

Level 1 Project (CPJ1)  
Level 2 Project (CPJ2)

Summer 2008

Chief Moderator's  
Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our Customer Services on 0844 576 0028 or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

Summer 2008

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

## Contents

General comments	2
Entry	2
Learner performance	2
Assessment evidence	3
Formatting of project outcomes	3
Mark and sample submission	3
Suitability of work submitted	4
Awarding	4
Comments specific to Level 1	5
Appendix i - June 2008 grade boundaries	6

## General comments

### Entry

The summer 2008 examination was the culmination of the qualification pilot year. Level 1 Project had a total of 114 candidate entries and Level 2 Project 115. Of these, 55.3% achieved a pass grade at B in Level 1 and 83.5% achieved a pass grade at C in Level 2.

### Learner performance

Some impressive pieces of work were seen. The best pieces were those in which candidates had made a clear, personal choice of project objectives. In the very best pieces of work, the objectives tended to take the form of a question which could be addressed as part of the research process.

Conversely, in centres where there was evidence that the objectives had been prescribed for the students, for example when a large number of candidates wrote projects about the same theme, there tended to be less evidence of personal development of ideas, and also less clarity in the way the projects were developed.

A number of projects suffered from a lack of focus. It is difficult, for example, for a project to work successfully if the candidate has simply taken exploration of a theme, rather than a specific question to research, as the basic objective. There was evidence at the lower end of Level 1 of candidates producing work which lacked any coherence whatsoever and in these cases it was difficult to discern what the main objectives were.

Some projects which were strong in other areas were let down by a lack of significant evidence of research. A research base is essential as part of the foundation for successful development of ideas in AO3. At the upper end of Level 2, some very impressively organised research reviews were seen, as well as quite detailed primary research in the form of questionnaires or surveys.

Candidates should be encouraged to write *reviews* of their research, rather than simply to include pages of printed out source material. For learners unable to achieve this, highlighted comments in the source material did at least provide some evidence of an attempt to select relevant material. However, where many such pages were inserted, the project suffered from a lack of structure. Candidates should be encouraged to select *relevant* material.

Candidates who do undertake questionnaire research should be encouraged to give thought to basic issues such as question design, and sample size. The very best work came from candidates who appeared to have been given clear teaching about research methods. Guidance like this is essential as part of the task of providing learners with the tools for success and makes a marked difference to levels of student attainment. The specification for the Level 2 Project recommends that candidates receive around 20GLH of teaching, which could usefully include guidance in the design and use of questionnaires.

Candidates who used secondary sources of data did not always show evidence either of having evaluated its reliability, or of being selective in picking the most relevant material. At Level 2, there was not a great deal of evidence of good practice with use of references and the construction of bibliographies; this is an area in which almost all candidates could improve.

Only at the upper end was evidence seen of analytical use of research material. Candidates should be encouraged to build arguments based on research material, especially in cases where the material addresses controversial themes.

In only a few cases was there evidence of continued reflective practice throughout the project development process. Candidates should be engaging in a critical journey, in which mentors challenge them to justify and develop their ideas as part of creating rich and thoughtful project work. More could be made of the activity log to detail this evidence.

### **Assessment evidence**

Remarks from centre assessors are most beneficial when closely linked to the marking criteria. In projects where extensive, wide-ranging material is included, centre assessors are encouraged to provide annotation locating key sections and justifying the award of marks. At times, there was little evidence that projects had been read.

Marking should indicate whether bonus marks for independent study have been awarded.

### **Formatting of Project outcomes**

Formatting of assessment evidence was variable. Good outcomes were well structured with clear demarcation of different sections which corresponded well with the assessment objectives.

Some centres submitted pieces of performance work where it was hard to identify work of individual learners and this made it difficult to support marks awarded by the centre. In all performance pieces, candidates should identify themselves, their role and any costume changes to camera at the outset.

Centres who are submitting IT work are encouraged to use a moderator's toolkit available on the Edexcel website. This will greatly assist moderators in accessing assessment evidence in electronic format.

DVD is now recognised as the standard form for producing images or performances, or CD for music. Discs and cases should be labelled with centre and candidates details.

