candidate is very aware of the need to detail challenges and how they were overcome.

The plan has been judged to meet all Grade C and Grade A criteria.

Assessor feedback to the candidate is extremely helpful and supportive of the candidate, suggesting next steps, without being over directive.

Presentation of Project Findings/Product

The candidate gives a detailed description of presentation methods used. Methods are robustly justified and the structure of the presentations discussed maturely and in detail making it clear that the candidate had approached this phase of the project logically and with great thought. The candidate provides opportunities both for audiences to ask questions to clarify areas of uncertainty

and for assessment of impact of the presentations. The candidate has considered her audiences carefully in putting together her presentations. Future uses for the presentations are also identified. The Assessor's feedback is very supportive of the candidate, for example, making it clear that the presentation to S2 girls will indeed be used in the future.

Assessor comments strongly support the awarding of all Grade C criteria and two of the Grade A criteria for this section. The Grade A criterion of "skilful and creative use of resources including people, information and learning context to progress the project" is judged not to have been met. The award of this criterion (over and above the C Grade criterion of "effective and critical use resources…") would require more evidence that the candidate had accessed more external learning environments and been more creative in terms of methods used and development of methods that were used.

Evaluation

In discussing the success of the project the candidate gives a strong justification of the decision not to produce a website. The candidate's discussion is strong enough to merit the award of the Grade C criterion of " A critical and justified evaluation of all stages of the project process". Assessor Comments explain that the Grade A criterion of "Incisive, well balanced evaluation of project outcome against project aims, supported convincingly by well selected evidence" was not awarded as there is a lack of evidence backing up conclusions. The candidate could have given a more in depth analysis of the project against specific aims as described in the plan. Few learning points are given.

The candidate's analysis of communication methods shows insight. All aspects of communication (with University tutor, GPs, school staff as well as in presentations) are considered.

Sensible, appropriate and interesting next steps to take the project further are suggested.

Self-evaluation

The candidate evidence and strongly supportive Assessor Comments justify the award of all Grade A as well as Grade C criteria for this stage. The candidate follows italicised guidelines in each section of the SQA template to great effect.

Considerable honesty and insight is shown in the candidate's self-evaluation of development of all specified skills. In the research skills section the candidate explains how feedback was sought and then acted upon, information from various sources was compared to increase reliability and the Gantt chart used to give an overview of the project and allow evaluation. The candidate gives clear and specific examples to back up the assertion that interpersonal skills have improved, for example, the development of a "professional " manner to use when communicating with GPs. Development needs are clearly identified.

The candidate refers back to the initial analysis of skills and provides evidence of improvement in those initially identified as weaknesses. Issues are identified in retrospect and solutions given for future use. The candidate honestly and reflectively describes reactions to feedback sought and the impact of such feedback on progress at different points in the self-evaluation.

Overview

The candidate chose a project that she had a strong personal interest in pursuing. She approached her task logically and in a structured fashion. Her Gantt chart proved an extremely effective tool for evaluation as well as for planning. Her self-evaluation of skills is particularly strong being insightful, reflective and honest as well as concise. This piece in particular suggests a high degree of development during the course of the project. The candidate has clearly gained greatly from the project. The Assessor comments provided make it very clear why specific criteria were or were not awarded. To achieve an A grade the candidate would need to demonstrate more depth of research and analysis and a greater or more creative use of external learning environments.