

Commentary on candidate 1 evidence

Project title: We feel more to feel less

Project proposal

The project outline gave an interesting, cross-curricular and impactful subject matter, and explained its relevance and significance in modern culture.

The broad context section referred only to sustainability, however other contexts, although mentioned, could also have been expanded. The skills section is brief and it would be recommended to keep the content organised under the individual headings, making it easier for the candidate and assessor to follow.

The candidate clearly put thought into each of the sections in this proposal, however its lack of depth and real-world links lead to it not meeting the criterion for 'Robust and carefully argued justification of the proposal.'

The assessor's feedback was helpful as it provided encouragement and validation to the underlying ideas, but gave the candidate useful feedback that there are important gaps such as not fully reflecting on learning environments and resources. The assessor could even have given more specific feedback to encourage the candidate to think carefully about the requirements of this project and allow possible resubmission. All of the C criteria, as well as the first and third A criteria, have been met.

Project plan

The candidate incorporated a picture of a timeline for events, however this is hard to read, and the text is very small making it very difficult for the assessor and verifier. As mentioned in italics in this section, any separate documents should be included attached to the project, and not integrated directly into it where it affects legibility.

The planning section focused too much on planning the performance, and information on the planned research is minimal.

By planning to provide a survey after the performance, the candidate provided good opportunities to receive feedback, but should be more specific as to how this feedback will affect the outcomes of the project, or how they will actually use the information.

The resources section again focused mainly on the performance and would be helped by formatting in a more organised way, providing each resource, its importance and any replacement.

The candidate pointed out that having done previous research, they have found that some methods of delivering the presentation are better than others. This is good insight and reflection, and showed that the candidate is not only looking to present the project, but to ensure that the audience gets an informative experience out of it. This was reflected in the assessor's comments.

The candidate has met the criteria for C grade in all capacities, however the assessor has correctly not awarded the A grade criterion 'Outline the process for achieving own identified development needs'. The plan lacked reflection about the challenges that will have to be managed, and how their development is going to address these issues.

All of the C criteria, as well as the first, second and third A criteria, have been met.

Presentation of project findings/product

This candidate's presentation lacked detail and depth in its analysis. The candidate mainly discussed the reasoning behind choosing the project, and gave little detail about how they presented it and how they put forward arguments or discussions.

A feedback form is mentioned elsewhere in the submission, and this would have been the appropriate place to explain the contents of the survey, the reasoning behind the questions, what they expected from the feedback and what they would do with the information. It would also be appropriate to explain the contents of the

performance, and give an evaluation or analysis of how this presentation accomplishes its goals.

Looking at the project holistically, it is clear that the candidate has shown strong leadership and management of people and resources, and therefore met the criterion for 'Skilful and creative use of resources, including people, information and learning context to progress the project'. Although the evidence is not specifically addressed in this section, the project should be reviewed holistically, and evidence presented in the plan and evaluation sections provide the evidence to award this criterion.

All of the C criteria, as well as the second A criterion, have been met.

Evaluation of the project

The candidate effectively evaluated their project meeting the C criteria but it is considered that the assessor should not have awarded any A grade criteria considering this section on its own. It would have been useful to have been given information on the results of the feedback survey here, and where the information would have been reflected or implemented. The candidate met only the C grade in this section and holistically the first A grade criterion from the self-evaluation section.

Self-evaluation

Although the candidate provided a lot of information in this section, it is felt that most of what is said discussed the 'project' as opposed to a reflection of development of skills and understanding. The candidate talked about the process, the challenges and the outcome, but did not deliver on how that affected them as an academic, as a performer or as a person. Due to this, the candidate has not met any of the grade A criteria. However, the candidate input here, holistically supports the awarding of the A criterion in the evaluation of project section, which was awarded by the assessor. Within the self-evaluation there was enough self-reflection throughout to justify awarding grade C criteria in this section.

Overview

This project was awarded a B grade. It met some A criteria, particularly in the earlier stages of the project. All the way through there is too much focus on the product rather than the process. With sections lacking detail and insight it is considered that this was a borderline B.