Centres are advised to consult the "Moderation of Project Qualifications - Guidance to Centres", available on the Edexcel website, which contains detailed guidance about the formatting of assessment evidence.

Careful editing of project outcomes is beneficial to the moderation process, as well as beneficial to the learners' own evaluation process. For example, while it is good practice to submit slides from PowerPoint presentations, these could be usefully condensed to one or two pages with 6 - 12 slides on each.

Submission in plastic folders is to be discouraged.

### **Mark and sample submission**

Most centres met the deadline for dispatch of candidates' work for moderation and supplied the necessary documentation. Centres are reminded to refer to the 'Information Manual' and 'Moderation of Project Qualifications - Guidance to

Centres' booklet which outline key administrative dates and requirements. These can be found on the Edexcel website.

The availability of the online mark submission screens to selected centre administrators and the automated sample selection procedure, which did not request the highest and lowest samples, caused some difficulties. However, most centres were able to overcome these problems. Centres are reminded that mark submission for all Project Qualifications will only be available via Edexcel Online. OPTEMs will not be produced for Project qualifications. The highest and lowest scoring candidates work must always be provided along with a full sample of 10 candidates (if the entry size is greater than 10 candidates) even when these are not identified online as part of the requested sample. Guidance on the submission of marks and samples for moderation can be found at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

### **Suitability of work submitted**

In some cases, projects were submitted where there was a question of overlap with other qualifications. In the most clear-cut cases, candidates themselves stated that the work had been done as part of another course. Whilst work done as part of other courses may serve as a foundation for the Project the learner work must follow the specification for the project and be assessed by centres against the project assessment grid in order to be awarded marks and grades for the work. Specifically, candidates who had not planned from the outset with the Project assessment objectives as a focus, produced work where it was difficult for higher levels of attainment to be accessed.

### **Awarding**

Projects follow the same processes as traditional GCSEs. As with any GCSE, each unit is awarded to ensure that the standard is established and will be maintained. It is necessary to ensure consistency of standard in each examination window and as a consequence of this, grade boundaries may be subject to change.

The grade boundaries for the June 2008 Examinations determined by the awarding committee for the series is reproduced in an Appendix to this report.

## Comments specific to the Level 1 Project

Centres generally showed a good understanding of the requirements of project work. Projects submitted were generally awarded marks by centres that demonstrated a good understanding of the assessment objectives. The best projects showed considerable creativity on the part of the student, who had entered enthusiastically into the task of planning, researching, developing and reviewing their work. In some cases, the level of developmental work was very impressive.

Candidates generally had made serious attempts to structure their work. In some cases, this resulted in project outcomes which were clear and readable. It was helpful when there were records of research included in the project; this tended not always to be clear and in some cases, the fact that there was no evidence of research limited students, whose work was strong in other areas, from attaining higher marks.

Even though at Level 1 candidates are not expected to carry out independent research, there is still an expectation that there will be some research (which may be directed) to find resources to underpin project development.

At the lower end, some work was submitted which simply took the form of written essays. It is difficult for work of this form to score well against all of the assessment objectives, though some credit was gained for written development. Candidates should be encouraged to think of their work on the qualification as a *process* in which significant design decisions are taken, followed by research and development, culminating in review.

There were some questions about the amount of work that had been done on projects submitted. The nominal recommendation is that project work should occupy 60 GLH. Some projects presented rather little evidence, raising a question as to whether an appropriate period of time had been allowed for the different aspects of project work.

In some cases, candidates identified the work as work done for another qualification. In cases where work had not been done in accordance with the Level 1 requirements, this tended to restrict candidates to the lower end of the marking bands.

## Appendix i - June 2008 grade boundaries

Please note that the data in this document applies to the June 2008 examination only.

### Level 1 Project, CPJ1

Grade	A*	A	B	U
Mark Boundary	28	21	14	0
UMS	6	4	2	1
Cumulative % candidates	2.6	18.4	55.3	100

### Level 2 Project, CPJ2

Grade	A*	A	B	C	U
Mark Boundary	28	24	19	14	0
UMS	8	6	4	2	1
Cumulative % candidates	21.7	33.9	55.7	83.5	100

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH