

Commentary on candidate 2 evidence

Project title: Is Spain one of the most advanced countries regarding LGBTQIA+ rights in Europe

Project proposal

The candidate clearly outlined the aims of the project and provided a good justification for the choice of topic.

The broad context section was expanded and the candidate gave their choices some consideration. The broad contexts of economic development and citizenship related well to the project theme. They have outlined a range of learning environments to be accessed, some of which will be unfamiliar.

The candidate recognised how they will use and develop their knowledge of three subject areas during the course of their project but did not allude to the social aspect of this project. It is not recommended that the use of English is included as a means of making a project interdisciplinary (similarly with using maths to analyse data or computing to make a PowerPoint).

The skills section is completed well and for most areas the candidate evaluated their current strengths and weaknesses and how the project will allow them to develop.

Overall, this is a well-conceived project and the assessor comments to the candidate were positive and encouraging. All of the C and A criteria have been met.

Project plan

The candidate outlined succinctly in the plan template when they will meet each objective, and a more detailed Gantt chart is provided with additional information.

The planning strands provided more detail for the project aims which were outlined in the proposal. This is an excellent approach to planning.

The candidate stated that they intended to make contacts within less familiar learning environments in Spain and also shared which online sources they intended to use. Research methods, dependencies and contingencies were all relevant to the needs of the project.

The assessor comments were formative in nature and provided helpful suggestions to the candidate going forward.

All C and A criteria have been met.

Presentation of project findings/product

This section is very brief. The candidate outlined how they presented their research and findings and to whom. They also provided a very brief summary of the content of the presentation.

Although two of the A criteria and all of the C criteria were awarded by the assessor, there is not enough detail presented in this section to meet these A criteria and possibly some of the C criteria. However, when the project is considered holistically, additional evidence can be found in the evaluation of the project section. The candidate should have used the italicised sub-headings to describe how they presented their project findings and explained the choices made regarding methods and audience.

Evaluation of the project

The candidate considered the strengths, weaknesses and learning points of their project and provided evidence to support the initial project aims outlined in the proposal.

The candidate considered their communication methods, which were largely successful. They acknowledged the fact that not all contacts replied but they had more than enough for the purposes of the project.

The candidate described their success in having their findings published by one of the businesses contacted. This is commendable.

All of the C and A criteria have been met.

Self-evaluation

The candidate provided an honest evaluation of skills development across the project. There was balance provided as the candidate considered successes, weaknesses and learning points.

There is a comment about the candidate's use of feedback in the 'interpersonal skills' section and in the 'self-evaluation' section. These were sufficient to meet the C criterion regarding feedback but not the second A criterion. All of the C criteria and the first A criterion have been met.

Overview

This is a good project which the candidate clearly enjoyed carrying out. Although there is a great deal of evidence to support the awarding of A criteria throughout the project, the presentation of findings section was weaker, with details of the presentation content and the findings missing. Also the assertive and justified use of feedback was not evidenced in the self-evaluation. This resulted in the award of a grade B.