"How can ICT be used to promote learning and memory by scheduling the spacing of revision sessions?"

(C Grade)

Proposal

The candidate's proposal, although meeting the minimum grade C criteria, is limited in content. While the Project outline is satisfactory, the reasons for choosing it require elaboration. The section on Learning Environments, in terms of contact with other agencies, also requires expansion. However, the weakest section of the Proposal is Skills Development, in which many of the comments made by the candidate relate to the existing situation, and not to future development. The sub-section on the development of Interpersonal Skills shows little insight into what is involved here, with minimal reference to how the skills of negotiation and collaboration will be developed. There is also too much evidence of over-reliance on input from teachers (*Timeline*). Her thoughts on independent learning seem to imply that passive involvement in reading will be the main contributory factor to the development of this crucial skill, and there is little evidence to show that the student has understood that this is one of the key rationales behind the project. In the paragraph on Presentation Skills, she describes how the presentation will be made, rather than what skills she hopes to develop by the exposition of her findings. Again, in the subsection on Self Evaluation, it is clear that there is an over-dependency on others. She does mention feedback, but she should have considered the possibilities of feedback from areas other than her teachers.

It is interesting to note from the Assessor feedback to the candidate that this is the second submission of the Proposal, and that the candidate has clearly taken steps to incorporate and act upon previous assessor comments.

As indicated in the Assessor Checklist, the candidate's Proposal meets all of the C criteria, but there is little evidence that any of the A criteria have been met.

Plan

The timescale is lacking in detail, and probably fails to take into account the many other demands which will impact on the project's progress and completion.

The planning requires to be fleshed out. To a large extent it simply reiterates statements made in the Proposal. It is good to note that the advice of the mentor / assessor on the scope of the project has been taken on board by the candidate.

Again, the candidate's thoughts on research methods and resources are limited, with over-reliance on reading materials. We are already beginning to get the feeling that the candidate will undertake this project with a minimum of co-operation with other human sources.

It is interesting to note that, despite the caveat highlighted by the assessor in his / her comments on the Proposal, the candidate still expresses the intention to include a short film in her Power Point Presentation.

The comments on dependencies are weak. As they stand, they are simply an elaboration of the different stages of the project, rather than an in-depth consideration of factors which might impact on the successful execution of the project. The contingencies show little depth of thought on how to deal with the myriad of eventualities which could impact on the successful completion of the project (see *Assessor Comments*). And while there is a reference to a Project Log, the potential use of it requires expansion. The Assessor comments on the candidate's earlier idea of identifying weekly targets but, as there is no reference to this in either the Proposal or the Plan, the assumption must be made that this has come out of a discussion between the Assessor and the candidate.

The detail of the Plan reflects the statements made in the project proposal, and the grade C criteria are met but it is doubtful that there is sufficient development and expansion in the Plan for any of the A criteria to have been overtaken.

Presentation

Despite the intentions expressed in the Project Proposal, there is little or no reference in the Presentation to the marketing and distribution of an App.

While the Presentation seems to have gone reasonably well, there is one glaring omission, which is the failure to look for and analyse feedback from her audience. At no point in the presentation is there any reference to the importance of feedback from the target audience in assessing the degree of success in delivering her findings and results. There was no question / answer session, and we are left wondering how the candidate was able to reach any conclusions as to whether or not her presentation had been successful and her findings had been of use or interest to her audience. Given that she encountered difficulties in her presentation, she should, as pointed out in the Assessor Comments, have considered the benefits of a rehearsal of her delivery.

The Assessor feedback highlights a lack of independent thought leading to the subsequent failure to present to her intended audience.

In the Checklist, the assessor has deemed that all of the C criteria and one of the A criteria – *Accurate and deepening of understanding through application of subject knowledge in the chosen context, with meaningful connections well established*, - have been met. While it is not entirely clear from the comments on the Presentation, both by the candidate and the assessor, that this criterion has been fulfilled, we have to assume that the assessor feels that the award of this criterion is justified.

Evaluation of project

The candidate's evaluation of her project is fairly basic, and fails to develop her reflections on the process to any real degree. Again, there is evidence of over-reliance on other agencies, and her comments on the success of the project are tantamount to a description of the various stages of the project, with little in-depth analysis along the way of how things evolved. There is little evidence of negotiation with outside partners or of cooperation / collaboration with others, or of the importance of the implementation of feedback from any other involved parties. Again, the candidate's comments on this are primarily descriptive.

The assessor comments that the project evaluation was basic encompass all of the above.

Self-evaluation

The reference to business and marketing is largely irrelevant, given that this aspect of the original reasons for the proposal was not investigated in any depth in the course of the project or referred to in the presentation.

Likewise, the candidate's research skills show little sign of having developed from her outline in the proposal. While feedback from her teacher has been taken into account, there is no feedback whatsoever from the main recipients of her presentation, her audience. As already stated, this is a striking omission from the process.

There is no reference to her timeline, which was always vague from the outset, and it is clear that her monthly targets had not taken sufficient account of other demands on her time in the course of the year.

Independent learning is restricted to reading and the writing of a few e-mails. There is little evidence of showing initiative and taking positive steps to develop aspects of her personality.

In the domain of problem-solving, the candidate should have made a more conscious attempt to tailor her presentation to the needs and level of her audience, as some of the content of her presentation was too complex. It is a pity that this was not anticipated from the outset.

Overview

The Assessor's Additional Comments emphasise the over-reliance on staff in certain aspects of the project, and the fact that the proposed links to business and marketing had not been developed as stated in the original proposal. Some good points were indeed made, but overall, the project lacks the substance and depth required for it to be considered worthy of a grade higher than C.