



**Level 1 Foundation and Level 2
Higher Project Qualifications**
Specifications 7301/7302

Report on the Examination
2010 examination - June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

General Comments

The number of candidates this series showed a considerable increase over entries last summer. This was most evident for the Level 2 Higher Project. Whilst 'standalone' candidates formed the larger part of the entry, it was clear that Diploma linked candidates were growing in number. It is important to emphasise, however, that for moderation purposes, no distinction is made between these categories of entry.

A full range of Projects was seen, with some extremely impressive work at the higher mark range of both the Level 1 Foundation and Level 2 Higher Projects. There are still more written projects than artefacts across both levels, but moderators do report a greater variety of outcomes than previously. Group projects still remain in the minority, with both good and poor examples of these being seen this series.

Project Outcomes

Moderators were highly impressed with many of the Projects seen. There was frequently evidence of a high level of candidate engagement with their chosen title, and a real sense of the 'journey' made by the learner. Better candidates showed imagination in the choice of the format of their Project, and used a range of skills and resources in carrying out their research. Their research was clearly outlined in the Production Log, and clear reasons were provided for their choices.

Weaker candidates, in contrast, tended to choose titles which were likely to be descriptive in nature, used a narrow range of resources and few research skills. Clearly, the role of the Supervisor is a key one here in encouraging learners to think about the range of options available to them in researching and producing their Project.

As in previous series, candidates found AO4 to be the most demanding of the assessment objectives. The best candidates ensured that they referred back to the aims and objectives of their Projects and gave a clear and considered assessment of how successful they had been. The role of Supervisor questioning in the Presentation can be used to ensure that evidence of the candidate's ability to review their learning is demonstrated.

Administration

It remains the case that the majority of centres met the deadline for submission of projects for moderation, and with all evidence requirements clearly fulfilled. In a minority of cases, however, this was not the case.

Centres should note the following requirements:

- All project components must be submitted; that is, there must be a completed AQA Production Log, a Written Report (this may be accompanied by evidence in other formats in which case the Written Report will be shorter) and evidence of a Presentation. If any one of these components is not submitted, or is substantially incomplete, then the project should not be submitted as no award can be made.
- Where a learner chooses to submit a presentation as an artefact, then this does **not** stand in the place of the presentation. A 'presentation as an artefact' forms part of the project product and cannot subsume the presentation required as part of the wider evidence requirements.

- If evidence is submitted in electronic form then its submission on either a CD/DVD or USB would be preferred. If moderators are unable to access information provided by centres, then candidates may, potentially, be disadvantaged.
- Learners should be encouraged to complete their Production Logs with as much detail as possible. Supervisors are required to countersign each page as it is completed. Learners should be strongly encouraged to complete the final section of the review pages detailing changes which they have made to their plans after their discussion with their supervisor. This was frequently a weakness evident in the Production Log. Supervisors must not complete the sections of the log detailing 'Your Supervisor's comments and advice'.
- For Group Projects, there must be clear evidence of the contribution of the **individual** to the project. It is not acceptable to log what the 'group' did and not provide an 'audit trail' of the individual contribution. Likewise, whilst it is interesting and relevant to be provided with evidence of the 'group outcome', in itself this evidence is insufficient.
- Centres are reminded that it is acceptable to provide additional evidence to support entries in the Production Log. The Production Log states that 'additional journal material, planning evidence, research evidence, records of meetings with your supervisor, etc may be added' to the log. Centres should see the Production Log as a crucial document which, if completed appropriately, would enable learners to demonstrate evidence for assessment objectives AO1, AO2 and AO4.
- The role of the supervisor includes discussing with learner the suitability of a proposed title. Supervisors must ensure that the choice of title is that of the learner. It is neither acceptable for supervisors to provide titles for learners, nor for them to 'frame' the activities which constitute the project.
- Supervisors should ensure that they provide details on the Candidate Record Form of the centre's 'Taught Element'. The Taught Element does not form part of the assessment evidence for candidates, but, centres that do not provide a taught course are clearly disadvantaging their candidates.

None of the above comments should be taken to infer that a majority of centres failed to deliver the project qualification in an approved fashion. The advice is offered to support both new and existing centres and confirm, for a handful of existing centres, where action needs to be taken.

Standard of Marking

Moderators commented that, in general, the standard of marking was good, and that there was evidence, where more than one teacher had been involved in the marking, of appropriate internal standardisation of marking. Supervisors are reminded of the requirement for candidate's work to be clearly annotated to show how marks have been awarded.

In some cases projects were submitted with marks well below the likely 'pass mark'. Centres are reminded that projects are assessed at the Level at which they are entered. If a candidate fails to achieve a 'pass' mark at Level 2, they can only be awarded a U grade. In some cases, Centres may need to review the level of entry of candidates.

Support for Centres

AQA have provided an extensive support programme for centres during the life of the Project Qualification, and this is set to continue during the coming academic year. Centres are

encouraged to avail themselves of the opportunities provided. Meetings range from Introductory meetings for centres completely new to the qualification, to Centre Coordinator and Supervisor training meetings and events designed to support the development of a Centre Taught Element programme and for centres delivering the Project qualifications as part of the Diploma. All centres will be invited to Teacher Standardising meetings and new centres should ensure that they send a representative. Other support and training opportunities are also available to centres and are advertised on the AQA website.

All registered Project centres have a Project Adviser who can be contacted for advice about any aspect of Project delivery.