

Commentary on candidate evidence

Project title: Why does stress affect sleep quality?

The candidate was awarded a **grade B**.

Proposal

The proposal outline is well considered and clearly meets the first A grade criterion. Other sections of the proposal are weaker and there is limited expansion across all sections to achieve the other two A grade criteria. The candidate reflects well on their current skills levels and identifies how these will be developed. The broad contexts and learning environments are somewhat sparse and lack ambition. The assessor's feedback should reflect this and a suggestion to the candidate to redraft and resubmit should have been advised at this stage. The candidate makes good links to their career choices and the influence of their current studies, as well as the impact on the wider world. There is sufficient detail present to award all of the C grade criteria and criterion A1.

Plan

The detail in the timescales section shows that the candidate has thought sequentially, and that clear planning is in place for each month which links with the expanded dependencies and contingencies. The actual 'planning' section has limited input however, the level of detail in the timescales makes the candidate's individual objectives for the different aspects of the project quite clear. The research methods are well laid out, looking at different methods that can be used and how each will meet the requirements of this project in a succinct way.

The candidate comments extensively on their proposed research methods and presentation plans using multiple presentation formats. It is considered that they have clearly identified resources that extend beyond simply using the internet but using academic and unfamiliar sources in addition to a survey is not necessarily ambitious enough to meet later A criteria. The dependencies and contingencies were both fully expanded and considered in sufficient detail to achieve these A grade criteria. Criterion A3 was not given by the assessor however, there is sufficient

evidence to award it, though this makes no difference to the final grade. Their presenting of clear objectives in combination with regular logging of skills is used to complete these objectives and allow for reflection. This is reinforced when marking holistically in combination with the evaluation and self-evaluation sections.

All A and C grade criteria can be awarded.

Presentation

The candidate has acknowledged what they presented and to whom, and has justified what was included in their different formats and why. They explicitly state what their conclusions were and how these assisted their delivery of the presentation and allowed reflection of how their research strands impacted the overall success of the project. The reflection is strong, but it could be argued that there is a lack of some skill and ambition in terms of delivery as there is no indication of interaction or creative use of software etc in their delivery. They clearly evidence how they have developed their understanding of the subjects and have allowed them to make significant connections between the biochemical and psychological effects of stress and lack of sleep, and the impacts this has on people in their wider life.

All C grade criteria and grade criterion A3 have been met.

Evaluation

Considering evidence from the evaluation section it is clear that, while meeting the C grade criteria, the candidate has made some well-justified, clear decisions as to the content and delivery of the presentations, catering to their audiences and the poster/ PowerPoint deliveries. Similarly, there is a clear thread of use of feedback running through the project and how this influenced their choices, which lends itself to meeting A grade criteria in the self-evaluation. There are several aspects of this section that overlap with the self-evaluation criteria and vice versa, which makes it challenging to achieve the A grade criteria in both of these sections. Weaker links back to the original aims in the proposal have also limited their ability to access this A grade criterion.

The candidate has achieved all C grade criteria and one A criteria.

Self-evaluation

It is clear that the candidate has re-evaluated their originally identified skills assessment, which benefitted from their clearly explicit 'areas for improvement' in their proposal. There is clear evidence throughout that this candidate has had regular discussions and taken feedback on board to reflect on their progress and skills development. The self-evaluation highlights their successes and developments but could benefit from being more critical, without being overly-so to provide further balance and detailed insight. Each component is quite concise, and the candidate would have accessed both A grade criteria if they had reflected more thoroughly.

All C grade criteria and one A criteria have been met.